CORE
Metadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk
Provided by University of Minnesota Digital Conservancy

Student Learning on Faculty-Led Study Abroad: A Qualitative Study of Stakeholder Views

A Dissertation
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA BY

Mary H. Schlarb

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Advisor: Deanne L. Magnusson, Ph.D.

May 2019

Copyright
by
Mary H. Schlarb
2019

Acknowledgements

Throughout the doctoral program and dissertation project, many people have supported and guided me. I would first like to thank Dr. Deanne Magnusson for the unparalleled level of guidance and support she provided me throughout this learning process. She models the student-centered, authentic teaching this study addresses, and her guidance at all stages of this project has been both constructively critical and essential to my progress. She knew when to challenge me rigorously, both in my thinking and my progress, and when to provide encouragement. It has been such a pleasure to collaborate with her on this project.

I am also deeply grateful to Dr. Michael Paige for his mentoring in the earlier stages of this project as my initial advisor. He challenged me intellectually, shaped my thinking on study design and direction, and encouraged me with his exuberant support. His scholarship was a guidepost for me throughout this study, and I am inspired to continue that work as a professional and a researcher. With his passing, we have lost a tremendously thoughtful and engaging intercultural educator who contributed so much to our understanding of intercultural learning and internationalization.

I would also like to thank the other members of my committee, Dr. Alexandre Ardichvili, Dr. Christopher Johnstone, and Dr. Richard Krueger, for their thoughtful guidance on my research design, and for shaping my understanding, through their teaching, of internationalization, organizational change, and research methods. Many other OLPD faculty, including Dr. Gerald Fry, were also instrumental in my development, for which I give thanks.

This study would not have been possible without the willingness of the student and faculty participants to engage in the focus groups and interviews, and I would like to acknowledge, with deep appreciation, their active, reflective, and frank discussions.

Too many friends and colleagues to list surrounded me with support and encouragement throughout this process, but I would like to give a special thanks to Dr. Carol Van Der Karr, who supported me as a friend, mentor, role model, and supervisor at every stage. Many thanks, too, to my teammates in the International Program Office, current and past, who cheered me on and filled in the gaps during my residencies: Hugh Anderson, Daniela Baban Hurrle, Amanda Barnes, Kayla DeCoste, Heather Drew, Julie Ficarra, Gonda Gebhardt, Kate Hudson, Lee Scott-Mack, and Maere Vunk.

I am grateful to my institution, SUNY Cortland, and the United University Professionals Joint Labor-Management Committee for providing release time and support for my professional development through this program.

To my fellow LIIE cohort mates, I would like to express my profound gratitude for their perspectives, support, and friendship. Like the students in my study, when I embarked on this academic program, I had expected to learn the academic content, but had not anticipated the personal growth I would experience and connections I would make in what quickly became a learning community and family. I wish each of them continued success as they pursue their dreams in life and careers.

Heartfelt thanks to two friends who spurred me on with their encouragement and ongoing check-ins, Leah Shafer and Heather Naro. Each provided much-needed perspective and laughter to keep me forging ahead.

To my wonderful parents, Roger and Candy Schlarb, I want to express my endless gratitude and love for all they have given me in life, leading me on a privileged path of life-long learning though their example, their support, and their loving kindness. My deepest wish is that I could still express this to Mom, whose spirit and inspiration continue to guide me.

And finally, to the loves of my life, Mike and Max Richardson, I cannot begin to articulate all the ways they have supported me throughout this process and life. Many thanks for the love and laughs, patience and advice, and, of course, “power-up” hugs.

Abstract

This is a study of intercultural learning and teaching through study abroad programs at one four-year public higher education institution in the United States. The purpose of this study is to determine stakeholder views of factors influencing student learning in faculty-led study abroad programs. Using a constructivist grounded theory methodology and qualitative methods, the researcher explored with faculty study abroad leaders and returned study abroad students their experiences with intercultural learning, and from the collected data, constructed themes related the two research questions. The first question was: 1) In what ways do student and faculty stakeholders describe the student learning outcomes achieved through participation in faculty-led study abroad programs? Themes related to student learning outcomes include applied learning of course content, professional development, comparative understanding of cultures, personal growth, and understanding of identity-related issues. The second question was: 2) What do faculty and students view as factors influencing student learning outcomes in faculty-led study abroad programs? Key factors suggested by students and faculty related to student-centered teaching and learning, instructor expertise, student behaviors, and institutional support of faculty. Several implications for pedagogy and professional practice in the field of study abroad also emerged from this study. These related to faculty and student mutual definition of student learning outcomes; incorporation of authentic student-centered pedagogical practices, and related faculty professional development. Study findings also illustrate the need for institutional support for faculty engagement in study abroad programs.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements i
Abstract iv
List of Tables vii
Chapter One: Introduction 1
  Purpose of the Study 4
  Research Questions 5
  Definition of Key Terms 5
  Context of the Study 9
  Conceptual Frameworks Guiding the Study 12
  Study Approach 16
  Conclusion 19
Chapter Two: Review of the Relevant Literature 20
  The Internationalization of Higher Education 22
  Internationalization for Intercultural Learning 25
  Internationalization as an Organizational Change Process 30
  Internationalization as Individual Transformation 32
  Faculty Roles in Internationalization and Intercultural Teaching 39
  Student and Faculty Voice in Internationalization 51
  Faculty Preparation for Intercultural Teaching 53
  Significance of the Study 61
  Conclusion 63
Chapter Three: Research Design 64
  Purpose of the Study 66
  Research Questions 66
  Research Methodology and Rationale 67
  Research Context 78
  Research Methods 78
    Research Sample and Data Sources 81
    Data Collection Methods 89
    Data Analysis Methods 91

  Conclusion.. 96
Chapter Four: Study Findings 98
  Results 99
    Research Question 1: Student Learning Outcomes 100
    Research Question 2: Factors Influencing Learning Outcomes 138
  Summary of Findings 188
Chapter Five: Discussion 192
  Summary of Findings 193
  Alignment of Findings with the Literature... 196
  Implications for Pedagogy and Practice 204
  Research Limitations.. 212
  Areas for Future Research.. 218
  Conclusion.. 220
Bibliography 223
Appendix 1: Focus Group and Interview Questioning Route (Students) 231
Appendix 2: Focus Group and Interview Questioning Route (Faculty) 233

List of Tables

Table 1………………………………………………………………………………..…..90

Chapter One: Introduction

Globalization has created a demand for interculturally competent graduates (Paige & Goode, 2009). In response, higher education institutions have sought to internationalize, developing more intercultural opportunities for students to gain the skills, knowledge, and attitudes required to work and communicate with others from a diversity of backgrounds (Paige & Goode, 2009). Student mobility through study abroad and exchange programs has been a particular focus of such efforts, as institutions offer study abroad programming as a means to exposing students to other cultures and perspectives. Institutions have also developed new opportunities for faculty themselves to engage in transnational research and teaching (Gopal, 2011; Lemke-Westcott & Johnson, 2013; Stohl, 2007), including short-term, faculty-led study abroad programs, an increasingly popular format (Baer et al., 2018). In this context of campus internationalization, faculty are increasingly viewed as having a significant role in the internationalization process in terms of curriculum and delivery (Fakunle, 2019), as they facilitate their students' intercultural learning through cultural mentoring and teaching (Paige & Goode, 2009; Stone, 2006; West, 2012) and play a leading role in cooperation with international partners and exchange initiatives (Hunter, Jones, & de Wit, 2018).

And yet, despite the central role students and faculty play as the primary intended beneficiaries of, and participants in, internationalization activities, the voice of both groups have been largely absent in campus internationalization discourses (Hunter, Jones, & de Wit, 2018; Fakunle, 2019). Instead, decision-making, planning, and assessment related to internationalization is often left to senior administration leaders, with the expectation that faculty and administrators implement the prescribed international activities (Hunter et al., 2018). Leask, Jones, & de Wit (2018) argue for a more inclusive, accessible form of internationalization that acknowledges the views and roles of diverse stakeholders in the framing of internationalization discourse. They argue that faculty need to become stakeholders in shaping internationalization, precisely because they play such a crucial function in engaging with students in the delivery of curricular content. They suggest that to be effective, faculty engagement requires support for their professional development:

> Academics have the most important role to play in the internationalization process, as they are key to the curriculum and its delivery. So, attention to the professional development of academics in addressing the international and intercultural dimension of the curriculum is needed. They require help to design and assess effective internationalized learning outcomes (p. 1).

Since curriculum internationalization can take different forms across academic disciplines, faculty might need support in adapting teaching and learning processes, building related skills and confidence for making active contributions to internationalization, defining and assessing outcomes, and supporting students in their intercultural learning.

Students, too, play a significant role in internationalization activities, such as mobility and exchange programs. Fakunle (2019) suggests that from an economic perspective, it is students and their families who fund their participation, and who support internationalization through tuition and fees, and yet financial support is often neglected, as internationalization processes are hardly ever seen through the lens of the student" (p. 2). Institutions cite goals for student mobility, such as heightened global awareness, intercultural competence, and labor market competitiveness, and yet fail, in defining and assessing these objectives, to recognize students' motivations for participating and their "agency in internationalization discourses and processes" (p. 2). A more inclusive, effective approach to internationalization and mobility requires institutions, practitioners, and scholars to acknowledge and incorporate student perspectives on what they are learning and gaining from their participation. This view reflects a recognition, advocated by Mitra (2006) and other scholars of K-12 school reform, that students "possess unique knowledge and perspectives about their schools that adults cannot fully replicate" (p. 315). In this framework, students themselves become change agents who not only contribute to decisions about their personal and learning goals, but also to organizational transformation.

While there is presently a theoretical and empirical understanding of how intercultural learning occurs on study abroad programs (e.g., Paige & Vande Berg, 2012; Vande Berg, Paige, & Lou, 2012), less is known about how this learning occurs specifically in shorter-term faculty-led programs. It is an emerging area of inquiry. Faculty play an integral role to the design and delivery of these programs; however, research on their readiness to fulfill the role of intercultural mentor is sparse, and much of the scholarship on internationalization of higher education has focused on the organizational, rather than the individual level of development required to engage in intercultural teaching (Sanderson, 2008). A few researchers, however, have found that many faculty who participate in these internationalization activities have not had training in pedagogies that facilitate intercultural learning, whether on campus or abroad, nor do they necessarily have the intercultural competence required to communicate well with students or research partners from other cultures (Blaess, Hollywood, & Grant, 2012; Goode, 2008; Gopal, 2011; Paige & Goode, 2009). This is because “international education professionals generally do not have an intercultural theoretical background and thus lack an understanding of the cultural variables that are central to the intercultural experience of their students” (Paige & Goode, 2009, p. 347), leaving the student to learn and develop themselves. Furthermore, faculty sometimes do not have the training needed to help their students develop cultural self-awareness and intercultural competence, possibly due to institutional emphases on program policies, financial rules, and liability issues. According to a growing body of research, the result is often that students are not learning what was previously supposed while abroad (Vande Berg et al., 2012).

This study examines factors influencing student learning through study abroad programs at one four-year higher education institution. This research thus addresses gaps in both the empirical and practitioner literature on faculty-led study abroad with an intercultural component. The aim is to illuminate the nature of student intercultural learning abroad and the factors contributing to achievement of those outcomes, from the perspectives of students and faculty. In this way, I hope to understand how these stakeholders make meaning of their experiences to contribute to a more inclusive process of internationalization. The ultimate goal is to inform individual and institutional strategies for designing effective study abroad programs that help students define and achieve the intended learning outcomes.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to determine stakeholder views of factors influencing student learning in faculty-led study abroad programs. This dissertation builds upon the existing research on intercultural teaching and learning by examining student and faculty views on learning outcomes achieved on study abroad programs and factors they believed supported or hindered realization of those outcomes. The role of faculty as cultural mentors and their level of readiness to foster intercultural development of their students is also explored in terms of prior training, institutional support, personal background, attitudes and perspectives on intercultural learning and the cultural mentor role, level of experience as a study abroad course leader, or experience teaching courses with an intercultural component at home or abroad (M. Paige, personal communication, February 15, 2016).

Research Questions

The following are the research questions:

1. In what ways do student and faculty stakeholders describe the student learning outcomes achieved through participation in faculty-led study abroad programs?
2. What do faculty and students view as factors influencing student learning outcomes in faculty-led study abroad programs?

Definition of Key Terms

Key terms used throughout this study are defined below to a foster clarity and a common understanding of concepts.

Internationalization of higher education. For the purposes of this study, Knight's (2003) definition of "internationalization" is used. She defines internationalization of higher education as "the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of postsecondary education: (p. 2). "the process of integrating an international/intercultural dimension into the teaching/learning, research and service functions of a university or college. An international dimension means a perspective, activity or service which introduces or integrates an international/intercultural/global outlook into the major functions of an institution of higher education" (p. 3).

Culture. Kappler Mikk and Steglitz's (2017) definition of "culture" is used in this study. They define cultures as "groups of people with a salient set of shared cultural traits, such as technology, aesthetic, language, belief system, group identification, etc. Such groups are (or were) generally situated in, or derived from, a common place and time" (p. 14). They recognize, however, that culture "is continuously in flux, never static, and always contested, even within groups," (p. 15), as it contains multiple subgroups sharing a range of interests and identities. It is therefore important, in the context of internationalization, to avoid equating culture with nationality, always critically contemplating the diversity of cultures existing within a country, or even a region or locality. ***Interculturalism*** relates to "the mixing of people from different backgrounds, domestic and international, and the skills required for communication" (Kappler Mikk & Steglitz, 2017, p. 27).

Intercultural competence. For the purposes of this study, Janet Bennett's (2008) definition of intercultural competence is used. She defines *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" (p. 97). She describes three of the most salient intercultural competencies: the cognitive dimension (mindset), the behavioral dimension (skillset), the affective dimension (heartset).

Intercultural Learning and Teaching. In the literature on study abroad and intercultural development, the terms intercultural learning and teaching are often used. In this dissertation, these terms refer to learning and teaching across cultural contexts. In the study abroad program format, for example, “through exposure to cultural differences, it is hoped that these learners will acquire the skills, knowledge, attitudes, and more sophisticated worldviews regarding cultural difference that will enable them to communicate and interact effectively, in a mutually understood and supportive manner, with persons from other cultures” (Paige & Goode, 2009, p. 334). Paige (2006, in Paige & Goode 2009, pp. 336-337) describes the following five dimensions of intercultural learning, including the following:

1. Learning about the self as a cultural being: Learners become aware of how their cultural backgrounds contribute to their values, individual identities, preferred patterns of behavior, and ways of thinking.
2. Learning about the elements of culture: Learners come to understand how “patterns of everyday life that identify a group of people and organizing their communication and interaction” (p. 337).
3. Culture-specific learning: Learners consider the cultural elements of the host culture they are visiting.
4. Culture general learning: Learners learn through the common intercultural experiences people have when visiting another cultures, such as intercultural development, adjustment, adaptation, culture shock, acculturation, and assimilation.
5. Learning about learning: Learners come to know and use specific strategies for

refining their understanding of a culture, such as learning from the media, engaging with host country people.

Intercultural teaching involves facilitating these types of learning across cultural contexts, which Paige and Goode (2009) suggest requires intentionality, or purposeful reflection on the intercultural dimension, rather than merely having diversity present without addressing it.

Intercultural mentoring. Intercultural mentoring is closely associated with intercultural teaching, in that it is a process where international education professionals, including faculty, study abroad advisers, language instructors, and others, "facilitate the development of intercultural competence among their students" (p. 333). It refers, however, to a broader process of facilitation through curricular, co-curricular, or less formal activities such as training workshops, orientation programs, discussions, advisement, guided reflection, and other activities designed to foster self-reflection and growth throughout the intercultural experience.

Faculty-Led Study Abroad Programs, the specific focus of this study, are faculty-designed and delivered study abroad courses for which students earn credit. In the context studied, they are typically of shorter duration than traditional, semester-long study abroad programs, taking place over the course of one to six weeks. In these courses, faculty guide students as they study specific course content, undertake field research, or participate in applied learning practicums or internships. Faculty assess students and assign grades, as they would on an on-campus course.

Context of the Study

The context for this study is a public, four-year comprehensive college in the northeastern United States. The college’s total student enrollment is approximately 7,000, with over 17 percent of undergraduates studying abroad. The campus is comprised of three schools, including Arts and Sciences, Education, and Professional Studies, which house a total of 28 academic departments overseeing 62 undergraduate and 35 graduate majors. The college employs about 580 faculty and 800 staff.

Internationalization has become a focus at the college, as it has at many higher education institutions in the U.S. and worldwide. The principal goals of internationalization relate to preparing students for an increasingly globalized world by infusing the college experience with diverse perspectives, internationalizing the curriculum, and expanding education and work abroad experiences. College leaders also look to internationalization as a means to increasing the visibility of the institution, enhancing the college brand, and expanding student enrollments.

The college has a history of strong administrative support for internationalization and broad faculty interest and activity. Its president, with the support of the provost and the rest of his cabinet, has expressed his strong interest in international education initiatives through allocation of resources and staffing and in faculty hires. Fiduciary responsibility for all international programs rests with its international education office, which now oversees a variety of study abroad and on-campus programs. These include overseas service programs, international student and scholar programming and services, faculty exchange, dual diploma and pathway programs, campus international relations, and international partnership development.

The college has a long history of operating study abroad programs, having opened its first exchange program in 1967 with a university in Spain. The college now offers about 50 international programs on five continents, with a portfolio that includes about 25 short-term faculty-led courses, 25 study abroad and exchange partnerships, two internship programs, and student teaching programs. The increased number of faculty-led programs and student participating on them reflects a national trend towards enrollment in short-term programs (Baer et al., 2018). The college's students' options are expanded exponentially by virtue of their ability to participate in any of the over 1,000 international programs offered through the state public higher education system's study abroad consortium. The consortium provides the college's international education staff and faculty with a professional network and direct assistance from the state system's global affairs office, counsel's office, and other offices in terms of vetting programs and professional development regarding best practices. For over 30 years, the consortium has developed policies and procedures to streamline the smooth transfer of students' credits from international partners and among the state's campuses.

Historically, the college's student participation rate in study abroad fell below 10 percent of the graduating student population, but in recent years, the college has made strides in increasing its study abroad enrollment numbers, to nearly 18 percent in 2017-18. This increase can be attributed to a number of potential factors, including the institutional commitment to increased international programs staffing; growing engagement by faculty in the development and promotion of diverse, curriculum-based overseas programs; greater visibility after the relocation of the IPO; enhanced outreach and marketing; and increasing student access to participation through alumni and institutional scholarships.

In February 2014, the college joined Generation Study Abroad, an Institution of International Education (IIE) and State Department initiative to double the number of U.S. students studying abroad by 2019. In making this commitment, the college aspires to increase study abroad enrollments significantly within the next five years. Perhaps the college’s most significant strategy for meeting this goal will be to continue to increase diversity in study abroad, particularly as it relates to access for economically disadvantaged students. To increase access further, the college has committed to increasing scholarship opportunities, expanding outreach to underrepresented and economically disadvantaged students, and developing additional programs that are at least as affordable as a semester on campus.

In the past few years, the international education office and other campus units have collaborated to offer local workshops for faculty to support international course development and raise awareness of policy and procedures related to international activities. Topics have included study abroad course development, international grants, collaborative online international course design, faculty exchange, and advising for study abroad. In addition, the state system administration regularly offers workshops and conferences, such as on diversity in study abroad, and comprehensive internationalization. These workshops have been well attended by faculty, indicating an interest in professional development in and engagement with internationalization.

Conceptual Frameworks Guiding the Study

This study is influenced by two conceptual frameworks: Vande Berg et al.'s (2012) experiential constructivist framework of student learning abroad, and 2) Sanderson's (2008) concept of "internationalization of the academic Self.

The experiential constructivist framework for learning abroad

Vande Berg et al. (2012) describe three competing paradigms, or "master narratives" coexisting in the field study abroad, the context for my study: positivism, relativism, and experiential constructivism. These narratives shape how we make sense of our work in the field of international education; however, as Vande Berg et al. point out, they also "limit our capacity to adapt to new conditions and take advantage of new opportunities" as we "selectively perceive those things that tend to confirm its assumptions and to ignore, deny, minimize, and otherwise explain away things that fall outside it" (p. 15).

Positivist paradigm. The 19th-Century French sociologist August Comte is credited for developing positivism, which is based on the idea that it is possible to establish reliable, valid knowledge about social life using the scientific method (Crossman, n.d.). Vande Berg et al. (2012) characterize the positivist view, which dominated the early years of study abroad, as assuming that we learn through exposure to an outside world that is objective and fixed. The physical world, which is divided into societies that fall within a hierarchy of "civilized" to "uncivilized," imprints itself on students in the form of high-culture knowledge and social skill, complemented by disciplinary knowledge, through experiences such as "the European Grand Tour." This view still exists within study abroad, and many programs, particularly the increasingly popular short-term faculty-led trips, are designed merely to expose students to “high culture” sites and knowledge. Research has shown, however, that this approach to study abroad design and learning is not effective in fostering intercultural development (Vande Berg et al., 2012).

Relativist paradigm. The relativist paradigm emerged in response to criticisms of the positivist assumptions about the superiority of some cultures. Relativism assumes that notions of truth and falsity, right and wrong, and standards of reasoning are defined based on differing frameworks of assessment established within the particular context (Baghramian & Carter, 2016). Relativists within study abroad assume that all cultures are equal, with no one culture being inherently superior to another (Vande Berg et al., 2012). This is a minimalist view of cultural difference that emphasizes universal commonalities, such as our common humanity. In the relativist view, however, our students nevertheless face challenges in engaging with other cultures, so we must design programs that will “immerse” them in the host culture, encouraging—or forcing—them to engage with host nationals as much as possible so that they are transformed into culturally aware global citizens. The Georgetown Consortium Project (Vande Berg, Connor-Linton, & Paige, 2009), however, a major study of 61 study abroad programs, found little to support the relativist immersion approach, with the typical immersion approaches failing to bring about students’ intercultural development as expected.

Experiential constructivist paradigm. In the experiential constructivist paradigm, individuals make meaning of their world based on their own perceptions and interpretations of events and phenomena. This paradigm is influenced by the work of social constructivists Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann, who, in their seminal book, *The Social Construction of Reality* (1967), argued that “reality is socially constructed” (p. 1). According to this framework, a person “constructs the world into which he externalizes himself. In the process of externalization, he projects his own meanings into reality” (p. 104). In the context of student learning abroad, each person, often with others in his or own cultural group, learns from continually reflecting on experience and the environment through the lens of their background, prior experiences, their needs and interests. Vande Berg et al. (2012) explain that the primary goal of student learning abroad in this framework “is not, then, simply to acquire knowledge but develop in ways that allow students to learn to shift cultural perspective and to adapt their behavior to other cultural contexts” (p. 18). Experience is not sufficient; students must reflect on their experiences, and how their own cultural and genetic makeups have shaped how they perceive the world. Faculty leaders, too, must take responsibility for developing their own intercultural attitudes, knowledge and comprehension, and skills (Otten, 2003). According to Gopal (2011), developing these competencies “is an ongoing process that involves the deconstructing and reconstructing of one’s fundamental values, beliefs, and perceptions” (p. 378). The role of the faculty leader, according to the experiential constructivist paradigm, is to nurture the skills of self-reflection and reflexivity, or having a critical self-reflection on one’s intercultural interactions (Littlejohn & Domenici, 2007, in Gopal, 2011).

In this study, the researcher incorporates the views of students and faculty engaged in faculty-led study abroad programs, examining how students and faculty make meaning of intercultural learning and teaching. My premise is that both student and faculty intercultural learning and development is most effective when approached through experiential constructivist, reflective methods.

Internationalization of the Academic Self

Sanderson (2008) characterizes internationalization as requiring both organizational change and individual transformation. He observes that scholars of higher education internationalization since the 1990s, such as Knight (2004, in Sanderson, 2008) and de Wit (2002, in Sanderson, 2008), have focused on the institutional level, but do not address the need to provide guidance to assist faculty at what he calls the "*within*-institution level" on "internationaliz[ing] their personal and professional outlooks" (p. 176). He cites a “conspicuous gap in the literature” related to the “substance of how staff, themselves, might ‘become internationalized’” (p. 6). Advocating for a new focus on professional development of individual faculty, he establishes a framework for “internationalization of the academic Self” that marks a transition from organizational internationalization models to a focus on the individual teacher level. This, he argues, requires combining *authenticity in teaching*, as conceptualized by Cranton (2001, in Sanderson, 2008), with *cosmopolitanism*, a concept discussed in depth by Rizvi (2005). In this framework, faculty must reflect on how their own culture shapes their own worldview and the perspectives of their students. Central to authentic teaching is critical reflection and self-reflection on one’s own culture and worldview, which, he suggests, “can facilitate a transformative process, which can result in greater self-awareness and self-acceptance" (p. 283). In addition, he argues, teachers must "embrace a cosmopolitan ethic" by developing intercultural knowledge, awareness, and skills (p. 294).

Sanderson’s framework for internationalization of the academic self aligns with the experiential constructivist in that it focuses on how faculty develop themselves to become more effective, authentic intercultural educators. It is based on the constructivist notion that faculty have agency in this process of self-development, where they continually reflect critically on their own worldview and teaching, mirroring the experiential constructivist emphasis on student self-reflection. In both cases, the person reflecting, whether the student or the teacher, can benefit from guidance and mentorship. The aim of this study is to determine how student and faculty make meaning of their intercultural learning and teaching experiences, and to generate recommendations, based on their perspectives, for ways in which they can be supported by peers, instructors, mentors, and their institution.

Study Approach

Using a constructivist grounded theory methodology and qualitative methods, the researcher explored with faculty and returned study abroad students their experiences with intercultural learning, and from the collected data, develop a picture of what components—formal and informal, institutional, personal—can foster intercultural learning (or not) in short-term, faculty-led courses. The focus of this study is learning outcomes in faculty-led courses due to the increasing popularity of this program format as a study abroad option. The Institute of International Education (IIE), in their *Open Doors Report* (Baer, Bhandari, Andrejko, & Mason, 2018), indicated that 65% of students who studied abroad in 2017/18 did so through short-term programs, many of which were faculty-led, consistent with a steady increase in the popularity of these programs over the past several years.

In grounded theory, first hypotheses and concepts, and then theory is systematically discovered from the data of social research (Glasser & Strauss, 1967). In contrast to logico-deductive research, where the researcher examines and tests or verifies an existing theory or an *a priori* hypotheses, with grounded theory, the aim is to generate inductively, through comparative analysis, a theory that describes, explains, or predicts behavior or other phenomena. The grounded theory researcher is interested in a particular phenomenon, such as intercultural learning, and collects and continuously, comparatively analyzes data through qualitative and quantitative methods. The research design starts with an initial framework, but the methods and sample population might shift as concepts and hypotheses emerge from the ongoing data analysis.

In grounded theory, the researcher gathers field data using qualitative methods, such as focus groups, interviews, document review, and observations, or from quantitative methods, such as surveys. The researcher continually analyzes the data while collecting it, in an ongoing, iterative "constant comparative analysis" (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Throughout this process, the researchers use "theoretical sampling" (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) determining how and from whom to collect data as concepts, themes, and hypotheses emerge from the data. This is an iterative process, where the researcher collects the data, codes it, writes memos comparing data and reflecting on emerging themes and theories, collects additional data to those themes further, and comparing again, in pursuit of a central theory or conceptual framework. Ultimately, through this process, the researcher achieves theoretical saturation, where the themes related to the phenomenon under study are thoroughly described or explained. In the ongoing process of comparative analysis, the researcher integrates these themes into either a substantive or formal theory.

Some might understandably assume that “theory” indicates the researcher will develop a new theoretical or conceptual framework. That was not, however, how grounded theory was initially conceived by Glaser and Strauss (1967), nor is it how current grounded theorists, such as constructivist Charmaz (2006, 2014), see as the end point of grounded theory research. Charmaz (2014) suggests that while the researcher’s goal or outcome might be to develop new or expand on existing theory, it might also be a less ambitious effort to understand or find solutions to a problem, write a report, or complete a task. Whatever the researcher’s goal, she contends, grounded theory is a research process that provides “systematic, yet flexible guidelines to collect and analyze qualitative data to construct theories from the data themselves” (p. 1), to understand better how people make meaning around a particular phenomenon. Grounded theory research can reach the heights of new theory or conceptual framework, or it can, on a lower level, support or contribute to a better understanding an existing one, help identify areas for further exploration, or simply contribute to understanding of a phenomenon (Charmaz, 2014).

For this study, the researcher used the constructivist grounded theory approach, as conceived by Charmaz (2000, 2006, 2014, 2017). The constructivist grounded theory assumes that individuals make their own meaning of their experiences. This methodology also aligns with the emerging experiential constructivist view in the field of study abroad that students interpret their intercultural experiences and construct their own reality around what is happening in terms of what they are taking away from their study abroad experiences. It fits, too, with Sanderson's internationalization of the academic self framework, where faculty critically self-reflect on how they are making meaning of their intercultural education efforts. Thus, by using constructivist grounded theory methods, this research simultaneously invokes self-reflection by student and faculty participants and by the researcher.

Conclusion

A growing body of literature is shaping our understanding of student intercultural learning, particularly in the area of study abroad, and this growing awareness is starting to influence international education practice nationally and internationally. At the same time, researchers and theorists are transitioning from a focus on internationalization as a change process at the organizational level to considering how it functions at the level of individual faculty and staff development, with the recognition that these individuals play a critical role in the achieving the intercultural learning outcomes we expect for our students. In addition, the field is beginning to show signs of a philosophical shift, reflected in both practice and discourse, towards a more inclusive vision of internationalization that incorporates the voices of diverse stakeholders, including students and faculty, in shaping internationalization processes.

Chapter Two: Review of the Relevant Literature

Globalization has fueled a demand for graduates to be “global citizens,” “world minded,” “globally engaged,” and “interculturally competent” (Paige & Goode, 2009). In response, universities and colleges have sought to increase intercultural opportunities on campus and abroad so that their students can gain the skills, knowledge, and attitudes they need to engage with others across cultures (Paige & Goode, 2009). At the same time, opportunities for transnational, collaborative research and teaching have emerged, offering institutions and faculty new directions for broadening the scope of their work and their reputation and ranking. Short-term, faculty-led study abroad programs provide one such opportunity, as this format becomes an increasingly popular avenue for student engagement with the world (Baer et al., 2018). Taken together, these activities comprise approaches to internationalization, a process of change that occurs on both the organizational and individual levels.

Faculty who participate in these initiatives or who teach culturally diverse students, however, may be neither trained in culturally competent pedagogies needed to facilitate student intercultural learning, nor themselves have the attitudes, cultural knowledge, or skills required to engage effectively with partners and students from other cultures (Gopal, 2011). In this study, the researcher explores student intercultural learning on faculty-led study abroad programs and ways in which faculty leaders facilitate that learning. After establishing the concept of internationalization as both an organizational and individual change process, the researcher presents a review of the literature on study abroad learning outcomes, on faculty roles in internationalization and intercultural teaching, and on faculty development in support of these roles.

The complex socio-political, economic, and technological forces of globalization have compelled higher education institutions worldwide to internationalize their curricula, their research, and their administrative structures. This process involves organizational change and innovation across the teaching, research, and service missions of academic institutions, requiring adaptation in response to these external global forces, combined with planned change focusing on shifting the organizational culture (Bartell, 2003). As universities and colleges increase opportunities on campus and abroad for their students can gain the intercultural skills, knowledge, and attitudes required in intercultural workplaces and communities, they encourage faculty to pursue transnational, collaborative research and teaching activities as a means to expanding the scope of their scholarship and infuse broader perspectives into their teaching. To support faculty engagement, higher education institutions have fostered more international exchange partnerships, developed cross-border research collaborations, and opened branch campuses abroad (Gopal, 2011; Lemke-Westcott & Johnson, 2013). In addition, many admissions offices have shifted focus to recruiting international students in order to fill enrollment shortfalls, increase campus cultural diversity, and attract qualified graduate students (Stohl, 2007).

Faculty play a central role in this organizational change process, by virtue of their integral involvement in teaching, curriculum design, research, and to varying extents, campus governance (Friesen, 2012; Paige & Goode, 2009; Sanderson, 2008). Yet faculty engagement in internationalization, and their capacity to contribute, fall short of what is needed (Friesen, 2012; Goode, 2008; Gopal, 2011; Paige & Goode, 2009; Stohl, 2007). Demands on their time, lack of resources, skepticism about institutional motives, and underdeveloped attitudes, knowledge, and skills to interact with partners and students from other cultures (Gopal, 2011), have all been described by faculty themselves as barriers to engagement. A growing body of literature has explored these and other barriers to faculty participation in internationalization, as well as strategies higher education institutions can and have used to overcome them. This literature review explores higher education internationalization as an organizational change process, considers the role of faculty in internationalization and intercultural teaching and learning, and potential barriers to their involvement, and suggest ways in which institutions can support faculty and internationalization.

The Internationalization of Higher Education

Definitions

Altbach and Knight (2007), two leading scholars in the field of internationalization, distinguish between the terms *globalization* and *internationalization,* two concepts that are often confused. They define globalization as "the economic, political, and societal forces pushing 21st century higher education toward greater international involvement" (p. 290). For the first time, they argue, global capital has been heavily invested in developing the "knowledge society," where education is viewed as a commodity within the context of free trade. Internationalization, on the other hand, "includes the policies and practices undertaken by academic systems and institutions—and even individuals—to cope with the global academic environment" (p. 290). Higher education institutions engage in internationalization for a variety of reasons, including commercial advantage, knowledge and language acquisition, enhancing the curriculum with international content, among others. Internationalization is therefore, according to Altbach and Knight, a response to globalization, where institutions cannot control the forces of globalization, but do generally have a choice in what activities and policies they pursue.

In the higher education sector, internationalization is defined in a variety of ways, depending on the context and stakeholders involved (Gopal, 2011). Knight's (2003) comprehensive definition is often cited in the literature and in practice as follows: "the process of integrating an international/intercultural dimension into the teaching/learning, research and service functions of a university or college. An international dimension means a perspective, activity or service which introduces or integrates an international/intercultural/global outlook into the major functions of an institution of higher education" (p. 3). Hudzik (2011) adds the element of institutional "commitment, confirmed through action" (p. 6), emphasizing the need for universities to invest time and resources in these efforts. Green and Shoenberg (2006) define 'comprehensive internationalization' as "a process that would lead to institutional transformation over time, built on an institutional vision for internationalization, a clearly articulated set of goals, and a strategy to integrate the internationally and globally focused programs and activities on campus" (p. 1). Internationalization is thus seen as a strategic organizational change process involving multiple stakeholders, who actively work to transform the institution into one that can respond to a rapidly changing external environment.

Rationales for Internationalization

Higher education institutions decide to internationalize for a variety of reasons. According to Hudzik (2004, in Stohl, 2007), "The case to internationalize higher education is unimpeachable...The complexity of community and world problems demands a wider array of problem-defining and -solving perspectives that cross disciplinary and cultural boundaries." Altbach and Knight (2007) provide an overview of the most important stimuli for academic internationalization, including the following: profits, enhancing research capacity and intercultural learning, increased demand for and access to higher education worldwide, traditional internationalization for providing intercultural experiences and enhanced curricula, internationalization for economic and political integration (i.e., such as in Europe through the ERASMUS exchange program), developing country internationalization for economic development and increased quality and cultural diversity, and individual pursuit of international experiences. Friesen (2012), summarizing the literature on internationalization, emphasizes that institutions internationalize both in order to develop a greater international presence (Stromquist, 2007, in Friesen, 2012) and in pursuit of humanist ideals of mutual understanding (Schoorman, 2000, in Friesen, 2012).

Stone (2006) lists several well-documented pressures that have "heighten[ed] the need for most people, regardless of their vocational, cultural, or geographical contexts, to learn to interact more effectively with others from different cultural backgrounds," including the following:

> the advent of more globalized economies, markets, and international alliances; the rapid development of new information and communication technologies; vastly increased international mobility; the growing multicultural profile of most societies across the world; and the 'internationalisation' of education programs and institutions (p. 335).

Stone uses the term *globalization* to describe "the physical realities, rather than an ideological position, caused by such substantial increases in international economic interaction and interdependence" (p. 335).

Stohl (2011) traces the trend towards institutions' efforts to internationalize in the 1980s and 1990s, with an emphasis on how international education could support national security in both political and economic terms. He contends, however, that these efforts were not as successful as expected. Internationalization scholar John Hudzik (2003, in Stohl, 2007, p. 370) has written that "By numerous measures, American higher education has failed to meet the challenges and opportunities of globalization, and the American public is ill-prepared" in terms of "virtually all indicators of international knowledge, awareness, and competence." These include knowledge of geography, world affairs, and skills in languages and cultural exchange. Study abroad enrollment in the U.S. also continues to be low, at only about three percent of U.S. college students in three-year programs (Stohl, 2007).

Internationalization for Intercultural Learning

Institutions typically assess their progress in internationalization activities through study abroad and international student enrollments; number and locations of partners; languages taught; and types of teacher, research, and service collaborative activities. Although these data still remain important in assessing levels on international activity, focus has turned to comprehensive internationalization and student learning outcomes (Hudzik, 2011). Factors now considered in measuring internationalization include the affordability, accessibility, and learning outcomes of study abroad programs; the quality of the international student and scholar experience and support of their integration; levels of faculty engagement in research and teaching with international colleagues; and the extent to which students on campus have curricular and co-curricular opportunities to learn about and engage with other cultures, without necessarily studying abroad (Bartell, 2003; Green & Shoenberg, 2006). The concept of internationalization therefore now incorporates a broader range of activities and measures, many of which are more qualitative in nature.

Stohl (2007) also poses the question of how internationalization can go beyond the metrics of study abroad and international student enrollment, research collaborations, and internationalized curriculum content to encourage greater learning and discovery:

> To capture the faculty's interest in, and commitment to, internationalization, we need to move beyond the conceptualization of the internationalization or globalization of higher education in terms of how the different aspects of teaching, research, and service functions of the university are becoming more "internationalized" and examine how these activities encourage greater learning and discovery (p. 359).

Stohl therefore suggests that the ultimate objective of internationalization should be optimizing opportunities for intercultural learning, achieving what Simcock (1989, in Stohl, 2007) calls the "third level of learning," where "one learns with the other and learns how to produce and work jointly with others with multiple ways of knowing and doing” (p. 369).

Stone (2006) lists a comprehensive set of aspects of internationalization that "transcend fiscal necessities," such as international student recruitment to meet enrollment targets. These include aspects such as "developing appropriate teaching methods, curricular, and support services for international and local students from diverse cultural backgrounds; identifying the benefits of international experience (e.g., exchange programs) for staff, students, and institutions; and encouraging the uptake of these opportunities and finding ways to maximise and sustain these benefits over time;"...developing ICE [intercultural effectiveness] levels of staff and students to facilitate positive social interaction and the development of productive and enduring professional relationships;...and providing opportunities for staff and students to develop "global citizenship competencies, including an understanding of global issues and ways to actively engage in addressing them" (p. 336). All of these needs, Stone contends, "require developing an understanding of the perspectives, values, and behaviours of other cultures. Most of them also demand a level of interpersonal ability to interrelate effectively with people from different cultures" (p. 336).

Stone (2006), focusing on the context of internationalizing the student learning experience—and by extension, faculty teaching methods—argues the need to identify and adopt a higher "resolution," more actionable, interpretation of internationalizing teaching. He suggests that the constructs of international knowledgeability and intercultural competence "offer overlapping paths forward in responding to the need to internationalise student learning" (p. 337). He defines these two constructs as follows: International Knowledgeability is comprised of two elements: 1) "knowledge that pertains wholly or mainly to a specific nation or group of nations" (e.g., language, culture, economy, geography, etc.) and 2) "global or generic knowledge that is broadly relevant and transferable across national borders" (p. 337). Stone (2006) further explores a more detailed and comprehensive set of student learning objectives ("Global Education Objectives" adapted from Pike and Selby (1988, in Stone, 2006, p. 338). These objectives, Stone clarifies, should not be seen as a "prescriptive syllabus" and do not necessarily have to be addressed in all courses or subjects; rather, they are meant to stimulate thinking on how to internationalize student learning when considering curricular review and development. He suggests that instructors and curriculum designers should consider the following contextual factors when deciding whether to internationalize the student learning experience:

- “the appropriateness of international content for particular subjects, courses, and the broader curriculum;
- the personal interests of both staff and students' departmental and organisational cultures;
- relevance to likely student vocational destinations;
- institutional priorities;
- available funding opportunities; and
- perceived areas of deficit in need of concerted attention” (p. 351).

In essence, he suggests, teachers and curriculum designers should “align[ ] any change with the existing needs, interests, and priorities of these concerns” (p. 351).

Bartell (2003) views internationalization as occurring on a continuum, from limited and symbolic, to a synergistic and transformative process that involves and influences all stakeholders, including faculty, staff, students, administrators, and the surrounding community. He suggests that higher education institutions vary significantly in where they fall on this continuum, depending on their university culture, curricula, fields of study, and strategy. Furthermore, he explains, internationalization occurs to different degrees across units within an institution. Crosling, Edwards, and Schroder

(2008), examine curriculum internationalization in the six business disciplines at a university business school, finding some disciplines "are more culturally embedded and, therefore, more amenable to curriculum integration than others" (p. 110). Green and Shoenberg (2006) similarly suggest that the extent to which faculty are inclined or disinclined to consider international perspectives is based on the extent to which their discipline is intrinsically international, comparative, or global in nature.

Green and Shoenberg (2006), however, argue that many of the new efforts institutions are making are more like a “mechanical add-on to what already exists than an effort to make international perspectives an integral part of the institutions and its curriculum” (p. 3). They suggest that institutions should change the curriculum to infuse global learning, which will require engaging faculty who design and teach the internationalized curriculum in “an organic rather than a mechanical way” (p. 3). Faculty, as “gatekeepers” (Groening and Wiley, 1990, in Green & Shoenberg, 2006), must see the value of internationalization, and will not likely make changes without the involvement of their departments and disciplines.

Crosling et al. (2008) also describe the internationalization of curricula as a process of organizational change. "Organizations,” they write, “like living creatures, tend to be homeostatic (Goodstein & Burke, 1997, in Crosling et al., 2008) and, according to Lewin (1991, in Crosling et al., 2008), must be ‘unfrozen’ for change to occur" (p. 110). Crosling et al. (2008) contend that

> curriculum change, involving large numbers of staff and students, is a difficult process. It confronts the same constraints of those introducing change in any

> large, complex organization and, therefore, has to be carefully planned, well resourced and have the involvement and support of the academic staff (p. 119).

Academics have to teach different materials differently, which is time consuming and can be viewed as a loss of academic independence and autonomy (Crosling et al., 2008). This adaptation requires a shift in institutional culture through an organizational change process (Bartell, 2003). It also requires the development of individuals' own "global mindsets," in a process Sanderson (2008) calls "internationalization of the academic Self." The elements of change at both the institutional and individual levels are explored below.

Internationalization as an Organizational Change Process

Sanderson (2008) notes that until now, much empirical research and meta-analyses has focused on internationalization as an institutional, organizational development process (e.g., Knight, 1999a; Hudzik, 2011). The research on faculty engagement in internationalization, shaped by Knight's work since the mid-1990s, has emphasized structural and institutional challenges and remedies, rather than the development or internationalization of the "academic Selves" of faculty. The literature on internationalization has mainly identified institutional and disciplinary barriers to the engagement of individual faculty. Research on individual-level development and transformation is significantly more limited.

Internationalization as Organizational Change and Development

To be sustainable, the organizational change process required for internationalization must include not only development of an institution's ability to respond flexibly and quickly to external forces of globalization; it must also incorporate a "long-range strategy for managing change" (McLean, 2005, p. 12). Bartell (2003) suggests that to be effective in this type of strategic planning for internationalization, higher education institutions need to acknowledge and understand their existing organizational culture and employ some form of “strategic culture management” (p. 66) in the adaptation process. He describes how the concept of organizational culture has emerged in the organizational literature in recent decades as having a significant impact on organizational effectiveness, either supporting or inhibiting organizational development and innovation. Planners that work to understand the embedded culture of an organization and its environment, and to establish a culture that has shared values, vision, and trust, can motivate individuals within the organization to engage in the transformation process (Bartell, 2003).

Bartell (2003) defines some of the distinctive cultural characteristics of higher education institutions that can serve as complicating and inhibiting factors in planning and implementing internationalization. Universities, for example, have less clear, differentiated, and difficult-to-measure goals compared to business organizations. They are labor-intensive and are comprised of numerous and varied stakeholders diverse in their disciplines, cultural backgrounds, and roles. Within institutions exist parallel structures, where faculty tend to value autonomy and academic freedom, while administrators are more oriented towards institutional maintenance through procedures and policy. Bartell (2003) further describes how the rapidly changing and demanding environment in which universities operate places additional pressure on programs, delivery systems, and relationships among stakeholders. In addition, each institution, and even units within institutions, have unique cultural features with respect to “hierarchy of authority, patterns of communication, interactions and coordination” (p. 50), strategic plans and institutional goals, and disciplinary synergies with international activities. Those planning for internationalization must consider these and other cultural factors in order to effect meaningful change, because “without accompanying culture change, most organizational changes fail or remain temporary” (Cameron & Freeman, 1991, in Bartell, 2003, p. 54).

Internationalization as Individual Transformation

Faculty Transformations

Sanderson (2008) characterizes internationalization as not just an institutional change process, but as requiring individual faculty development and transformation. Writing from an Australian perspective, he suggests that the prevalent discussions of internationalization of higher education, such as Knight’s (1999a, in Gopal, 2011), focus on the organizational level, but are limited in terms of utility because they do not provide concrete guidance for how individual faculty can internationalize their teaching and research. To advance this notion, Sanderson develops his “internationalization of the academic Self” framework that combines authenticity in teaching with cosmopolitanism. In this model, faculty must be authentic teachers, which requires that they "appreciate how their home culture produces and supports their personal and social worldviews" (p. 282). He draws from Cranton's (2001, in Sanderson, 2008) work defining authenticity in teaching, where "critical reflection and self-reflection on the basic assumptions of one's own culture and worldview can facilitate a transformative process, which can result in greater self-awareness and self-acceptance" (p. 283). Sanderson describes the process as “a vital step in understanding others, particularly cultural Others. Being able to critically reflect on one’s own values is fundamental to being able to dismantle the barriers that obstruct a legitimate understanding and acceptance of others” (p. 12).

Sanderson then expands Cranton’s notion of authenticity in teaching through the concept of cosmopolitanism, which he characterizes as being “underpinned more by attitudes of openness, interconnectivity, interdependence, reciprocity, and plurality” (p. 14). He discusses at length varying definitions of cosmopolitanism, giving preference to the concept of "rooted cosmopolitanism," which combines the local and everything beyond the local. Teachers, he writes, should "embrace a cosmopolitan ethic" by developing "intercultural knowledge, awareness, and skills" (Eisenchlas & Trevaskes, 2003, p. 87, in Sanderson, p. 294). Notably, Sanderson distinguishes between “the fleeting, superficial, popular and spontaneous use of cosmopolitan and a deeper appreciation of, and subscription to, cosmopolitanism as a way of life and an integral part of a teachers’ personal and professional values” (p. 16).

Crosling et al. (2008), reviewing the literature on organizational change, describe several conditions that relate to the individual development and Sanderson’s (2008) notion of internationalizing the academic self. Carnall (1997, in Crosling et al., 2008), suggests the need for "awareness (understanding the need for change); capability (people must feel that they can cope with new situations, and inclusion ('ownership' of the change process, a credible commitment of managers, understanding of accountability and reward systems)" (p. 109). Dirks et al. (1996, in Crosling et al., 2008) relate the degree of 'psychological ownership' of individuals for an organization to three types of change alternatives: self-initiated/imposed; evolutionary/revolutionary; and additive/subtractive. Psychological ownership is positive for self-initiated, evolutionary, and additive change, and negative for imposed, revolutionary, and subtractive. Trowler (1998, in Crosling et al., 2008) emphasizes the importance of understanding and addressing pre-existing staff attitudes in the change process, taking both a 'bottom-up' and 'top-down' approach that develops among faculty and staff a shared vision and commitment to the change, facilitated by hand-on experience and room for experimentation and adaptation.

Stone (2006) contends that reflectiveness is a critical element in developing one’s own intercultural effectiveness, or competence, just as Cranton (2001, in Sanderson, 2008) suggests self-reflection is required to develop authenticity in teaching. Stone characterizes reflectiveness on “one’s own ways of thinking, feeling, and doing” as a “higher-order ability,” which, if done systemically, “can enhance self-awareness that allows major progress in relating better to people of other cultures…and enhanced understanding of what might have transpired below the surface of a particular situation and therefore how better to approach and engage in the next related encounter” (p. 348).

Tervalon and Murray-García (1998), writing of the context of medical education and training, similarly suggest that cultural competency should be accompanied by lifelong self-reflection and an appropriate change of attitude and behavior, a specific trait they call *cultural humility*. This, they contend, can be supported with certain pedagogical approaches, patient-focused interviewing and care, community-based care including training within the settings where one will practice, and institutional consistency. Staff and faculty at institutions, like individuals, must also continually reflect with cultural humility on practices and policies related to hiring, faculty training, curricular development, and assessment in order "to redress the power imbalances in the physician-patient dynamic, and to develop mutually beneficial and non-paternalistic partnerships with communities on behalf of individuals and defined populations" (p. 123).

Student Transformations

In recent years, discourse on desired student learning outcomes from intercultural and international activities has focused on development of a variety of skills and behaviors related to increased awareness of other cultures, knowledge of global issues, and ability to engage with people from diverse societies. Terms such as *intercultural sensitivity*, *global* or *international mindset*, *intercultural competency*, and *intercultural effectiveness* are often used to describe these desired learning outcomes, but it is not always clear the extent to which these terms are distinct from or similar with one another. Below is a brief definition of each of these terms.

Milton Bennett (1993) describes *intercultural sensitivity* in terms of stages of personal development, along a continuum of "increasing sophistication in dealing with cultural difference, moving from ethnocentrism through stages of greater recognition and acceptance of difference," or "ethnorelativism" (p. 22). Intercultural sensitivity, he contends, is organized around the concept of differentiation, in the sense both that people differentiate phenomena in different ways and that different cultures maintain different patterns of differentiation. The term intercultural sensitivity therefore relates to the "way people construe cultural difference and in the varying kinds of experience that accompany different constructions" (p. 24).

Blaess et al. (2012) suggest that the primary goal of internationalization initiatives is instilling in students a "global mindset…a requirement to developing global cognitive capacity" (p. 89). Leininger and Javidan (2010, in Blaess et al., 2012, p. 89) define global mindset as follows:

> a set of individual attributes that can help increase a leader's effectiveness in influencing groups, organizations, and systems that are unlike their

> own. It helps leaders to decode what is going on around them in cross-cultural environments and choosing the right behavior under the relevant cultural conditions. A global mindset has three primary dimensions: intellectual capital, psychological capital and social capital (p. 89).

Janet Bennett (2008) defines *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" (p. 97). She describes three of the most salient intercultural competencies: the cognitive dimension (mindset), the behavioral dimension (skillset), the affective dimension (heartset). Deardorff (2009), using the Delphi technique where "an iterative process [was] used to achieve consensus among a panel of [intercultural] experts" on the meaning of intercultural competence, defined the concept as ability to demonstrate "*effective* and *appropriate* behavior and communication in intercultural situations, which again can be further detailed in terms of *appropriate* behavior in specific contexts (appropriate behavior being assessed by the other involved in the interaction)" (p. 479). Hammer (2012) explains the components of intercultural competency development as involving "increasing cultural self-awareness; deepening understanding of the experiences, values, perceptions, and behaviors of people from diverse cultural communities; and expanding the capability to shift cultural perspective and adapt behavior to bridge across cultural differences (Hammer, 2009a, 2010, 2011)" (p. 116). The term intercultural competence has therefore been used to describe a set of cognitive skills based on awareness and knowledge of other's and one's own culture, appropriate behavioral responses in intercultural situations, and an appreciation for difference. It is characterized as a process, where one grows or perhaps at times regresses situationally and over time.

Stone (2006) prefers the term *intercultural effectiveness,* which he defines as "the ability to interact with people from different cultures so as to optimise the probability of mutually successful outcomes" (p. 338). Stone uses *intercultural,* as opposed to *cross-cultural* or *transcultural*, "in deference to the most widespread current conversations of the most relevant recent research" (p. 339). He chooses to use *effectiveness*, while acknowledging that *competence* is used widely in the literature (e.g. AUCC, Knight 1999a), where it is seen as "appropriate because it is understood by these users as a holistic concept that can be seen to encapsulate a range of a such attributes knowledge, attitudes, and skills considered essential for successful professional and personal performance (Gonczi, cited in Eraut, 1998)" (p. 340). Stone suggests that the term *competence* has been seen by some to be problematic. It has been redefined with difference nuances, such as related to assuring and managing workplace quality, investment in "human capital," and "to provide what is perceived to be a more objective basis for the negotiation of a range of other industrial issues such as performance pay, skills formation, and greater accountability" (p. 340). *Competence*, argues Stone, still tends to be associated with lower order skills training, and is considered by some, such as Talbot (2004, in Stone, 2006) to be part of "'an inappropriate epistemology' (p. 587) that pertains to lower order abilities unable to capture important aspects of professional performance and understanding" (p. 340).

Stone therefore argues that "competency-based education and training can and should effectively foster the development of higher-order, meaningful, and transferable forms of learning...Progressive competency-based approaches offer a means for much more clearly identifying what it is people need to learn, what steps are involved along the way, and how to know when progress has been achieved" (p. 341). Stone chooses to use the "less stigma-laden term *effectiveness*" to "circumvent possible concerns readers may have about the term *competence*" (p. 341).

Focusing on the context of internationalizing the student learning experience—and by extension, faculty teaching methods— Stone (2006) argues the need to identify and adopt a higher "resolution," more actionable, interpretation of internationalizing teaching. He suggests that the constructs of international knowledgeability and intercultural competence "offer overlapping paths forward in responding to the need to internationalise student learning" (p. 337). He defines these two constructs as follows: International Knowledgeability is comprised of two elements: 1) "knowledge that pertains wholly or mainly to a specific nation or group of nations" (e.g., language, culture, economy, geography, etc.) and 2) "global or generic knowledge that is broadly relevant and transferable across national borders" (p. 337). Stone (2006) further explores a more detailed and comprehensive set of student learning objectives, or "Global Education Objectives," adapted from Pike and Selby (1988, in Stone, 2006, p. 338). These objectives, Stone clarifies, should not be seen as a "prescriptive syllabus" and do not necessarily have to be addressed in all courses or subjects; rather, they are meant to stimulate thinking on how to internationalize student learning when considering curricular review and development.

Student mobility through study abroad and exchange programs has been a particular focus of university and college efforts to internationalization student learning.

These programs are promoted as intercultural opportunities for students to gain the skills, knowledge, and attitudes required to work and communicate with others from a diversity of backgrounds (Paige & Goode, 2009). The largest expansion of study abroad programming has been in short-term, faculty-led courses. In these programs, students are guided by faculty to destinations abroad for periods typically of one to four weeks. The Institute of International Education (IIE), in their *Open Doors Report* (Baer et al., 2018), indicated that 65% of students who studied abroad in 2017/18 did so through short-term programs, many of which were faculty-led, consistent with a steady increase in the popularity of these programs over the past several years. The body of literature on the outcomes from faculty-led study abroad is emerging. An increasing number of studies on such programs has contributed to understanding of the learning and development outcomes (Anderson, Lawton, Rexeisen, & Hubbard, 2006; Biraimah & Jotia, 2012; Jackson, 2008a; Stebleton, Soria, & Cherney, 2013). These studies indicate that even during trips of short duration, positive learning outcomes are to some extent achieved, including professional development, growth in cultural awareness (Biraimah & Jotia, 2012); global and intercultural competencies (Stebleton et al., 2013); or intercultural sensitivity (Anderson et al., 2006; Jackson, 2008a).

Faculty Roles in Internationalization and Intercultural Teaching

McLean (2005) emphasizes the importance in organizational development for both an institution’s leadership and faculty and staff to be committed, supportive, and involved. Faculty in particular are seen as having a central role in campus internationalization as an organizational development process (Crosling et al., 2008; Friesen, 2012; Goode, 2008; Green & Shoenberg, 2006; Paige & Goode, 2009;

Sanderson, 2008; Stohl, 2007). From their research of an Australian university, Crosling et al. (2008) emphasize the following key considerations in engaging faculty in organizational change:

1. “People respond positively to change when: they understand why it is required; they can cope with it; and they have ‘ownership’ of the change process.
2. Senior management must be seen as committed to the change, through leadership and the provision of resources.
3. Academics value autonomy on curricula matters, especially with individual subjects.
4. Australian academics are frustrated with increased administrative and teaching workloads and are under pressure to research more” (p. 117).

Friesen (2012), using a phenomenological approach, considers the ways in which faculty experience internationalization and perceive institutional strategies at their institutions. She bases her findings both on interviews with five faculty members who have been nominated for internationalization awards at five different Canadian institutions of higher education and analysis of institutional strategic planning documents at six different institutions. Themes emerging from her study include globalization's impact on the faculty experience and the lack of faculty understanding of how internationalization of higher education is an institutional response to globalization. Yet faculty themselves, as the "primary contributors and inhibitors" of internationalization, are themselves affected by globalization; for example, they must "relate to students with increasing levels of intercultural sensitivity (Morey, 2000) and approach pedagogy from multiple worldviews (Donald, 2007)" (p. 211). "New roles" include being involved in more cross-disciplinary international partnerships, networks, and research, which represents a "tightening link" between faculty interests and institutional interests. Faculty are "key agents" in the internationalization process, who can "best facilitate the intercultural development and transformative learning of others if they have the opportunity to experience this process first" (p. 224).

Stohl (2007) also argues that the engagement of faculty is critical in sustaining internationalization of higher education, yet institutions have not sufficiently engaged faculty. As a result, student mobility has not been as extensive as it could be, and internationalization has not "deliver[ed] the learning, discovery, and engagement that we seek" (p. 359). Institutions need to establish risk and reward mechanism that foster faculty involvement in internationalized scholarship and teaching. Stohl asks how faculty will prioritize internationalization activities in the context of competing demands on administrative time and budgets. His response:

> If we want to internationalize the university, we have to internationalize the faculty. We have to move them in the necessary directions. We thus need to consider not only how to do what needs to be done but also how what needs to be done affects the faculty and how we can mobilize their power over the process (p. 367).

Challenges and Strategies for Engaging Faculty in Internationalization

The internationalization change literature points to other challenges and strategies for faculty engagement on the level of individual faculty, on the institutional level, and even more broadly. Crosling et al. (2008) describe some of the individual-level barriers, citing Trowler's (1998, in Crosling et al., 2008) contention that “academics value autonomy and may be especially resistant to imposed change" (p. 110). This is because individual faculty generally have a high degree of autonomy with respect to what and how teach, and so they might view any change, such as curriculum integration, skeptically and as a threat. They argue, though, that because universities tend to be collegial institutions, where change management tends to be collaborative and planned, faculty might be more willing to engage in the change process if is evidence-based and built upon the action research model. They suggest that several variables can influence faculty adoption and sense of ownership. First, successful curriculum internationalization pilots can have a demonstration effect, based on well-researched assessment data. Second, leadership and continuing financial commitment by management can foster faculty commitment. And third, by convincing individual faculty that the teaching and learning innovation brought by curricular internationalization "does not threaten their continued employment, contributes to advancing their careers (relative to, say, research), contributes to improved learning outcomes, and can be implemented in a cost-effective way" (p. 117).

In her study of Canadian universities, Friesen (2012) found a mismatch between individual faculty and institutional understandings of and motivations for internationalization. Faculty in the study, for example, were uncertain of the relationship between internationalization and globalization, or about the definition of internationalization. Faculty saw it as being based at the level of individual relationships and enhancing quality of teaching, research and service, while institutional documents failed to define it or conflate terms (e.g., internationalization, international education, and international activities). Faculty also perceived institutional rationales focused on reputation and economic return rather than intercultural understanding or enhancing quality of teaching and research; although, one faculty respondent described her institution as emphasizing internationalization in terms of social responsibility. Faculty motivations for engaging in internationalization included past international experiences and personal connections, transformative teaching and learning, and personal development. Institutions, on the other hand, expressed academic rationales, but at the sub-category level, were motivated by improving profile and status. Faculty perceptions aligned with this analysis. Faculty respondents experienced different levels of engagement with institutional internationalization. Some felt personal and institutional motivations did not align, but there was still adequate personal benefit to engage, even if the benefits were tenuous and dependent on institutional factors. Others felt alienated and disengaged on moral grounds, for example, because they felt their institutions focused on quantitative instead of qualitative goals), while one felt her motivations aligned well with institutional ones.

Friesen concludes that innovation change theory suggests faculty engagement is strongest when individual and institutional rationales align, and when institutions reward faculty engagement and otherwise address concerns related to practical needs and personal values of faculty members. Her recommendations include the following:

- “Clearly communicate what internationalization means, its purpose and underlying values…
- Create a forum for dialogue and discussion so that disparate motivations and rationales between faculty members and institutional administration can be understood…

- Create opportunities for intercultural and international learning experiences for faculty members…
- Establish an enabling environment that supports faculty engagement in internationalization" (pp. 224-225).

In their case study of faculty at a Ukrainian university, Shaw, Chapman, and Rumyantseva (2011) examine the extent to which institutional and professional pressures precipitated by a national economic crisis, declines in enrollment, and changes in institutional procedures as they related to implementing the Bologna Process are reshaping the way faculty engage in their work, their careers, and their roles in their university. They present a useful framework for understanding the effects of educational reform on individuals, particularly when an institution does not support it with a corresponding transformation of internal structures and financial resources. The authors present the case of one Ukrainian university that has adopted the goals of Bologna in its rhetoric but has failed to provide faculty with internal policies and financial incentives that they need to further those goals, thereby "decoupling" internal and external activities. The resulting impact on individual faculty include those commonly associated with unfunded mandates, including increased workload and time commitment without increased compensation, lack of clear guidance on how to implement the reform, and insufficient time to reflect and plan thoughtfully for institutional change. In the case of the Ukrainian university, faculty, who are motivated, trained, and compensated for teaching, have suddenly been required to focus on research, without being given the time required for quality research and publication. This research suggests that they have been set up to fail, not just professionally, but also in their basic ability to provide for themselves and their families.

This case highlights a disconnect between Ukraine’s existing higher education structure and resources, and the expectations set by the Bologna Process. Presumably, since the model was established in Western Europe, it is based on a philosophy and approach to higher education shared by the countries of Western Europe, where research is more integrated with teaching and learning. As Shaw et al. (2011) point out, however, countries such as Ukraine come out of the Soviet model where the focus has been on teaching, and which have struggled economically. It would stand to reason, then, that countries like Ukraine need more time and resources to meet the goals of the Bologna process. This case, as well as others from Europe, supports the notion that regardless of context, faculty require guidance, resources, and recognition from their institutions in order to engage in internationalization successfully. Stohl (2007) echoes this strategy, suggesting that the most effective strategy is to engage faculty by incorporating international work into the reward structures, such as for tenure and promotion. Junior faculty in particular are often told they do not have the extra time required for international collaboration. This will require a shift in institutional and faculty culture.

Childress (2009) discusses how lack of funding frequently provides an obstacle to faculty engagement in internationalization activities. Others have similarly noted the financial barriers to faculty engagement (e.g., Hand, Ricketts, & Bruening, 2007, in Childress, 2009). In a cross-case analysis of how two institutions adopted differential investment strategies to overcome this barrier, she explores how, by developing funds from a variety of sources and across institutional units, they have had some success in engaging faculty in the internationalization planning process. Childress highlights the critical importance of engaging faculty in this process but notes that faculty are often not engaged due to deficient funding. She describes various rationales institutions may have for not allocating sufficient resources; for example, increased financial constraints on institutions despite expectations that they internationalize their curricula as "yet another undervalued, unfunded initiative" (Bond, 2003, p. 9, in Childress, 2009, p. 32). In addition, the costs of engaging in overseas travel for sustained teaching, research, and consulting projects, and often the cost of filling teaching vacancies on the home campus, can be barriers. Another rationale cited by some administrators is that responsibility for faculty development resides with the individual faculty and their departments, so they do not allocate funding required for effective participation in internationalization activities. And finally, organizational learning and human behavior research suggests that faculty will only engage in activities for which they are rewarded (Childress, 2009; Hand et al., 2007).

Childress (2009) found that the two institutions have been successful in using differential investment to engage faculty in internationalization by providing critical infrastructure, incentives, and communication mechanisms to support faculty in infusing international dimensions into their teaching, research, and service. Duke University, for example, used a strategy that included the development of a strategic investment plan, incentives provided by schools and centers, distinguished international scholar endowments, curriculum integration grants, and central international office matching grants. The University of Richmond's strategy incorporates faculty programming and course development grants, curriculum internationalization grants, summer international project grants, and school-based overseas conference travel grants. Key elements of these schools' success with differential investment, Childress argues, include support from the president and provost, the central international office, schools, departments, government grants, and alumni endowed contributions. Childress concludes by recommending that institutions, when developing strategic internationalization plans, must also develop a corresponding strategic investment plan to ensure faculty have the means and incentive to engage in international activities. Support at multiple levels, both internal and external, is critical, and even symbolic gestures, such as Richmond's offer to cover faculty passport application fees, can play a critical role in engaging faculty.

Green and Shoenberg (2006) further suggest that engaging faculty requires the leadership of disciplinary associations. As the ‘intellectual homes’ for faculty, disciplinary associations “can and should lead the way in promoting internationalization by fostering a dialogue among their members and providing useful resources” (p. iii).

To summarize, the literature recommends the following strategies and approaches for engaging faculty meaningfully in the internationalization process. First, because the culture of higher education establishes a high degree of faculty autonomy, leaders of internationalization planning should make every effort to reassure faculty that curricular change will not threaten faculty autonomy or jobs, but in fact, faculty are integral to the planning and change process. Second, because institutions must support their involvement by providing opportunities for professional development and their own intercultural and learning experiences. Third, wherever possible, programs and activities should be piloted and assessed, using rigorous research methods, so that faculty have examples of-- and confidence in-- successful approaches to internationalization. Fourth, campus leadership should develop reward and recognition structures, such as through tenure and promotion policies, as well as through public relations outlets, that encourage faculty to engage in international teaching, scholarship, and service, despite the additional time and effort it often requires. Fifth, institutions should recruit international faculty, while also increasing the awareness of existing faculty through clear communication about goals and expectations and by providing opportunities for dialogue. Sixth, through this dialogue and the meaningful involvement of faculty, administrators and faculty should work to align individual and institutional rationales for internationalization. And finally, campus leadership should provide resources, including informational, financial, and infrastructural, that support organizational learning and change and faculty engagement.

Faculty Roles in Intercultural Teaching and Learning

Faculty play a critical role in students' intercultural development process within the context of internationalization. Intercultural education professionals, including faculty, are increasingly seen as having an important role in supporting development of student intercultural competence, a common goal of internationalization (Blaess et al., 2012; Deardorff, 2012; Paige & Goode, 2009). Paige and Goode (2009) examine this role of faculty and international education professionals as facilitators of their students' intercultural development, a process they refer to as *cultural mentoring*. They describe how faculty are increasingly seen as having an important role in supporting development of student intercultural competence, supported by research that has shown that intercultural learning is substantially enhanced when facilitated (Paige and Goode, 2009). Savicki and Selby (2008) see this as more than a role, but a responsibility: "As practitioner-educators, it is our responsibility to ensure that students derive as much benefit as possible from time abroad" (p. 334).

In order to serve effectively as cultural mentors, international educators themselves must be interculturally competent and understand several dimensions of intercultural learning. These include learning about the self as a cultural being, learning about the elements of culture, culture-specific learning, culture-general learning, and learning about learning (Paige & Goode, 2009). They must also become proficient in supporting students as they encounter ten stress-inducing situation variables and personal factors, including cultural differences, ethnocentrism, cultural immersion, cultural isolation, language, prior intercultural experience, expectations, visibility and invisibility, status, and power and control (Paige & Goode, 2009). By understanding these, faculty can both support students at all stages of their intercultural experience, but also help them identify programs that fit their developmental stage.

Gopal (2011) and Lemke-Westcott and Johnson (2013) similarly describe the imperative for faculty engaged in transnational teaching at branch campuses to develop intercultural competency. Universities are increasingly internationalizing their degree programs by establishing branch campuses abroad. Faculty who are engaged in transnational teaching must take responsibility for developing their own intercultural attitudes, knowledge and comprehension, and skills (Otten, 2003). Developing these competencies “is an ongoing process that involves the deconstructing and reconstructing of one’s fundamental values, beliefs, and perceptions” (Gopal, 2011, p. 378). To support faculty engaged in international programs, institutions must go beyond focusing on revenue generation and logistics to provide professional development opportunities, establish policies, and commit resources (Otten, 2003). Domestically-based faculty also need to be interculturally competent as universities recruit and enroll more international students. Leask (2009), in a social science-based study of international students' academic experiences at her own institution in Australia, describes the missed intercultural learning opportunities taking place due to the lack of facilitation as follows:

> Within an internationalised curriculum, international students are valuable contributors of diverse cultural perspectives and experiences, who have the potential to transform the campus and the classroom into a vibrant microcosm on the world. However, it is clear from a number of studies that this potential is not being realised. Experience suggests that simply bringing home and international students together in class and on campus does not necessarily result in meaningful interaction between them or the development of valuable intercultural communication skills and international perspectives (p. 206).

Leask suggests, based on her research at her own institutions, that instructors and curriculum designers be much more intentional in designing formal and informal curricular activities to foster meaningful interaction between students. Although Leask does not directly address faculty intercultural competence as a factor in the missed opportunities of domestic and international student engagement, she does cite a study by Hanassab (2006, in Leask, 2009) that found "perceived prejudice and racism for university professors" to be one factor related to intercultural attitudes that detracts from the benefits of diversity at one U.S. university.

Yet the research that has been undertaken in this area suggests that faculty are not receiving the preparation required for their own intercultural engagement, much less for building the pedagogical competencies required to guide students in their intercultural development (Goode, 2008; Paige & Goode, 2009) or to teach transnationally (Gopal, 2011).

Student and Faculty Voice in Internationalization

Despite the central role students and faculty play as the primary intended beneficiaries of, and participants in, internationalization activities, the voice of both groups have been largely absent in campus internationalization discourses (Hunter et al., 2018; Fakunle, 2019). Instead, decision-making, planning, and assessment related to internationalization is often left to senior administration leaders, with the expectation that faculty and administrators implement the prescribed international activities (Hunter et al., 2018). Leask et al. (2018) argue for a more inclusive, accessible form of internationalization that acknowledges the views and roles of diverse stakeholders in the framing of internationalization discourse. They argue that faculty need to become stakeholders in shaping internationalization, precisely because they play such a crucial function in engaging with students in the delivery of curricular content. They suggest that to be effective, faculty engagement requires support for their professional development:

> Academics have the most important role to play in the internationalization process, as they are key to the curriculum and its delivery. So attention to the professional development of academics in addressing the international and intercultural dimension of the curriculum is needed. They require help to design and assess effective internationalized learning outcomes (p. 1).

Since curriculum internationalization can take different forms across academic disciplines, faculty might need support in adapting teaching and learning processes, building related skills and confidence for making active contributions to internationalization, defining and assessing outcomes, and supporting students in their intercultural learning (Leask et al., 2018). Students also play a significant role in internationalization activities, such as mobility and exchange programs. Fakunle (2019) suggests that from an economic perspective, it is students and their families who fund their participation, and who support internationalization through tuition and fees, and yet financial support is often neglected, as internationalization processes are hardly ever seen through the lens of the student" (p. 2). Institutions cite goals for student mobility, such as heightened global awareness, intercultural competence, and labor market competitiveness, and yet fail, in defining and assessing these objectives, to recognize students' motivations for participating and their "agency in internationalization discourses and processes" (p. 2). A more inclusive, effective approach to internationalization and mobility requires institutions, practitioners, and scholars to acknowledge and incorporate student perspectives on what they are learning and gaining from their participation. This view reflects a recognition, advocated by Mitra (2006) and other scholars of K-12 school reform, that students "possess unique knowledge and perspectives about their schools that adults cannot fully replicate" (p. 315). In this framework, students themselves become change agents who not only contribute to decisions about their personal and learning goals, but also to organizational transformation.

Faculty Preparation for Intercultural Teaching

As discussed above, research on internationalization of higher education has focused primarily on institutional and perceptual barriers to faculty engagement. While there is consensus in the literature reviewed that faculty have a role and responsibility to facilitate their students' intercultural learning, research on faculty motivations to engage in internationalization and their readiness to fulfill this role in terms of their own intercultural competence and facilitation skills is sparse (Blaess et al., 2012; Gopal, 2011; Paige & Goode, 2009). What research does exist focuses on the area of teaching international students and managing diverse classrooms, which is an important aspect of internationalization, but there is a gap in our understanding of faculty preparedness to serve as cultural mentors in a broader range of internationalized contexts, such as study abroad, transnational teaching, and online intercultural classrooms.

Several recent dissertation studies, however, have explored faculty preparedness, providing the possibility of emerging research (Anderson, 2016; Harvey, 2013; Nichols, 2013). Nichols (2013), for example, conducted an interpretive study addressing the themes of faculty awareness and understanding, integrating cultural competency into courses, and the influence of personal experiences on the development of intercultural competency. Harvey (2013), in her case study of CIEE's Seminar on Living and Learning Abroad, explores the role of faculty instructors in facilitating students' intercultural development, finding that skilled facilitation of the learning process was important in the complex process of intercultural learning. She also discovered, through use of the IDI and qualitative interviews, that faculty instructors experienced intercultural growth along Bennett's (1993) DMIS continuum and themselves perceived they had developed in their intercultural sensitivity and teaching through their leadership of study abroad courses. Anderson (2016), in her doctoral research on instructor influence on student intercultural learning during short-term study abroad programs, similarly concludes that skilled facilitation by an instructor can facilitate intercultural learning; although, in her study, instructor IDI score of intercultural sensitivity was not a significant predictor of student IDI gains, suggesting an area for further research.

The research that has been undertaken in area of faculty as intercultural teachers suggests that faculty are not receiving the preparation required for their own intercultural engagement, much less for building the pedagogical competencies required to guide students in their intercultural development (Blaess et al., 2012; Gopal, 2011; Paige and Goode, 2009). Goode (2008, in Paige & Goode, 2009), in a study of faculty study abroad course leaders, found that faculty had a limited understanding of intercultural learning and how to facilitate it. This, according to Paige and Goode (2009), is because "international education professionals generally do not have an intercultural theoretical background and thus lack an understanding of the cultural variables that are central to the intercultural experience of their students" (p. 347), leaving the student to learn and develop themselves. Furthermore, faculty sometimes do not have the training needed to help their students develop cultural self-awareness and intercultural competence among their students (Goode, 2008, in Paige and Goode, 2009; Gopal, 2011; Sunnygard, 2007, in Paige and Goode, 2009), possibly a due to institutional emphases on program policies, financial rules, and liability issues (Sunnygard, 2007, in Paige and Goode, 2009).

Gopal (2011), citing Smith (2010) and Wang (2008), discusses the challenges of transnational education, asserting that faculty neither receive preparation to teach students from diverse populations, nor formal intercultural competency training. This begs the question of how transnational teaching faculty can create a learning environment that is equitable for their students. Blaess et al. (2012), writing of the context of graduating leadership programs, similarly emphasize the value of preparing the professoriate as a precursor to preparing students, and explore the necessary institutional and cross-institutional supports and faculty development initiatives. They observe, however, that little research or discourse has focused on the preparedness of faculty in terms of their own global mindset and intercultural competencies to prepare leaders academically. Focusing on building student competencies before assessing and addressing faculty needs for competencies is "placing the proverbial cart before the horse" (p. 89). They contend that many professors serving in leadership faculty positions “may not themselves possess the knowledge, dispositions, and experiences necessary to effectively prepare graduate students engage in leadership studies to gain and grow in the realm of global and intercultural leadership competencies” (pp. 88-89).

They discuss "international currency," or the ability to exchange globally sensitive intellectual, psychological and social capital (Blaess et al., 2012). The more currency a faculty member has, the more they themselves can perform as global leaders, and the better they can academically prepare students. The idea is that if professors can develop a global mindset, similar to Sanderson’s (2008) concept of cosmopolitanism, they can transmit it to students. Doing this requires a change in the global culture of higher education. They discuss deductive approaches, such as integrating the concept of global mindset into the mission, core values, personnel policies, and programming. Inductive strategies should focus on asking campus community members to construct their ideas of diversity through reflection, analysis, and evaluation. This, they argue, is more likely to lead to development and integration of a global mindset. Faculty also need to be interested and invested in participating.

Blaess et al. (2012), however, argue that these deductive and inductive approaches, are not common at U.S. universities, and few faculty have developed a global mindset. Both institutional and faculty commitment are needed (Blaess et al., 2012). Institutions should engage in professional development activities and provide resources and opportunities for cultural immersion and exchange, for example, through research, teaching, and virtual conferences. Institutions should create "a culture of evidence" (p. 92) through course assessments, student learning outcomes, and instructional strategies that support developing a global mindset. Institutions should also identify faculty leaders and hire diverse faculty, including international faculty. Yet, they argue, it is ultimately the faculty who are responsible for developing themselves and their students as global leaders.

A proposed solution to this lack of preparation and intercultural competence training is the design and implementation of targeted intercultural training interventions for international educators, so they are prepared as facilitators and teachers in their students’ intercultural learning and development (Deardorff, 2012; Gopal, 2011; Paige & Goode, 2009; Savicki, 2008). Researchers who have conducted case studies and meta-analyses of intercultural training evaluation studies have found intercultural training to have positive effects on variables such as self-development, perception of trainees, relationship with host nations, cultural adjustment, and job performance (Bhawuk & Brislin, 2000). Savicki (2008) advocates for an integration of theory, research, and application in building the intercultural educators' mentoring skills. Paige and Goode (2009) suggest that in addition to obtaining their own intercultural training, international educators learn about the main intercultural theories, concepts, research, and best practices in training design. Gopal (2011) adds that this is an ongoing process requiring assessment, using instruments that measure intercultural development, such as the Intercultural Development Inventory (Hammer, 2012). Policy structures, she argues, must also be in place, and institutions must be committed, must invest resources, and must conduct assessments in order to improve their programs. Determining which type of training will best facilitate faculty learning can be facilitated by assessing faculty members' levels of intercultural knowledge and sensitivity, for example, by using Milton Bennett's development model of intercultural sensitivity (J. Bennett, 2008; Gopal, 2011; Paige & Goode, 2009).

Recommendations for Supporting Faculty Development

Researchers studying faculty intercultural competence have suggested a number of elements are required to support faculty in their role as facilitators of their students' intercultural learning. Many of the studies to date have been case studies, and while the findings from such examples can be important to understanding trends and themes, they cannot be ascribed to all institutions. Nevertheless, several elements or themes have begun to emerge in the literature. These relate to 1) development of their own intercultural attitudes, knowledge, and skills; 2) development of effective pedagogies; and 3) institutional support for these professional development activities (Blaess et al., 2012; Gopal, 2011; Paige & Goode, 2009). Each of the three elements is discussed below. Other, alternative themes and recommendations may emerge from the current and future studies.

First, Blaess et al. (2012) suggest faculty must develop themselves as interculturalists, emphasizing the importance of faculty preparing themselves to have global mindsets so that they can better prepare their students to become global leaders (p. 93). Gopal (2011) recommends using Deardorff's process model of intercultural competency as a framework for cultivating faculty intercultural competency through the reflection and transformation of attitudes related to valuing other cultures, motivations for participating in international activities, openness to other cultures, and ethnocentricity. Gopal further expands on Deardorff's model by proposing that faculty must build their knowledge and comprehension in the areas of cultural self-awareness, understanding of gender roles across cultures, and an awareness of the importance of language— both verbal and nonverbal— in acquiring intercultural proficiency. Finally, Gopal emphasizes the importance of nurturing the skills of self-reflection and reflexivity, or having a critical self-reflection on one's intercultural interactions (Littlejohn & Domenici, 2007, in Gopal, 2011).

Blaess et al. (2012) point out that while commitment on the part of faculty is also important, the literature they review does not directly consider the motivation and interest level of faculty in engaging in intercultural competency development. Research on this, they suggest, can help identify how to motivate faculty to participate in the face of many other obligations and challenges.

Second, some researchers have concluded that faculty must be prepared as facilitators and teachers in their students' intercultural learning and development (e.g., Paige & Goode, 2009; Savicki, 2008). To this end, Savicki (2008) advocates for an integration of theory, research, and application in building the intercultural educators' mentoring skills. Paige and Goode (2009) suggest that in addition to obtaining their own intercultural training, international educators learn about the main intercultural theories, concepts, and best practices in training design.

Bhawuk and Brislin (2000) trace the evolution of these elements within the intercultural training literature, by reviewing landmark studies and practice decade by decade from the 1950s until 2000. They describe research and practice in training development since the 1990s as using methods such as meta-analysis, developing models and assimilators based on intercultural learning theory, and creating evaluation measures. Bhawuk and Brislin (2000) see this evolution of more theoretically meaningful training methods and tools as being encouraging because they will allow facilitators of intercultural learning to support more sophisticated participants who have already encountered less theoretically grounded simulations, such as BAFA, Barnga, and Albatross.

Current training design has been linked to developmental models of intercultural competence, where tools such as Milton Bennett's developmental model of intercultural sensitivity, DMIS, (1986; 1993) allows faculty to assess and consider the disparate needs of learners in terms of their intercultural sensitivity level (J. M. Bennett, 2008; M.J. Bennett, 1986; M. J. Bennett, 1993; Kappler Mikk, Cohen, & Paige, 2009). With this approach, the intercultural facilitator meets students where they are developmentally, and if they are at different levels, you must teach to different levels. Milton Bennett (1986) and Janet Bennett (2008) offer suggestions for how to map training activities to learners' developmental stage, and Kappler Mikk et al. (2009) provide a detailed set of curricular materials and guides to assist faculty and international education professions in designing intercultural training.

Third, researchers have suggested that institutional commitment in a number of areas is required to support the development of faculty who are prepared to facilitate intercultural learning is institutional commitment in a number of arenas (Blaess et al., 2012; Gopal, 2011). If engaging faculty in internationalization activities is fundamental to achieving successful outcomes, then institutions must identify and overcome the barriers and challenges to their engagement (Stohl, 2007). These challenges include competing new models of higher education programs, initiatives, and delivery; declining state funding for basic research; security policies; and greater public scrutiny of higher education (Stohl, 2007). Cross-cultural teaching and learning must also compete with traditional policy interests focusing on revenue generation (Paige & Goode, 2009).

To overcome these challenges, according to the emerging literature, institutions should consider putting into place policies and resources that are supportive of faculty members' intercultural and pedagogical training (Blaess et al., 2012; Gopal, 2011). In addition to providing and funding professional development opportunities, institutions can create a culture of commitment to intercultural learning through their mission statements, core values, and campus programs. They can also offer immersion opportunities for faculty to learn through their own intercultural experiences and foster professional intercultural learning communities in which faculty can mutually support one another (Blaess et al., 2012). Assessment of these professional development initiatives is equally important (Blaess et al., 2012; Deardorff, 2009; Gopal, 2011). Through these efforts, institutions can move beyond internationalizing to “interculturalizing” their campuses, curricula, and people (M. Paige, personal communications, July 2015).

Significance of the Study

This review of the literature has shaped the researcher’s choice of topic, research questions, and approach in several ways. It has contributed to a foundational understanding of trends and focus of current scholarship related to internationalization of higher education in the context of globalization, and critical need to engage faculty in a variety of roles, including as cultural mentor for students. To be effective, intercultural teaching and learning, according to several scholars, requires internationalization, or intercultural development, at the individual faculty level. Yet this literature review has revealed a gap in the research related to student motivations and faculty capacity to engage in internationalization and to serve as cultural mentors to their students. A growing body of research has explored aspects of faculty engagement in organizational internationalization related to their attitudes, involvement, roles, institutional support, and challenges; however, understanding of the scope and process of internationalization of the “academic Self,” as conceived by Sanderson, is lacking. Several recent dissertations have provided initial empirically-derived insights into faculty intercultural development and its influence on student intercultural learning; however, only a few published studies have focused on this topic, specifically in the context of teaching international students and transnationally. Relatively little is still known about faculty levels of intercultural competence, their capacity and pedagogical training as cultural mentors, and how these factors influence their teaching and leadership in international initiatives such as study abroad programs. The extent to which faculty are interested in developing their own intercultural competence and pedagogical skills is also unclear. This study is designed to help close this gap, using a framework informed by Sanderson's concept of internationalization of the academic Self, and by Vande Berg et al.'s (2012) integration of constructivism and intercultural learning abroad.

As Sanderson (2008) argues, to remain relevant in an increasingly globalized world, higher education institutions must consider ways to look outward through internationalization initiatives. In the field of higher education internationalization, educators and administrators are moving beyond considering how universities and colleges can effectively change on the organizational level to how individual faculty, as the "gatekeepers" for intercultural education, can develop themselves and then mentor their students. As this literature review has revealed, substantial progress has been made in understanding the criteria for and challenges of infusing the global into organizational culture and curricula, and large body of literature and practice in the fields of intercultural communication and training has provided a well-grounded understanding of how to move individuals along Bennett's developmental continuum. There is a gap, however, in understanding student or faculty perspectives on the learning outcomes of study abroad and factors influencing those outcomes. Institutions are seen as needing to consider internationalization as an organizational change process in order to survive, thrive, and help students do the same as workplaces and communities becoming increasingly diverse. Faculty and student engagement are critical to the success of these endeavors, and so both research and institutional support must focus on helping them develop as internationalists and interculturalists in their teaching, scholarship, service, and personal lives. Through this study, the researcher aims to inform a greater understanding of how to do this effectively.

Conclusion

Higher education institutions are motivated to internationalize their research, teaching, and service functions for a variety of reasons. Forces of globalization, such as increasing demand for education and rapidly changing technologies to deliver curricula, as well as humanistic motives, such as improved intercultural understanding and learning, serve as drivers for internationalization. Regardless of what is motivating individual institutions, internationalization is an organizational adaptation process requiring institutional cultural change and individual development.

The literature on internationalization addresses a number of institutional and individual factors influencing this organizational change process. Engaging faculty is viewed as being central to the success of such internationalization efforts, yet it has also been one of the greatest challenges in changing organizational culture. Students, too, are increasingly viewed as key stakeholders in internationalization, and as agents in their own intercultural learning. Key to overcoming this challenge is understanding institutional culture and strategically planning and managing cultural change. This involves engaging students and faculty in shaping internationalization processes, providing structural and moral support, and committing financial and human resources. Institutions can also forge policies and procedures conducive to engaging internationally on the individual and institutional level, develop reward and recognition systems that encourage faculty to participate, and encourage leadership involvement and championing of a shared vision for internationalization.

Chapter Three: Research Design

In this study, a grounded theory methodology and qualitative methods are used to explore with faculty and students their experiences with intercultural learning on faculty-led study abroad programs. From the collected data, the components that can foster intercultural learning in faculty-led courses are developed. The methodology and methods used in this study are outlined in this chapter, placing the study within the grounded theory methodological tradition, providing a rationale for using that approach, and describing the data collection and analysis methods.

In grounded theory, first hypotheses and concepts, and then theory is systematically discovered from the data of social research (Glasser & Strauss, 1967). In contrast to logico-deductive research, where the researcher examines and tests or verifies an existing theory or an *a priori* hypotheses, with grounded theory, the aim is to generate inductively, through comparative analysis, a theory that describes, explains, or predicts behavior or other phenomena. The grounded theory researcher is interested in a particular phenomenon, such as intercultural learning, and collects and continuously, comparatively analyzes data through qualitative and quantitative methods. The research design starts with an initial framework, but the methods and sample population might shift as concepts and hypotheses emerge from the ongoing data analysis.

Glaser and Strauss (1967) developed the grounded theory approach out of a shared dissatisfaction with contemporary trends in U.S. social science research and a desire to orient the practices and skills required for research towards current social settings (Bryant & Charmaz, 2007). They argue that in sociological research, the emphasis has classically been on verification of existing theories, perhaps at the expense of the generation of new theory (1967). Their goal in presenting the grounded theory model is to “systematize theorizing” (p. 8), “improving social scientists’ capacities for generating theory that *will* be relevant to their research (p. vii-viii) and “help release energies for theorizing that are now frozen by the undue emphasis on verification.” Yet they do not intend to suggest that grounding theory in data and verification of existing theory are necessarily at odds. It is not, they contend, that verification is not important, but there is a need for generation of theory, too, and one approach can inform the other. Grounded theory offers a flexible framework for qualitative research and guidelines for conducting it (Charmaz, 2014).

In grounded theory, the researcher gathers field data using qualitative methods, such as focus groups, interviews, document review, and observations, or from quantitative methods, such as surveys. The researcher continually analyzes the data while collecting it, in an ongoing, iterative “constant comparative analysis” (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Throughout this process, the researchers using “theoretical sampling” (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), determining how and from whom to collect data as concepts, themes, and hypotheses emerge from the data. It is an iterative process, where the researcher collects the data, codes it, writes memos comparing data and reflecting on emerging themes and theories, collects additional data to explore those themes further, and comparing again, in pursuit of a central theory or conceptual framework. Ultimately, through this process, the researcher achieves theoretical saturation, where the themes related to the phenomenon under study are thoroughly described or explained. In the ongoing process of comparative analysis, the researcher integrates these themes into either a substantive or formal theory. Charmaz (2014) summarizes grounded theory as follows:

> Stated simply, grounded theory methods consist of systematic, yet flexible guidelines for collecting and analyzing qualitative data to construct theories from the data themselves. Thus researchers construct a theory ‘grounded’ in their data. Grounded theory beings with inductive data, invokes iterative strategies of going back and forth between data and analysis, uses comparative methods, and keeps you interacting and involved with your data and emerging analysis (p. 1).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to explore factors influencing student learning during faculty-led study abroad programs. Using a grounded theory methodology and qualitative methods, the views of faculty and returned study abroad students on their experiences are explored, and from the collected data, an explanation of what components—formal and informal, institutional, personal—can foster intercultural learning in faculty-led programs. Through this inquiry, gaps both in the empirical literature and the programmatic literature on intercultural learning during faculty-led study abroad programs are explored. The aim is to inform individual and institutional strategies for helping faculty develop their intercultural courses, pedagogical approaches, and tools for teaching and measuring student ICL.

Research Questions

The following are the research questions:

1. In what ways do student and faculty stakeholders describe the student learning outcomes achieved through participation in faculty-led study abroad programs?

2. What do faculty and students view as factors influencing student learning outcomes in faculty-led study abroad programs?

Research Methodology and Rationale

Barney Glaser and Anselm Strauss conceived of grounded theory methodology in 1967, and researchers have since expanded upon and adapted it over the past 50 years (e.g., Charmaz 2000, 2006, 2014; Bryant & Charmaz, 2007; and Evans, 2013). The purpose of this approach, according to Glaser and Strauss (1967), is the generation of new theory through comparative analysis of the data, as opposed to the traditional research focus on verification of existing theories. They acknowledge that verification is important, yet there is a need for generation of new theory, as well. As discussed earlier, while there is sound existing theoretical evidence for how intercultural learning occurs in study abroad (e.g., Vande Berg et al., 2012), less is known about how it happens, or not, on the increasingly popular short-term, faculty-led programs. By taking a grounded theory approach, this study is intended to gain a new understanding about intercultural learning within this program format, particularly from the perspective of faculty program leaders and students who participate on these programs.

Glaser and Strauss (1967) define grounded theory as the "purposeful systematic generation [of theory] from the data of social research", where the "accurate description and verification are not so crucial when one's purpose is to generate theory" (p. 28), and "the theory is derived from data, and not logical assumptions" (p. 30). They place a strong emphasis on "*theory as process*...an ever-developing entity, not as a perfected product" (p. 32). Through this process, the researcher allows "substantive concepts and hypotheses to emerge first, on their own...to ascertain which, if any, existing formal theory may help him generate his substantive theories" (p. 34). Charmaz (2014) suggests that not all grounded theorists use the methodology to generate theory, but "using the method will still enable you to increase the analytic import of your work and the speed with which you complete it" (p. 2). She further explains that

> Grounded theory guidelines describe steps of the research process and provide a path through it. You can adopt and adapt them to solve varied problems and to conduct diverse studies, whether or not you aim for theory development. You can join the journey to the final destination of writing a grounded theory report that reaches theory development or you may use the strategies to the extent that helps you complete a specific task. Just try to be aware of where you go, what you do, and how far you raise your analysis into theory construction" (2014, p. 16).

Bryant and Charmaz (2007), in their edited volume tracing the history and variations on Glaser and Strauss' original conceptualization, further describe the grounded theory method as comprising "a systematic, inductive, and comparative approach for conducting inquiry for the purpose of constructing theory…designed to encourage researchers' persistent interaction with their data, while remaining constantly involved with their emerging analyses" (p. 1). It is an iterative process where the researcher simultaneously collects, codes, and analyzes data, "moving back and forth between empirical data and emerging analysis" in a way that "makes the collected data progressively more focused and the analysis successively more theoretical" (Bryant & Charmaz, 2007, p 1). Data collection methods are primarily, but not exclusively qualitative, as some quantitative methods may be used where it supports greater exploration of emergent themes (Bryant & Charmaz; 2007; Evans, 2013; Glaser & Strauss, 1967). In grounded theory, the researcher must consider all data, such as those gathered through historical documents, observations, questionnaires, interviews, to explore all aspects of the theory. The literature review itself, rather than being a precursor to data collection, itself becomes a source of data.

For Glaser and Strauss, the data collection and analysis phases of research should be concurrent, not separate, so that the researcher can explore emerging concepts. Qualitative research is not only an impressionistic, unsystematic precursor to more 'valid' or 'rigorous' quantitative methods, but an effective methodology in its own right for generating theory and understanding of social phenomenon (Charmaz, 2014). It should not be judged based on the standards for quantitative research, but rather, on whether it closely fit with the data, was useful, conceptually dense, durable, modifiable, and had explanatory power (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Glaser and Strauss built upon the work of prior qualitative researchers, whose field and analytical methods were not usually clearly described, by explicitly outlining procedures that were more accessible (Charmaz, 2014).

Grounded Theory: "A Contested Concept"

Although grounded theory methodology has developed into the most widely used qualitative research method across many disciplines, it is a contested concept in terms of the approach used to data collection, handling, and analysis (Bryant & Charmaz, 2007; Evans, 2013). The two discoverers of the theory, Glaser and Strauss, themselves eventually diverged from one another in how they conceived of the principles, objectives, and procedures related to grounded theory, views represented in Strauss and Corbin's 1990 publication, and Glaser's 1992 critique of their approach. The divergence between Glaser and Strauss dating from the late 1980s had a significant impact on grounded theory methodology, resulting in further branching off into additional approaches. Bryant and Charmaz (2007) contend that grounded theorists often quote the mantra that theory is ‘grounded in the data’, without questioning or examining it, and only referring to a narrow range of grounded theory literature, despite a growing body of grounded theory scholarship across disciplines. To add more confusion, some qualitative researchers have cited grounded theory as their methodological approach, without following grounded theory strategies and processes (Charmaz, 2014).

Bryant and Charmaz (2007) describe three basic schools of grounded theory methodology: 1) the Glaserian school, 2) the Strauss and Corbin school, and 3) the Constructivist school, which “emphasizes how data, analysis *and methodological strategies* become constructed, and takes into account the research contexts and researchers’ positions, perspectives, priorities, and interactions” (p. 10). Many scholars would agree that grounded theory methodology has these three versions, but for some, grounded theory is far more diverse. Understanding these variations “allows novices to make informed choices and to articulate rationales supporting their choices” (Bryant and Charmaz (2007, p. 11). The distinguishing characteristics of these three models are described below.

Classic (Glaserian) Grounded Theory

Glaser (1978, 2012) sees his work as continuing from the initial conceptualization of grounded theory methodology with Strauss in their original work (1967), defining his work as ‘traditional’ or ‘classic’ grounded theory methodology. With this model, the researcher aimed to develop theory that achieved a close fit with the data, understandability, generalizability, and control (1967. P. 237). Glaser and Strauss together, and individually (1967; Glaser, 1978; Strauss, 1987), define the main characteristics of grounded theory practice as follows, according to Charmaz (2006, 2014):

- "Simultaneous involvement in data collection and analysis
- Constructing analytic codes and categories from data, not from preconceived logically deduced hypotheses
- Using the constant comparison method, which involves making comparisons during each stage of the analysis
- Advancing theory development during each step of data collection and analysis
- Memo-writing to elaborate categories, specify their properties, define relationships between categories, and identify gaps
- Sampling aimed toward theory construction (theoretical sampling), not for population representativeness
- Conducting the literature review after developing an independent analysis" (Charmaz, 2014, pp. 7-8).

Glaser and Strauss (1967) distinguished between two levels of theory production: substantive and formal. Substantive theories emerge from the data in a way that addresses phenomena and problems in a specific substantive areas. Grounded theorists can then develop formal theories by comparing substantive theories across multiple substantive areas to "discover" abstract concepts that explain problems occurring in those areas. Glaser and Strauss (1971), for example, considered how the substantive theoretical categories emerging from their studies on the process of death and dying applied more generically across other substantive areas (Charmaz, 2014).

Glaser and Strauss diverged in their approaches by the 1980s. Glaser is seen as having remained consistent in explaining the model he and Strauss developed in 1967, and which he further explains in his 1978 book. Here, he defines grounded theory “as a method of discovery, [that] treated categories as emergent from the data, relied on a direct and, often, narrow empiricism, developed a concept-indicator approach, considered concepts to be variables, and emphasized analyzing a basic social process” (Glaser, 1978, in Charmaz, 2014, p. 11), Strauss moved in a different direction.

Strauss and Corbin Model

First, in his 1987 manual on qualitative analysis, and later, with his coauthor Juliet M. Corbin (1990, 1998), Strauss advanced a version of grounded theory that characterized it as a method of verification (Charmaz, 2014), thus diverging from his earlier conceptualization with Glaser (1967). He and Corbin, in *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques* (1990, 1998), provided a set of procedures for conducting grounded theory research. They present a coding method that involves three stages: open coding, axial coding, and selective coding. Glaser (1992) argued this approach went against the original concept of theory emerging from data, by forcing both data and the analysis into pre-conceived categories that described more than explained the phenomenon under study. Others have argued that the Straussian method is too rigid and difficult to follow.

Despite these criticisms, Strauss and Corbin’s (1990, 1998) gained vast popularity among social scientist researchers, including among graduate students, who followed the technical procedures they outlined (Charmaz, 2014). Charmaz (2014) points out that many researchers still refer to Strauss and Corbin’s methods, despite Corbin’s substantial revision of the epistemological and procedural approach in 2008.

Constructivist Model

Although grounded theory methodology emerged during, and in part from, the major epistemological developments of the 1960s, it remained largely unchanged until the early 1980s. Since that time, however, grounded theorists have adapted grounded theory methodology to a wide array of contexts, applying conventions of their disciplines and using different models and methods. The constructivist grounded theory model emerged in the 1990s in response to criticisms of earlier versions. Critics contended that “grounded theory fragmented the respondent’s story, relied on the authoritative voice of the researcher, blurred difference, and uncritically accepted Enlightenment grand metanarratives about science, truth, universality, human nature, and world views” (Charmaz, 2014, p. 13). In response, researchers began to explore grounded theory approaches that still drew from both Glaser’s and Strauss and Corbin’s grounded theory inductive, comparative, and emergent approaches, while rejecting their earlier positivist assumption of researcher neutrality and of an objective external reality or truth. They continued to apply the more classical grounded theory methods of theoretical sampling, coding, and memo-writing in comparative analysis, but with “the assumption that social reality is multiple, processional, and constructed” and so “we must take the researcher’s position, privileges, perspective, and interactions into account as an inherent part of the research reality. It, too, is a construction” (p. 13).

Charmaz (2000) used the term ‘constructivist’ “to acknowledge subjectivity and the researcher’s involvement in the construction and interpretation of data and to signal the difference between [her] approach and conventional social constructionism of the 1980s and early 1990s" (Charmaz, 2014, p. 14). While social constructionist researchers in the 1980s and early 1990s did analyze how the worlds they studied were constructed by their research participants, they did not, according to Charmaz, reflect on their own constructions of these worlds.

Charmaz, out of a growing dissatisfaction with this approach, advocates for integrating researcher reflexivity, using flexible guidelines rather than hard-and-fast procedural rules. In this model,

> Neither data nor theories are discovered either as given in the data or the analysis. Rather we are part of the world we study the data we collect, and the analyses we produce. We *construct* our grounded theories through our past and present involvements and interactions with people, perspectives, and research practices (Charmaz, 2014, p. 17).

As Charmaz (2014) says of researchers:

> We are not scientific observers who can dismiss scrutiny of our values by claiming scientific neutrality and authority. Neither observer nor observed come to a scene untouched by the word. Researchers and research participants make assumptions about what is real, possess stocks of knowledge, occupy social statuses, and pursue purposes that influence their respective views and actions in the presence of each other. Nevertheless, researchers, not participants, are obligated to be reflexive about what we bring to the scene, what we see, and how we see it (p. 27).

Bryant and Charmaz (2007) advocate for a “repositioned GTM [grounded theory methodology],” taking the “fluid, interactive, and emergent” elements of Glaser and Strauss’ research process that are still relevant— “coding for actions and theory construction, successive comparative analyses, inductive-abductive logic, memo-writing, theoretical sampling, and theoretical integration” (p. 51). At the same time, a repositioned grounded theory methodology leaves behind positivist notions that there is a set of generalizable facts to be ‘discovered’ by objective, expert researchers, and recognizes “partial knowledge, multiple perspectives, diverse positions, uncertainties, and variation in both empirical experience and its theoretical rendering” (p. 51).

Charmaz (2017) further argues that we must consider not only the data and the perspectives of the research participants. The researcher must also evaluate how her or his own perspectives shape even the questions we ask and the interpretation we make. As she states, “The questions we ask matter; the perspective underlying our questions counts…Questions flow from our perspectives” (p. 34). A repositioned GTM, Charmaz (2017) argues, “bridges defined realities and interpretation of them. It produces limited, tentative generalizations, not universal statement…And this method acknowledges the human, and sometimes non-human, relationships that shape the nature of inquiry” (p. 51-52). Critical in this approach is the researcher’s reflection on her own position, privileges, perspectives, and interactions as shaping her data collection and analysis. The researcher is not a passive, neutral observer, and the research itself is “constructed rather than discovered” (Charmaz, 2014, p. 13).

Charmaz (2017) thus advocates for developing ‘methodological self-consciousness,’ which involves turning “a deeply reflexive gaze back on ourselves and the research process as well as on the empirical world...This methodological self-consciousness requires scrutinizing our positions, privileges, and priorities and assessing how they affect our steps during the research process and our relationships with research participants" (p. 35). In this process, the researcher becomes more attuned to the interplay between privilege, power, and marginality in interactions between researcher and participant, and how our worldviews shape our research decisions and how we make meaning of data.

Of primary concern, theory must be grounded in the data, and the researcher must rise above ‘description’, but not leap to generate theoretical statements without regard for systematic data collection and analysis, in what he calls ‘immaculate conjectures’ or ‘immaculate conceptualizations’ (Glaser, 2007). Thus, Bryant and Charmaz (2007) warn, “A researcher embarking upon use of GTM will have to avoid the Scylla of ‘mere description’ on the one side, and the Charybdis of ‘immaculate conceptualization’ on the other” (p. 14). They describe how analysis leads to theory as follows:

> Emergent categories arise from the researcher’s skill in defining these new properties through the successively more analytic comparative processes of comparing data with data, data with code, code with code, code with category, and category with category. In short, grounded theorists can build an epistemologically sophisticated view of emergence that allows for possibilities of emergent (but never wholly inductive) categories in the practice of theorizing” (p 25).

As discussed above, divergent grounded theory approaches exist and continue to emerge, and Gynnild (2011, in Evans, 2013), critiques both the proliferation of how-to books and the confusion of models by novice researchers (Evans, 2013). Most published grounded theory research does not cite which model of grounded theory is used (Evans, 2013), causing greater confusion. Evans (2013) argues that the researcher should choose and explicitly identify which grounded theory approach they will use based on the best fit with both the topic and the researcher's preferences and disposition. Bryant and Charmaz (2007) similarly suggest, "Any research method makes epistemological claims; a method must indicate why its application will lead to a development of knowledge, otherwise researchers would have no basis for choosing it in the first place" (p. 32).

For this study, the researcher chose to use constructivist grounded theory as conceived by Charmaz (2000, 2006, 2014, 2017). The constructivist grounded theory assumes that individuals, including the researcher, make their own meaning of their experiences. By using this methodology, study abroad student and faculty leader perspectives are brought to the foreground in the exploration of intercultural learning in study abroad. This methodology aligns with the emerging experiential constructivist view of intercultural learning abroad (Vande Berg et al., 2012). According to this framework, students interpret their intercultural experiences and construct their own reality around what is happening in terms of what they are taking away. Students learn from continual reflection on how their experiences and own backgrounds shape how they perceive the world (Vande Berg et al., 2012), and faculty guide their students in this process (Gopal, 2011). By using this constructivist grounded theory and qualitative methods, the researcher solicited stakeholder reflection on their intercultural learning and teaching experiences, analyzed their views, and constructed themes to explain ways in which student learning occurs in study abroad programs.

Research Context

This is a study of a medium-sized, four-year public comprehensive college in the northeastern United States. The college's total student enrollment is over 7,000, with over 17 percent of undergraduates studying abroad, but only just over one percent of the student body being international. The college is an example of a public institution at a midpoint in internationalization, and this study's findings could inform practice and theory related to intercultural learning on study abroad programs offered through similar institutions. The college has a long history of operating study abroad programs, having opened its first exchange program in 1967 with a university in Spain. The college now offers about 55 international programs on six continents, with a portfolio that includes about 30 short-term faculty-led courses, 24 study abroad and exchange partnerships, two internship programs, and student teaching programs. The increased number of faculty-led programs and student participating on them reflects a national trend towards enrollment in short-term programs (Baer et al, 2018).

Research Methods

The grounded theory study design includes qualitative methods to gain an understanding of faculty and student perspectives on their experiences with intercultural learning in faculty-led study abroad programs. Consistent with a grounded theory methodology, the research is designed with a general design framework, with the flexibility and fluidity to adapt methods and sampling as themes emerge, allowing for what Yin (2014) calls emergent design. According to Glaser and Strauss (1967), in grounded theory, the researcher bases early decisions about how to collect data only on a general sociological perspective on a topic. As they explain below,

> The initial decisions are not based on a preconceived theoretical framework…[but one] may begin the research with a partial framework of ‘local’ concepts, designating a few principal or gross features of the structure and processes in the situation that [the researcher] will study...These concepts give [the researcher] a beginning foothold on his research. Of course, he does not know the relevancy of these concepts to his problems—this problem must emerge—nor are they likely to become part of the core explanatory categories of his theory (p. 45).

The research design for this study was therefore envisioned as a general shape it might take, but with a fluid structure that the researcher adapted throughout data collection and analysis, and as themes emerged.

Grounded theory practitioners have varying views on the place and role of the literature (Bryant & Charmaz, 2007). Glaser and Strauss (1967) originally argued that the literature review should be carried out later, after themes begin to emerge from the data, to avoid pre-determined theoretical biases. Stern agrees, but notes “that pressures from one’s professors, funding committees, and other approval mechanism may work against being able to postpone a literature review to later (post-conceptual) stages of the research (Bryant & Charmaz, 2007, p. 20). Lempert (2007) deviates from this aspect of classic grounded theory methodology for pragmatic reasons:

> In order to participate in the current theoretical conversation, I need to understand it. I must recognize that what may seem like a totally new idea to me—an innovative breakthrough in my research—may simply be a reflection of my ignorance of the present conversation. A literature review provides me with the

> current parameters of the conversation that I hope to enter...It does not, however, define my research" (p. 20).

Bryant and Charmaz (2007) similarly question how the novice researcher can develop theoretical sensitivity without reading to become familiar with the field. Drawing from Dey (2007), they argue:

> An open mind does not imply an empty head...Anyone starting research will most certainly have some preconceived ideas relevant to the research area. A researcher can account for these ideas in some way, but certainly should not simply ignore them (p. 20).

They suggest that "the advice about postponing exploration of the literature usually emanates from experienced researchers, who themselves have developed an extensive knowledge of a vast mass of literature together with a general familiarity with key topics and an array of concepts at their fingertips" (p. 20). While there is disagreement among grounded theorist on the timing and role of conducting literature reviews, the literature is often viewed as serving as a form of data to inform development of grounded theory, concepts, or explanations emerging from the data.

Because the researcher is a novice with an emerging familiarity with the literature on intercultural learning, the literature review comprised a critical component of selecting the research topic, developing the research questions, and designing the study. The literature review both provided a foundational understanding of the current state of research on intercultural learning and internationalization and informed the analysis and synthesis of the findings and development of recommendations.

Research Sample and Data Sources

Grounded theory research begins with data collection. The aim is to find rich data that provides the researcher with the basis for understanding the world they are studying (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). According to Charmaz (2014), "Rich data are detailed, focused, and full. They reveal participants' views, feelings, intentions, and actions as well as the contexts and structures of their lives" (p. 23). The sources can be as varied as needed to achieve an understanding of the phenomenon under study. They could include interviews, observations, documents, records, fieldnotes, or written accounts. Quantitative data sources, such as survey results, are not ruled out, and literature reviews become another source of data to support the emerging theories. Grounded theory allows the researcher to combine sources of data, perhaps starting with a few assumed to be relevant, but adding others, even late in the research, as new ideas emerge. Charmaz (2014) urges researchers to let their research problem inform their choice of methods, but also to be willing to alter their research questions if other ones emerge as being more significant as the research unfolds. Decisions about data sources are also influenced by level of access and our roles and relationships with respect to the organization under study and the relationships people involved, and the view of the setting we want to understand. Whichever sources of data used, the researcher should reflect on how each method shapes and is shaped by what the researcher sees in the field and how she analyzes it. As Charmaz (2014) relates, "*How* you collect data affects *which* phenomena you will see, *how*, *where*, and *when* you will view them, and *what* sense you will make of them" (p. 26).

Sampling

Grounded theory focuses on *theoretical sampling*, or "the process of data collection for generating theory whereby the analyst jointly collects, codes, and analyzes his data and decides what data to collect next and where to find them, in order to develop his theory as it emerges" (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. 45). Decisions on data collection methods and sampling are not based on one approach but emerge as data is collected and analyzed. The basic sampling question, according to Glaser and Strauss (1967) is what groups or subgroups should be approached next, and what is the theoretical purpose and relevance of interviewing those groups. The sample size and number of cases are also not defined or prescribed: "Accurate description and verification are not so crucial when one's purpose is to generate theory" (p. 28), and "since evidence is not so crucial...the kind of evidence, as well as the number of cases, is also not so crucial" (p. 30). There can be no definite, prescribed, pre-planned set of groups, and researcher can only describe and cite the number groups after the research is complete. The basic criterion for selection comparison groups is theoretical relevance for furthering development of emerging categories: "The researcher chooses any groups that will help generate, to the fullest extent, as many properties of the categories as possible, and that will help related categories to each other to their properties" (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. 49).

Groups in this study were selected based on relevance to the research questions. The researcher focused on talking with both faculty study abroad course leaders and students who have returned from these programs, with the aim of understanding their perspectives on student learning objectives and factors influencing those outcomes. First, the college's faculty study abroad program leaders, or "faculty leaders," were consulted in focus groups and interviews about their experiences leading students abroad. The rationale for including them is because, in the context of campus internationalization, faculty are increasingly viewed as having a significant role in facilitating their students' intercultural competence through cultural mentoring (West, 2012; Paige & Goode, 2009), particularly in study abroad courses they design and deliver. And yet, faculty are not often consulted in discussions about campus internationalization processes (Hunter et al., 2018).

The college under study currently has 40 current and former faculty study abroad leaders across disciplines and with varying levels of experience developing and leading trips. The criteria for faculty inclusion in the study were: (1) they were teaching in the college, and (2) they have led study abroad programs. The full population of 40 eligible faculty leaders were invited by email to participate in the study, with the incentive of peer sharing of insights gained and approaches used in the running of study abroad course. The goal was to engage as many of these study abroad leaders, across the college's three schools and many departments, to gain a comprehensive understanding of faculty experiences and perspectives. From the roster of faculty leaders, 23 faculty who led one or more of 20 different study abroad courses agreed to participate.

Second, students who have returned from faculty-led study abroad trips offered between Fall 2015 and Spring 2018 were consulted in focus groups and interviews to learn about their experiences participating in these programs. The rationale for soliciting student views is that although students are often the primary intended beneficiaries of international education programs, their views are also not often incorporated in discussions about internationalization activities such as study abroad (Fakunle, 2019). The criteria for students were (1) they were students who were currently enrolled or who had recently graduated from the same college, (2) they participated in a faculty-led study abroad program within the past three years, and (3) they had received a grade for the course. Between Fall 2015 and Spring 2018, a total of 251 students participated in 22 different faculty-led programs. These students were invited by email to participate in the study. In response, 20 students who had studied on 11 of those programs volunteered and joined a focus group or interview. As an incentive to participate, students received campus bookstore gift cards.

Data Saturation

Grounded theorists have argued about what constitutes sufficient, quality data, but Charmaz (2014) suggests that researchers must collect enough rich data to illuminate their topic, while not being so limited in scope that analyses are superficial. With this in mind, the researcher considered the following questions suggested by Charmaz (2014) to assess whether sufficient data was been collected:

- Have I collected enough background data about persons, processes, and settings to have ready recall and to understand and portray the full range of contexts of the study?
- Have I gained detailed descriptions of a range of participants' views and actions?
- Do the data reveal what lies beneath the surface?
- Are the data sufficient to reveal changes over time?
- Have I gained multiple views of the participants range of actions?
- Have I gathered data that enable me to develop analytic categories?
- What kinds of comparisons can I make between data? How do these comparisons generate and inform my ideas? (p. 33).

By responding to these questions, grounded theorists can be more confident that their data is of sufficient quality and quantity to lend credibility to their findings (Charmaz, 2014).

In this study, to achieve data saturation, the researcher invited the full population of eligible faculty leaders and returned study abroad students to participate in focus groups. Due to student scheduling conflicts, some students could not participate in focus groups, and so instead were interviewed individually. In the same way, one faculty member was not available to join a focus group, and so was interviewed individual. From the 22 faculty who participated in focus groups, three were selected for individual follow-up interviews to explore certain emergent themes further.

Recruitment Methods

The faculty were identified via the international education office's roster of faculty study abroad leaders. The students were identified from that office's enrollment records of students who completed faculty-led study abroad programs. Invitation emails were sent through the campus email system to each group through blind copy and those interested in participating were asked to respond individually to the researcher. In response, a total of 20 students and 23 faculty leaders agreed to participate in the study. No participants withdrew from the study.

Risks to Participants

Foreseeable risks to participants are minimal. Faculty participants might have perceived a risk of negative evaluations of their study abroad program design, teaching methods, or outcomes emerging from the study. This is a low risk, but to mitigate this concern, they were be assured that their names and comments would remain confidential and anonymous and that the student investigator will do member checks with them to ensure their perspectives are not misrepresented.

Student participants might have perceived a risk that the faculty leader of their program would attribute any negative comments to them. For this reason, the researcher chose only to involve students for whom official grades have been posted for the course, so they did not fear their grade will potentially be affected. The research, however, only verified that student grades had been posted and did not use individual student letter grades as part of the study. Students were assured that their comments and names would remain confidential and anonymous, and she will make every effort to generalize comments so that readers cannot guess the identity of the person making them.

Potential Benefits to Participants

Faculty study participants potentially benefitted from participation in the focus groups or interviews, in that it provided them with a structured opportunity to discuss with their peers their experiences designing and leading student courses abroad, and to share pedagogical approaches and other elements of study abroad programming. Students potentially benefitted from the study, beyond receiving a campus bookstore gift card, by having a structured opportunity to reflect on their experiences study abroad and develop a network with other returned study abroad students.

The Researcher's Value Premises

The constructivist grounded theory approach incorporates critical inquiry, emphasizing raising critical questions throughout the data collection, analysis, and writing process. Charmaz (2017) describes critical inquiry as "an ambiguous and elastic concept," which, in its different forms, "addresses power, inequality, and injustice" and is linked to "emancipation and transformation" (p. 41). Constructivist grounded theory offers an approach to critical inquiry that brings together the research purpose of exploring and addressing critical issues, while embedding opportunities for individuals to voice their experiences and views, and in so doing, catalyzing transformation within the research process itself. Essential to this process is the recognition that the researcher, like the participants, can be subjective and influenced by their own values and biases, and so the researcher must be reflective, or “methodologically self-consciousness,” about how their perspective shapes even the selection of topic, the questions asked, the design, and the analysis (Charmaz, 2000, 2006). As Charmaz (2014) says of researchers:

> We are not scientific observers who can dismiss scrutiny of our values by claiming scientific neutrality and authority. Neither observer nor observed come to a scene untouched by the world. Researchers and research participants make assumptions about what is real, possess stocks of knowledge, occupy social statuses, and pursue purposes that influence their respective views and actions in the presence of each other. Nevertheless, researchers, not participants, are obligated to be reflexive about what we bring to the scene, what we see, and how we see it (p. 27).

The researcher has therefore reflected on the ways in which the research, from selection of topic and research questions, to research design, to data analysis was shaped by her values, biases, and assumptions.

First, the experiential constructivist paradigm offers an approach to this research and work that resonates with the researcher because it takes a critical view of past and current approaches, while providing evidence-based strategies for fostering intercultural learning based on where individual students are in their intercultural development.

Second, this study is influenced by the researcher’s belief, as an international education professional, in the imperative of providing students with meaningful and effective intercultural learning experiences, as opposed to providing mere travel opportunities. Students often pay high fees to study abroad, with the promise of developing intercultural competence, but they often return unable to articulate what they have learned and experienced beyond using platitudes such as “life-changing” and “amazing.” When we neglect the process of intercultural learning in our program design, teaching, and mentoring, we are failing them as international educators, which is born out in the literature on student learning abroad (e.g., Vande Berg et al., 2012).

Third, the researcher also believes there is a need to amplify stakeholder voices in programmatic and policy decisions that affect them. Qualitative, grounded theory methods have therefore been chosen to illuminate how students and faculty make meaning of their intercultural learning and teaching experiences. The researcher’s goal is to advance understanding of what higher education institutions, faculty, and international education staff can do to foster more substantive student intercultural learning and development, and more inclusive internationalization strategies.

And finally, the researcher’s role as an international education administrator might have influenced participant responses. Comments, particularly by the student participants, were largely positive, and did not elicit many negative or critical views, for example, on the learning outcomes, program design, or faculty teaching style. This is perhaps because those who agreed to participate had had positive experiences, or perhaps because they were reluctant to offer a critique of their faculty. Faculty, while exhibiting a willingness to comment critically on the topics discussed during focus groups and interviews, might have framed some responses more positively because the researcher is an administrator who regularly evaluates study abroad programs. The researcher addressed this potential bias by framing objectives of the study to the participants as being to encourage faculty and student participants to reflect critically, and not only positively, on their study abroad experiences.

Data Collection Methods

Data for this study were collected from a series of focus group discussions and individual interviews. The types of methods used this study are described below and summarized in Table 1.

Focus Groups

Faculty and student perspectives were gathered during eight focus groups, each designed according to the methods outlined by Krueger and Casey (2015). The focus group format is designed to encourage participants to reflect on and share their experiences and attitudes about the topic(s) in question. This is facilitated by means of a supportive environment, with the facilitator asking guiding questions (Krueger & Casey, 2015). Multiple focus group discussions were conducted so that trends and patterns could be identified. Homogeneous focus groups were constituted of faculty study abroad leaders and returned students. Prior to these meetings, participants were asked to complete brief questionnaires to gather basic demographic information. All focus groups were recorded with the permission of the participants. Questioning routes for the student and faculty focus groups and interviews are included in Appendices 1 and 2.

Interviews

After the focus groups, the researcher conducted open-ended interviews with selected faculty to explore further themes and perspectives emerging from the focus group. Gaining “rich” data that reveal a fuller “picture of what is going on” (Maxwell, 2013, p. 126). In addition, because some students and one faculty participant from the target populations wished to participate but could not attend a focus group, they had individual interviews using the same protocol as for the focus groups. Each interview was recorded with the permission of the participant.

Interviewing is a common method for eliciting data in qualitative research. Charmaz (2014) suggests that although grounded theory research can involve different forms of interviewing, the intensive form of interview—more than fact-finding informational interviewing or sometimes more confrontational investigative interviewing—is well-suited for grounded theory. Intensive interviewing generally involves “a gently-guided, one-sided conversation that explores research participants’ perspective on their personal experience with the research topic. The topic may be broad and fluid…or much narrower and more focused” (Charmaz, 2014, p. 56). Questions are typically open-ended, with the objective of understanding the participant’s perspective and meaning and following up on unanticipated areas of inquiry. The in-depth nature of intensive interviewing helps the researcher elicit research participants’ interpretation of their experience and provides a means to understanding their language, meanings and actions, emotions and body language (Charmaz, 2014).

Table 1: Data Collection Methods

Method	**Description**	**Rationale**
Focus Groups	• 5 groups with 4-5 faculty each (22 out of population of 40) • 3 groups with 3-8 students each (16 out of population of 251)	• Focus on learning stakeholder perspectives • Foster/initiate faculty and student dialogue
Interviews	• 4 faculty interviewees (1 initial and 3 follow-up) • 4 student interviewees	• Further explore themes and perspectives emerging from focus groups

Confidentiality, Data Security, and Privacy

In all transcripts and analysis, the identity of the participants has been separated from comments and pseudonyms are used. The data is stored on a password-protected drive in Google Docs, and any transmission of data has been through the password-protected drive. No health information has been collected or stored, and the identities of participants has not been shared with anyone outside the research team. To mitigate the minimal risks to faculty and student participants, the researcher made every effort to present data or findings in such a way that the particular person cannot be identified. Focus group and interview questions were framed in such a way as to allow each participant to decide what information they wish to share, and no participant has been compelled to answer questions that make them uncomfortable. All study participants signed and submitted an Institutional Research Board-approved consent document prior to participating in the focus groups and/or interviews. Participants were informed that if they wish to withdraw their consent at any time, to contact the researcher, the faculty advisor, or the Institutional Review Board.

Data Analysis Methods

In grounded theory methodology, the researcher continually analyzes the data throughout the data collection process, using “constant comparative analysis” (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). In this way, the research collects the data, codes it, writes memos comparing data and reflecting on emerging themes and theories, collects additional data to examine those themes further, and comparing again, in pursuit of a central theory or conceptual framework. Ultimately, through this process, the researcher achieves theoretical saturation, where the themes related to the phenomenon under study are thoroughly described or explained. In the ongoing process of comparative analysis, the researcher integrates these themes into either a substantive or formal theory. The goal is to "try to learn what occurs in the research settings…[and] what [the] research participants' lives are like" (Charmaz, 2014, p. 3). The researcher studies "how they explain their statements and actions, and ask what analytic sense [can be made] of them" (Charmaz, 2014, p. 3).

Charmaz (2014), describes the analytic process as follows:

> By making and coding numerous comparisons, our analytic grasp of the data begins to take form. We write preliminary analytic notes called memos about our codes and comparisons and any other ideas about our data that occur to us. Through studying data, comparing them, and writing memos, we define ideas that best fit and interpret the data as tentative analytic categories. When inevitable questions arise and gaps in our categories appear, we seek data that might answer these questions and fill the gaps. We may return to [our respondent] and other research participants to learn more and to strengthen our analytic categories. As we proceed, not only do our categories coalesce as we interpret the collected data, but also the categories become more theoretical because we engage in successive levels of analysis (p. 4).

As a result of this process, "analytic categories and the relationships we draw between them provide a conceptual handle on the studied experience," culminating in a 'grounded theory,' or an abstract theoretical understanding of the studied experience" (p. 4).

Using a qualitative, constructivist grounded theory approach, three student focus groups and four individual student interviews were conducted, and five faculty focus groups and four individual faculty interviews were conducted to understand how the participants make meaning of their experiences learning and teaching abroad. The researcher wrote notes after each focus group and interview with observations and emerging ideas. A transcript of the recording was produced for each focus group and interview, and the researcher then conducted a constant comparative analysis (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), using the following steps, which align with recommendations for coding made by Krueger and Casey (2015), Maxwell (2013), and Charmaz (2014):

1. Read through entire transcript and give an initial code to particular ideas or statements made by participants. Charmaz (2014) describes coding as the process of separating, sorting, and synthesizing data, attaching labels to segments of data to describe the contents of the segments. Through this process, themes and further questions about our data emerge, giving us a basis for making comparisons with other segments. In the process of coding, further questions emerge, indicating areas for further exploration during subsequent data collection.
2. Code the transcripts again, using Quirkos qualitative coding software, grouping segments of data using the categories emerging from the initial coding, or constructing new ones
3. Group these categories in relationship to each other, comparing as many similarities and differences in data as possible, as this “tends to force the analyst to generate categories, their properties and their inter-relations as he tries to understand his data” (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. 55).
4. Write memos, or analytic notes about the codes, emerging themes, and comparisons among them as the phenomenon under study, intercultural learning, comes into sharper focus. These memos later served as a way to trace the

evolution of the researcher's identification and analysis of potential themes.

5. Prioritize the categories the themes, deciding which ones to pursue and which ones to set aside. In this study, the following criteria, described by Krueger & Casey (2015), were considering when prioritizing themes:
    - frequency
    - extensiveness (how many different people mentioned it?)
    - intensity (passion, force)
    - specificity (how detailed)
    - internal consistency (did individual participants remain consistent in their views?)
    - participant perception of importance; and new or different nuances, or outliers.
6. Where possible, integrate the selected themes into a 'theory,' which at the highest level can be a substantive or formal theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), or it can be, at a lower level, an abstract explanation of the phenomenon or process under study.
7. Write up the findings in an analytical report of the findings, a process, as Charmaz (2017) contends, is an important part of the analysis, as the researcher continues to construct meaning from the data and emergent themes.

This was an iterative process, where the researcher continually gained insights with each data collection activity, each round of coding and memoing, and each stage of categorizing and prioritizing themes. In this process of sampling, the number of groups and the amount of data collected for each group depends on the point of data saturation.

This point is reached when “no additional data are being found whereby the sociologist can develop properties of the category...the researcher becomes empirically confident that the category is saturated” (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. 61). Sampling does not necessarily lead to generalizable findings; rather, the goal is to begin to develop explanatory concepts and theories about a phenomenon. In this study, the researcher aimed to reach saturation by collecting data from multiple focus groups and interviews. As themes emerged from the data, there themes were explored further in subsequent groups and interviews.

Quality Criteria to Ensure Rigor

Yin (2014) describes the importance of demonstrating the credibility of a study design. The researcher has aimed to integrate three elements suggested in the research methodology literature to ensure such rigor. First, the data collection was consistent and accurate, and the analysis was systematic and ongoing. To accomplish this, the same general focus group and individual interview protocols were used with all of the participants in the study, according to group type (i.e., faculty leaders or students); although, the researcher added probing questions for the sake of clarity and illumination of emerging concepts and themes. For accuracy and consistency in the analysis, the researcher constructed an organizational system of matrices and memo templates where data and themes were recorded (Maxwell, 2013; Yin, 2014).

Second, the overall quality of the study requires corroborating the main findings and evidence. To do this, the researcher frequently conducted “member checks” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, in Maxwell, 2013, p. 126) during the focus groups, asking research participants to verify intended meanings and provide feedback on emergent themes. Also called respondent validation (Bryman, 1988, in Maxwell, 2013, p. 126), this strategy involves asking participants to give feedback on data and conclusions. According to

Maxwell, “is the single most important way of ruling out the possibility of misinterpreting the meaning of what participants say and do and the perspective they have on what is going on, as well as being an important way of identifying our biases and misunderstandings of what you observed” (p. 127). It also provides a means to gain additional, new insights from the respondents, including what the implications of the main themes have individually and institutionally. By asking participants to comment on the analysis of emergent themes and provide any new insights, the researcher checked her initial interpretations and provided them an opportunity for additional feedback and corrections.

Third, the research must be replicable and the findings verifiable by other researchers. The researcher therefore kept a log, for what Krueger and Casey (2015) call a “trail of evidence” (p. 140), including field notes, recordings, memos, and transcripts.

Conclusion

The constructivist grounded theory approach has provided a process through which qualitative data was systematically collected, coded, and analyzed. The aim was to understand what students learn abroad and factors supporting or hindering that learning, from the perspectives of students and faculty participants. In this way, the study amplifies the voices of students and faculty who are integral to internationalization endeavors. The researcher’s perspectives also shaped the findings, starting with the selection of topic, to shaping the research questions, to design and analysis, which means the research “produces limited, tentative generalizations, not universal statements” (Charmaz, 2014, p. 51-52). The researcher, as analyst, is only “as *an* interpreter of the scene, not as the ultimate authority defining it” (p. 51-52). The researcher in this study thus strives to represent accurately and responsibly how study participants make meaning of their experiences, while acknowledging that each stage of the research process is an act of researcher interpretation and meaning making.

Chapter Four: Study Findings

This chapter presents the research findings by research question. For each question, key themes that emerged from the focus group discussions and individual interviews with students and faculty are presented and illustrated with pertinent student and faculty comments. For each theme, students and faculty views are presented to amplify student and faculty voice, which is not always present in discussion of internationalization of higher education (Fakunle, 2019; Hunter et al., 2018; Leask et al. 2018). These data are connected, synthesized, and explained to provide a description of significant themes. The purpose of this study is to determine stakeholder views of factors influencing student learning in faculty-led study abroad programs.

The following are the research questions:

1. In what ways do student and faculty stakeholders describe the student learning outcomes achieved through participation in faculty-led study abroad programs?
2. What do faculty and students view as factors influencing student learning outcomes in faculty-led study abroad programs?

To answer these questions, I conducted focus group and individual interviews with two stakeholder groups: students who participated in faculty-led study abroad programs, and faculty members who developed and led such programs. Using a qualitative, constructivist grounded theory approach, I facilitated three student focus groups and four individual student interviews involving a total of 20 students who had participated in one or more of 11 different study abroad courses offered Winter 2016 through Winter 2018. In addition, five faculty focus groups and four individual faculty interviews were conducted with a total of 23 faculty study abroad course leaders who led or co-led one or more of 20 different study abroad courses within the past five years. A transcript was produced for each focus group or interview and the researcher then conducted a constant comparative analysis of study participant comments (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), using the following steps:

1. Read through entire transcript and give a code to participant ideas or statements.
2. Code the transcripts electronically, grouping them using the dimensions or categories emerging from the initial coding.
3. Group these categories in relationship to each other.
4. Prioritize the categories the themes, considering the following (Krueger & Casey, 2015): frequency, extensiveness, intensity, specificity, internal consistency; participant perception of importance; and new or different nuances, or outliers.

Through this process of continual comparison of categories, several themes related to student learning outcomes and factors influencing achievement of those outcomes emerged.

Results

What follows is a discussion of each of the key themes by research question. The themes emerged from the focus group discussions and interviews. Direct quotes from study participants illustrate their views related to a theme to provide rich description of the theme. Key themes related to Research Question 1 on learning outcomes achieved through participation in faculty-led study abroad programs include the following:

1. Applied learning of faculty-led study abroad course content
2. Professional development
3. Comparative understanding of cultures
4. Personal Growth
5. Understanding of identity-related issues

Key themes related to Research Questions 2 on factors influencing student learning in faculty-led study abroad programs are listed below:

1. Student-centered teaching and learning
2. Instructor expertise
3. Students behaviors
4. Institutional support of faculty

Research Question 1: Student Learning Outcomes

What follows is a description of student and faculty views on the types of student learning that occurs through study abroad programs. Five themes related to outcomes emerged from the data.

Theme 1: Applied Learning of Faculty Study Abroad Course Content

A key theme that emerged related to student learning outcomes on study abroad programs was the applied learning of the course content. Both faculty and students emphasized the value of learning the course content experientially, in another cultural context. Study participants described three types of applied, or experiential, learning that occurred on their study abroad course. Some talked about experiences where students learned through *observation*, such as students who watched a Shakespeare play or observed teachers teaching, while others related how students learned through *interaction* with a space, such as by entering a medieval cathedral, or with people, such as sport organization leaders or local peers. Other participants discussed how students had learned through *practice* of knowledge of a skill, such as teaching a lesson in a classroom or conducting participatory health research.

As one student, Maheera, suggested, study abroad “brings into real life” the content of the course, in her case, Spanish language. Another student, Rebecca, made the following comment about observing applied public health approaches in the Mexican context:

> I just wanted to learn about different cultural approaches to medicine. Because we did holistic medicine and more herbal medicine while we were down there. And we did see their public hospitals, so it was interesting to see those two sides of it. I also wanted to learn more about the public health aspect of medicine, because as a biomedical science major you only know, there's a biomedical model and it's very impersonal, so seeing the public health approach was incredible, and it literally blew my mind. (Rebecca, Student)

She then described how she learned about the impact of health policy on the lives of the local community members who talked to her group. Others in her focus group echoed that, while they had expected to learn about the course’s disciplinary content prior to departure, they were surprised to develop a deeper emotional, personal, or tactile connection to the content area than they had anticipated.

> I think something about being around the stuff definitely helps with the culture…It's one thing to read and see *Cleopatra*. It's one thing to read the *Castle of Otranto*, it's one thing to read this English poem or that English poem or the *Canterbury Tales*, but something else to read and then go to Canterbury and then go see The Globe [Theater] and be immersed in it… actually going there and seeing it and the engaging with it on that tactile personal level. (Robert, Student)

Most faculty developed their study abroad courses to give students this type of applied opportunity learn the course content in a relevant cultural, historical, or geographical context. They described learning in the study abroad context as “filling a gap,” “connecting the dots,” having “epiphanies,” and making the context “more relevant.” One faculty member, for example, aimed for her students to learn, in an applied way, the importance of responding to community-articulated needs, rather than imposing the models and approaches the students had learned in other course work. She provides an example of how students in her study abroad course to South Africa learned in this experiential way:

> They come here, and they're thinking about building their own health program for somebody, they always think about nutrition and physical fitness. Their head doesn't go anywhere else. There's so much more that comes to the dimensions of wellness. It gives us a teaching opportunity. I had them out in the Transkei, and they were doing some work with the mamas, the older women in the town. They were asking them how they felt about their health…The mamas said yes, but they don't always have the opportunity to eat healthy food…Then the students decided that they were going to build a physical fitness program for these women, out in a rural area, where that is not what they need, because they don't have access to healthy food. So, let's start with needs. It gives you the opportunity to remind them that…it is about helping the people with what they need help with, and not what you have decided they need help with. (Alison, Faculty)

Joel, who co-leads a course in the United Kingdom on Medieval literature and history, also remarked on the value of applied learning in the context they were studying:

> We had experiential reflections as their final...I had a student who had never seen a professional Shakespeare production. We went to see, at the Barbican Theater, *Antony and Cleopatra,* and she provided micro-descriptions of what she saw, thinking about staging and direction, lighting. It was amazing how careful her description was, and so clear that it had dawned on her that performance is an act of interpretation. That it's not just reading that counts, it's seeing embodied performers working through the script. That, from an English point of view, that's a beautiful epiphany…So, there's something to be said for standing in the space, and smelling it, and seeing it, that just brings everything into perspective…We want our students to have epiphanies of various kinds. Some of them are content oriented. (Joel, Faculty)

Students and faculty both indicated that they felt study abroad programs offer students opportunities to learn in ways they had not been able to learn in the traditional classroom. Other students made similar remarks:

> There are things I learned that I can never get out of a classroom. And there's nothing against learning in classrooms—it works, but to a certain extent. And being able to experience it is something you'll have for the rest of your life, and I promise you will never stop talking about it…it's just incredible. (Rebecca, Student)
>
> It's one thing to sit here and talk about the Brazilian rainforest is being cut down. It's another thing to go and see hillsides that are no longer forested. (Karen, Faculty)
>
> What I've—and most of us really have always tried to do it—in the classroom…is to open up the minds of our students and also just open up their…emotions in a way...And you can do that in a classroom, but it's frustrating, because once you're involved in study abroad, you realize that the classroom, it only goes so far. It's great that they read books and they talk about issues, they take exams, they write papers, all the rest of this…but for me, who really wants to open them up to the world, and once you bring the world in it's hard to do that in a decisive way till you get them out of here. (Sam, Faculty)

Both students and faculty, therefore, view study abroad as providing a venue for applied learning, where students experience course content in an authentic cultural context.

Theme 2: Professional Development

A second theme emerging from student and faculty comments relates to developing professional knowledge, networks, and skills. In both the focus groups and interviews, students explained how their study abroad experience helped them explore and identify areas of focus for their major, graduate school, or their careers. Similarly, faculty discussed how student experiences abroad gave them “real world” exposure to their professional field in ways that helped them better understand that field and develop skills and a comparative understanding of professional practices.

Some students, for example, described being surprised about how their study abroad experience led them to discover in what areas they wanted to focus their studies and careers, as suggested by the following comments:

> Seeing the public health approach was incredible…I wish I could've changed to community health, it would've been a better fit, one hundred percent. I'm a people person. I appreciate science, but the interactions I had and what I learned, I would never have gotten that had I just been taking classes here…Being exposed to that in a different country—just amazing. (Rebecca, Student)
>
> I like international sports and the aspect of sports. I've figured out…that I want to do event management, but just going gave me a better understanding of everything…We also went to different sporting organizations and saw different stadiums and teams and got the international sports side and corporate. Which is different because we don't really see that at [the College]. (Carrie, Student)
>
> It opened my eyes to going to college, getting my masters over there or working over there…So it was a huge eye opener for my future. (Michael, Student)

Other students talked about how, because of their experiences abroad, they were considering pursuing opportunities in different fields than they had originally intended; for example, three students—majors in history, English, and biomedical sciences—talked about their how they intended to pursue careers in the field of international education. Another changed her career focus from pediatric medicine to chiropractic medicine:

> The one thing that I always tell people that I noticed between Mexico and the U.S. is that I originally wanted to be a pediatrician. It was my goal. I was just set on that. Going over there, it just seemed so different in their careers. They seemed to be happy…I think that trip really helped me put things into perspective. I ended up deviating from that track, actually. Now, I'm going to a chiropractor school next September…It really…opened my eyes to a lot of things that I wouldn't have been able to see, had I stayed in [the state] for the winter. (Tanya, Student)

Several students discussed how their experience abroad opened their eyes to issues and careers related to social justice, sustainability, and social activism. In each case, the student indicated that this experience inspired them to take personal action and ethical responsibility to make change, through personal and career choices, as indicated in the comments below:

> The program…focused on ecotourism…and sustainability, and we met with artists who were working towards that goal… and that…was the one thing that I really took away from that trip…I already had a big interest in sustainability, but I think it kind of made me interested after. And even my job on campus, I'm a green rep in the res halls…So, that kind of made me more interested in that and actually kind of focusing on the morals behind the job rather than just the job itself. (Erika, Student)

> I think that because of this whole trip, I knew that I enjoyed working with people…I'm thinking of it as a future for me. And I think that's a huge impact…that's changed me...This trip reinforced what I want to do in life…like, if I ever become a doctor, Doctors Without Borders, or maybe the Peace Corps…I think it solidified what I want to do, and what I want to accomplish in life, but also opened up my horizons to what I want to do from my position or whatever I become what I can do with that. (Abdul, Student)

Some students mentioned how they felt their study abroad experience had enhanced their credentials. One student, for example, indicated that her study abroad experience has already captured the attention of prospective employers, suggesting that it gives some advantage in the job search process.

> Every job I've had, job interview that I've had, for internships and stuff…everyone sees on my résumé study abroad and they're, like, "What did you do? Tell me about that." So, having that experience that not a lot of people have is really important. (Carrie, Student)

Several faculty leaders also talked about how students' study abroad experience can enhance their credentials and build their professional networks and distinguish themselves to future employers:

> They got to visit the equivalent of the Centers for Disease Control. My colleagues in the Biology Department were very impressed that they and their students got so much attention from bigwigs and that thing they said, "Well, we'd never get something like that at the one in the United States." So, we emphasize to those biomed majors that experience like this is going to take their résumé and put it

> right on the top of the pile when they're trying to get into medical school or nursing school. (Diane, Faculty)
>
> I wanted to try to create those opportunities for students…in sport management. It's an incredibly international industry, and all the American institutions have international connections, they're trying to make international connections. Helping to even set apart our students from others by having that experience, too… For us, trying to make it relevant to what it is that they're doing, and there's so much sport abroad that it seems like a pretty easy connection. (Francine, Faculty)

Many faculty similarly created their study abroad courses to expose their students to professional practice in their intended fields. Examples of field experiences include supporting a temporary HIV testing clinic, providing health education to rural communities, teaching English language learners in schools, tours of businesses and organizations, and archaeological field research.

> So that's how it originally started…the idea of creating a course that allowed [future] educators an experience abroad in an educational setting. So not just going abroad to visit places, but actually working within an educational setting. (Connie, Faculty)
>
> I think it's extremely important for the students…I came from 40 years of business in the business world, and I've lived in what I call the real world, which I think many students don’t experience. And so, it's a chance to get them exposed to the real world…Internationally, they’re going to be working with colleagues internationally…I just think it's incredibly important. (Tony, Faculty)
>
> The reason I take students to Turkey is besides the experience, they actually learn field research, they learn field methods, they learn data analysis, both archaeological and anthropological, and so they're actually doing hands-on field work…Another reason I select students is because I'm pretty certain they want to go on in the discipline. So, this gives them actual field experience, and sometimes you need to do that to find out if you want to actually go on and do that, so be in the field. (Lee, Faculty)

Theme 3: Comparative Understanding of Cultures

In the focus groups and interviews, most students and faculty suggested that gaining a comparative understanding of cultures was one of the primary learning outcomes of their faculty-led study abroad courses. Students and faculty alike described how course participants learned about the host country and gained a comparative perspective on two or more countries or regions. Many of the study participants suggest this comparative perspective leads to an opening of one's mind, which they expressed as an ability to understand and manage multiple perspectives at once. Several faculty had developed their study abroad courses so their students could gain a comparative understanding of professional practices in their field, across different contexts.

Several students discussed how they gained a perspective that allowed them to contrast two or more cultures or subcultures. One student who studied in Mexico, for example, described how she had learned about Mexican history and culture, gaining a comparative perspective on Latin America to contrast with what she had learned about Spanish society during a prior semester abroad in Spain. In this way, she explained, she overcame being "Spain biased" in her Spanish language studies and usage. Another student, Michael, whose program allowed him to engage with students from several European countries, spoke of how he learned not only about cultural aspects of their countries, such as food and music, but also their views on policies he was studying.

> When you actually meet them face-to-face, you realize there's a lot more you have in common than you don't have in common. So, whether it's music, food, culture, viewpoints…And you realize that…this is not how I thought people were because of how media describes it. These are people just like me, whether they dress the same or dress differently… I kind of got the feeling from the actual people that lived there…of how the European Union worked, and how their policies interacted with each other, how they actually affect the people. (Michael, Student)

Erika described developing a comparative understanding of the cultural practices of different faith-based subcultures within Indonesia, stating:

> In Indonesia, the main religion is Islam, so we had call to prayer five times a day…It was kind of interesting, learning about that, because I've never been in a country where Islam was the main religion, and it's the country with the biggest Muslim population…In Bali, there was a lot of Hinduism and a lot of Buddhist statues and stuff like that. And then also we studied at a Catholic university. So, it was cool to see all the minority religions within the same country…So, even though we learned about the main religion and kind of really dove into that, we also saw the culture of the minority groups within Indonesia. (Erika, Student)

Several students recounted how they gained a comparative perspective on aspects of their own, U.S. American society. Speaking of her experience on a study abroad program in China, a student reflected as follows:

> We're very much into ourselves in the United States, and just going to another country—that's even maybe similar or something drastically different—really makes you appreciate what's going on…In China, there's a little bit of tension. It's not like people are walking around miserable, but there are security cameras all over the place, and as an American you're like, "What the heck? My private property"…But if you take a step back, that makes you appreciate…the rights that you have and the life that you have in comparison to others. And I think that's important, especially for college students trying to become the people that they are, just to have more of a worldview. (Krista, Student)

Similarly, some of the faculty described how, by learning about elements of another culture, students gain perspective on their own culture and assumptions. They begin to question their assumptions they had held not only about the host culture, but perspectives they had on the U.S.

> [The U.K.] is a nice place to take students who have never traveled before, because there's no language barrier, but there are some really interesting cultural differences, that can give them a very robust sense of what it is not to be in the U.S. (Joel, Faculty)
>
> My students have the same reaction, they all said the same thing, "Their health system is so much better than ours," because they found out that if something

> happens to them over there, they will be treated for free. And there's no bill and it's just the way it is, and that's that. You know we were having conversations about that as well. And in a number of different ways I saw them compare the U.S. to other places, and we came up wanting…For the most part all of them were like, "Why aren't we more like this, this is nutty, why are we the way we are?" (Claudia, Faculty)

> A different culture has to be experienced to be understood…And with a little bit of encouragement or planning,…really you immerse yourself in another culture, and then [the students] see things can be done differently…I don't think it can happen any other way, I don't think you can have that kind of learning except to be in another culture...And I think the U.S. students, they've never seen anything except their own culture for the most part, because we're the dominant world culture. So, they just assume everybody does everything like we do and it's great for them to see…that there's a world that's different than their world. (Bob, Faculty)

Part of developing a comparative perspective, according to one faculty member, relates to gaining the ability to question assumptions. She has designed her study abroad programs with this outcome in mind, as she describes in the following comment:

> I think the programs that I do with health force students to question assumptions. And, first, recognize that they have assumptions, because one of the really bizarre things about assumptions is you don't know that you're thinking that it has to be that way, just it always is, and then when things are very different…All those compare and contrast moments that just naturally happen force students to think about what are the things they've never questioned before. (Sarah, Faculty)

Many students described how, as a result of learning about and comparing aspects of different cultures, they had become more “open-minded.” Students made the following comments, for example, when asked what they would carry forward from their study abroad experiences into their lives and careers:

> Definitely the same concept of just being open minded, because a lot of times I remember ... you never know where people are coming from. You never know what they went through until you can travel and you see life through a different perspective, a different lens… I always think, "Okay, this has to be the way," and then you see somebody and they're like, "Oh, what about this way?" Just being open and honest to just say, "Well, what about this perspective? What about this

> lens? Or what about ..." It's just all this the *what abouts*...asking and learning. (Maheera, Student)
>
> Whenever I meet new people or I'm in a new situation, I try to see things from different perspectives…I know what I've lived and my life experiences, and how it shaped how I think, but everybody else has been through different things and being able to experience other things, sometimes people can become defensive and they shut off, "Oh, that's not how I think, so I don't want to see it, I don't want to learn." And I want to learn from those things. So, I try to think of myself as an open-minded person, so I can be more receptive to what people tell me and teach me. (Rebecca, Student)

Several faculty also indicated how developing a comparative perspective led to an opening within their students—of their minds, their eyes, of their world, as illustrated in the following comments:

> Their mind is opened up. It's like a flower. (Scott).
>
> The reason I am so passionate about study abroad, is that it opens their minds…I see that they are seeing things and thinking about things that they didn't think about before …When I say this about opening their minds, some people often say to me, "Oh yeah, then they really appreciate what they have back here much more," and that is true, but it's also true that they, after being there for a while, they are able to see the riches that the Mexican people have that maybe we don't have so much. That, to me, is invaluable. (Diane, Faculty)
>
> Just to get…exposure, awareness to a world that is much, much, much bigger than what they think the world is…I just keep saying it's getting exposure to the real world, getting outside of their bubble, however their bubble was defined. (Tony, Faculty)

These student and faculty comments suggest that "open-mindedness" relates to an openness to considering different perspectives, an awareness of how one's own lived experiences shaped one's own perspective and assumptions, and an ability to compare and accommodate new perspectives within one's thinking.

Comparing professional practices. Some faculty explained how they developed their courses so students could gain a comparative understanding of professional practice in their fields across different contexts. As one faculty leader, Hanna, explained with the following comment, her goal in this regard is to help her students become more comfortable with the “cognitive dissonance” they will face as teachers in different contexts, working with students from diverse backgrounds:

> One of the other things about being in Ireland itself is we try to set up an environment where they’re asked to teach in a place that is totally different than them teaching in the U.S.…I mean being in the environment teaching a whole bunch of different types of children, that environment is set up so that the students have to be more self-aware of what’s going on around them. They have to understand, how do I talk to these children? How do I relate when I say certain phrases?
>
> And so, it really sets up just being there allows for the teaching to shift…So, we actually used our study abroad to kind of create…almost like a cognitive dissonance, in the sense that your situation is totally different than what you’re accustomed to, which in turn hopefully changes how you do what you do. (Hannah, Faculty)

Hannah reflected on her own experience teaching K-12 and how traveling positively influenced her effectiveness working with her students from different cultures. She explained,

> I remember being a teacher, having a lot of students from all over the world where I was teaching in Massachusetts at the time. And I hard time connecting with certain groups of kids as a professional, as a teacher. And I remember I had a large Brazilian population in my classes and they were speaking Portuguese and I had to have other kids translate. I didn't really know much about Brazil or even what they were into.
>
> Then after I had gone on a Brazil trip myself, I thought, Wow, I could have done this and this and this, and I could have totally had different experiences for my students. So, the reason I wanted to lead something is so that students would have an opportunity to see a different culture and actually think, Okay, they do things a little bit differently here, and how can I think about this maybe in the future when I'm teaching different populations of people? The cultural competence is huge, huge part of it. (Hannah, Faculty)

Emily provides a parallel example of how her students can gain perspective on community health clients' experiences, needs, and lives. She created her course to support her students' development of cultural competency skills within the health field through encountering other perspectives.

> From the Health Department, we struggle a little bit with how to help our students become, on our terms, culturally competent. They have to understand that in order to design effective programs, they have to understand things from somebody else's viewpoint. We struggle with how to do that, but it was very obvious to me, reinforced after the Cuba trip, that the study abroad really helps with that when they're faced with having to try and understand something from someplace else. I think they begin to see how that might be a challenge for somebody here and how they can apply that to their work in the U.S. (Emily, Faculty)

When asked how the experience of a course like hers would help her students in gaining a comparative perspective within the field of community health, she explained,

> The community health folks, it's huge because it's a very, very different system than the one that we have. There were pluses and minuses to their system…Almost all of the students, when you talked to them, they said that had a huge impact on them to learn about a completely different system. Then I can talk about, "Okay, this looks this way. Let's really dig in and see what's working and what's not working and what did the data show?" in a compare and contrast kind of a thing, "And what were the benefits of this?" and so looking at different systems. (Emily, Faculty)

Another health faculty leader, however, cautioned against using the concept of cultural competency as if it is a specific skill set that students can attain. She suggests that in the field, greater importance should be placed on being able to learn and reflect continually on appropriate behavior and approaches. When asked to define the term 'cultural competency,' she responded,

> We're actually trying not to use it in health, because it sounds like a box you can check, like you're competent now, congratulations. People say they're fluent, or "I have Microsoft Excel", like it's skill that you have…The thing I love about going to India, and even more in Haiti, is that you're constantly having to assess what is

> appropriate behavior based on your gender, based on your race, based on the tone of your skin, because race in India is not the same thing here. (Sarah, Faculty)

Contrasting poverty and privilege. For many of the faculty leaders, another significant comparative perspective that students can gain abroad relates to students encountering, in a comparative way, issues associated with their socio-economic status. Notably, most students did not mention this as an outcome of their study abroad experience. In the comments below, faculty describe how, for example, they aimed for their students to be exposed to marginalized communities to gain an awareness and critical understanding of the interplay between poverty and privilege, and how their own socioeconomic status shapes their construction of the world:

> I take students out of a school in a rural part of China and…their eyes are just open so wide. And oftentimes they're so emotional…Those are the right moments for our reflective conversations…what privileges they've had in their lives and in the comparison to that….With their privilege with the fact that they actually don't have to bring toilet paper to the class, because they don't have pencils or pens or paper, and they just had no awareness that there was an environment that existed like this. (Chris, Faculty)

> We talk about the third world, they have no idea, and although there is poverty in this country, too, I think as educators, stretching them a little bit is really part of our job. And it's not always the easiest part, but it's maybe the most effective, in some ways, if we want to see changes for the better to actually have a little discomfort and learn to come to terms with it. (Claudia, Faculty)

> They had a deeper understanding of why a father from Mexico might legally cross the border and send all his money home. Because, while our students are not wealthy, they have a different feeling of what the privileges of just being able to go to college at a place like this. Feel poor, but not really be impoverished. Struggle, but not in the ways that they saw in those communities. (Angela, Faculty)

Several faculty talked about how, by developing this comparative perspective on poverty and privilege, students became more aware of issues they would encounter as professionals in their fields, whether in U.S. and international settings. Angela and Sarah, for example, each observed the following:

> Seeing what it really means to be marginalized, and the language barrier makes it very apparent, but there are other ways that marginalized populations are placed aside in this country [the U.S.], too. Sometimes, that's because they do speak differently, different dialects, of what might be called the White Trash dialect…Does that mean they don't get the respect they deserve from their doctors?...So, that's something I'm going to lean into. (Angela, Faculty)

> My students are people who want to be health professionals mostly, who want to be counselors, who want to be social workers, who want to be doctors and physicians' assistants, and so certainly there is value to them in learning that there are different ways to think about culture, there are levels of poverty that you can't imagine, that helping people really isn't help if you're giving people things they don't want because you think they should have it, or can't maintain and they're not sustainable. (Sarah, Faculty)

Sarah described a point of tension, however, between wanting her students to become more conscious of how poverty affects communities and ethical considerations about working with those communities. The benefit to students, their learning must be balanced with the needs of the community they are visiting and work that meets those needs.

> It is enormously beneficial, I think, for my students to see other cultures and other ways of thinking about wealth and poverty. And having things, and not having things. But I don't know that the benefit to my students is ethical if it doesn't also benefit the other people. So, one of the things I'm trying really hard to do…is how do we do both at the same time? How do we find meaningful work that other people couldn't do?... Just because we want to give something, doesn't mean it's valuable. And sometimes it's worse than not being valuable…it's actually damaging if it suggests you can't do this on your own…A lot of our advice and ideas just don't work in the setting. And that's what I really need my students to learn, right? Before you can go and help somebody, you need to know enough about them to know what's helpful. And the best way to know what's helpful is to ask and actually listen. (Sarah, Faculty)

Sarah therefore problematizes “helping,” wanting students to learn to approach people with humility, to ask about their needs and to take their commitment to meeting those needs seriously. This is challenging in the face of social media and pervasive perceptions in the U.S. about the value of U.S. American expertise and aid.

> I think my students come in...like, we have so much to give and we know so much and we're so well-intentioned, that of course we're going to be enormously helpful. And we're going to go to this orphanage and we're going to change lives. And not only are they thinking that, but their families are thinking that. We have a Facebook group and all of their aunts and uncles and grandparents are posting, "Oh my gosh, you're changing the world, honey. You're making a difference. These children are never going to forget you." You're really not a blip on these children's radar…But those habits of superiority that do get reinforced here all the time…and we are getting it reinforced by all the people who tell us what great jobs we're doing and how we're saving-- *Like, Like, Like, Thumbs Up. Heart emoji*. Right?

Sarah works to counteract these self-perceptions of superiority by asking students to listen to the people with whom they are working, hearing how they define their own needs, and keeping themselves “in check” so when they are in a setting, they can be more effective.

Theme 4: Personal Growth

In discussing learning outcomes, both students and faculty often remarked on other ways in which students had developed personally through their study abroad experience. Their comments about personal development outcomes encompassed a wide range of affective, dispositional, and behavioral transformations, such as gaining empathy, problem-solving skills, self-confidence, resilience, humility, and cooperative, inclusive attitudes. Faculty also described how in some case, negative attitudes and perspectives were reinforced through study abroad.

Students and faculty described a process of transformation students could experience through participation on a study abroad program. Some, for example, described how, upon returning from abroad, they had become “a whole new person,” or had “changed as people, as learners, and as future teachers.” The following student and faculty comments illustrate views on student personal transformation:

> The growth I had in that three weeks, holy cow. It was awesome, so definitely more open about things… there's so much that you get out of those three weeks. And don't write it off, because it's a three-week program, or five-week program, because you get so much out of it. (Rebecca, Student)

> There's an opening up process that takes place for each of them that they could not have predicted…It kind of passed over them and as they got to know people and took their classes and…they have become connected to the culture and people of India…It really just opens up their world and changes them completely. (Sam, Faculty)

Gaining empathy. Both students and faculty discussed how having experiences immersed in a non-English language environment gave students a new understanding of the lived experiences of English language learners. Through this newly gained perspective they have developed greater empathy for newcomers to the U.S., as underscored in the following student and faculty comments:

> I always feel like, if I'm in a city or something, someone comes up to me and they don't speak English very well, I get very frustrated sometimes because I can't convey what I'm trying to say to them. But being on the other side of that, where I was the one people didn't understand, that was totally a game changer. I learned, I understood the struggle of trying to communicate in new language, how tough it was to ask for directions or what something meant. It really was a big thing, being on the other side of the ball there. (Samantha, Student)

> It was just being…in somebody else's shoes. I can't imagine being from another country and coming into America, from such a kind culture, and just a different culture and coming to America and just being bombarded with everything. (Rebecca, Student)

> For teacher ed, it’s also that many of our students are going to have English as second language learners in their classroom, and for them to really understand where those students are coming from, placing them in that experience where their language is taken from them and they do have to communicate in very different ways than what they're used to, to feel kind of the not incapacitating nature of not being able to use your language to speak, but essentially that,

> because many times they feel that…You really think about how do you approach your pedagogy, how do you approach your children in a way that allows all learners in the classroom have access to what you're working with. (Connie, Faculty)

Learning to navigate and communicate independently. Students and faculty also discussed how one can gain a number of skills to help them navigate unfamiliar places independently, as illustrated in the following comments:

> I wanted to start my travel experience. I wanted to go on this trip alone…I learned how to navigate the Tube, which I thought would be hard, but was really simple…I feel comfortable if I want to go on another trip. I'll feel comfortable going by myself on that trip...It's addicting. Once you leave the country, it's like, when's my next flight?...I'm ready to go again. (Beth, Student)

> I tell my undergraduate students that my goal for them at the end of the trip to India is that they would feel comfortable going back to India by themselves and maybe bringing a friend or family member. That they would feel comfortable enough navigating everyday Indian life, that they know how to book trains now and they know how to get autos and all of that feels less frightening and less scary. (Sarah, Faculty)

> On the first trip I took students on, the one who had never been on an airplane before, and she's traveling the world now. It just gave her enough of a boost to think, Wow, this really isn't that hard. You don't have to know the language, you can get around. Like that sort of wandering, adventurous spirit. (Karen, Faculty)

Students and faculty discussed how students were able to learn to communicate and navigate in contexts where they knew little or none of the local language, as they became more comfortable with the uncertainty and confusion that can often occur when immersed in a foreign language.

> Traveling abroad really does help you develop…When you're really put in a situation where, you're like, "Okay, I don't really speak the language too well, so what are other traits that I have, that I can use?" Or like I really learned to work with other people to figure out, "Okay, you're strong at this. I'm strong at that." Or "I'm weak at this. What can we use to play off of all of our strengths, to get where we need to go? Because we need to take the train, and we don't know the common language." (Maheera, Student)

> Having that accent barrier brought me out of my shell. Needing to communicate with people and not always understanding exactly what they're saying...When we were at restaurants, talking to servers, or taking rickshaws around… knowing how to communicate without having language be an issue...I think it will help me, especially being in America, where we're the melting pot of all countries, being able to communicate with anyone from anywhere is just a great skill to have. (Amy, Student)

> [Students] learn how to communicate in an experiential way. I find that one of the fascinating parts that I discovered, and it might have been through my own students in psychology. Eighty percent of our communication is nonverbal…There are other ways to communicate, through eyes, through observation … It's a fading skill. (Chris, Faculty)

Other faculty described how, by going abroad, students become more interested in learning languages in general, so they can communicate. Connie, for example, recounted this story about one of her students:

> I had a student…he took three courses with me and he would always say, "If you're in America, you learn English," and he'd always say this, and it wasn't until he took this course and he went abroad and he was unable to speak any of his language, because our host families don't speak English, the teachers don't speak English, the children don't speak English. So, it is a very immersed setting for them and they realized how very difficult it is to be incapacitated without your language. He changed his mind from this trip. (Connie, Faculty)

Self-confidence. Students and faculty frequently indicated that students developed greater self-confidence as they learned to manage challenges and act independently abroad. The following student and faculty comments describe this aspect of growth:

> I think…it's really important for self-confidence and independence…because I know the first time I studied abroad…I was so shy and then I came back and everyone was like, "Wait, you're talking now?" It creates these drastic changes over the span of a week or two and it's just really amazing and beneficial. (Carrie, Student)

> I find that when they come back they're more mature in the way they talk to faculty...They just seemed more relaxed in who they are...[I had] just a really quiet student... I had her as an advisee so she was really shy to pull those words, giving the whole sentence. And after [studying abroad], she was just talking about things and just had so much more confidence and a more mature attitude. (Claudia, Faculty)

Resiliency and tolerance for adversity. Several students and faculty suggested the study abroad experience compelled students to take risks and push past their comfort zones, as they developed tolerance for adversity and resiliency. The following comments suggest this "mindset," as one student called this willingness to step outside one's comfort zones:

> I feel like a study abroad puts you in a lot of now-or-never situations. You're going to do something now or you're never going to have this opportunity with this same group of people ever again. I feel like that's something that really pushed me out of that comfort zone…That really pushed me a lot during the trip. (Tanya, Student)

> I think for some students, it breeds resiliency. It helps them figure out how to bounce back. I think study abroad is a safe way to help…to get them there for the first time. To see that they can actually do it. (Alison, Faculty)

> Tolerance for adversity. Traveling anywhere is uncomfortable sometimes. It's unfamiliar, the food is weird…We largely live in a really comfortable lifestyle. Students, most, are not that uncomfortable on a somewhat regular basis, or even occasionally…So, dealing with bad weather, or food you're not sure about, or, Oh gosh, we don't flush the toilet paper…Or we use a hole, wait a minute!...And then, you just get this is the new normal for while we're here, and it's routine. Then it's not really a big deal anymore. That's an important thing to learn, that it's okay to be uncomfortable. (Karen, Faculty)

Another student, Maheera, felt that by stepping out of her comfort zone, she had become more cognizant of her personal strengths and areas she wanted to develop further, such as people skills or skills related to navigating unfamiliar places.

> I always thought to myself, "Oh, I'm definitely open minded. I'm okay." But then when you're really challenged in certain situations, then you really realize, "Okay,

> am I am who I say I am?" You really realize, "Okay... I don't know if I can do this. I don't know if I'm strong enough"...It really shows you what your weaknesses are, and really shows, "Okay, I'm really strong in this area," and then it's like, "Okay, well maybe I have to work on my people skills. Or maybe I have to work on navigation," or whatever…Traveling really helps… Learning what I'm strong at, what are my weaknesses. (Maheera, Student)

One faculty member, Sarah, similarly describes how students not only learn how to cope with discomfort, but also how to acknowledge, authentically, how challenging it can be for them.

> I think if our goal is that students are competent or culturally aware or whatever, we're never going to make it. We're going to be really disappointed in ourselves and frustrated with our students. So, I think the fact that they're interested in going someplace that they haven't been, especially after I'm telling them it's going to be really hard and it's going to be uncomfortable and at least once a day you're going to regret coming…And the fact that they're willing to come. I think I know that students are starting to get it when they get really more comfortable saying, "This was really hard for me." Or, "I was really uncomfortable with this." (Sarah, Faculty)

Changing Attitudes. Several students and faculty described learning outcomes related to changing attitudes and behaviors towards themselves and others. Some students, for example, discussed how study abroad helped them learn to be more patient and able to adapt:

> We have to learn how to adapt a little…and it's a good learning experience, because you learn to be flexible…You kind of learn to have to leave the rigidness of America behind you…You just have to go with the flow. Things aren't going to work out all the time but maybe that's for the better. You found something else to do and it all works out. (Lisa, Student)

> You take things with a grain of salt. Just let it go and don't let it affect you because it's just differences and people sometimes have different ways of acknowledging them or, when they encounter someone with a difference, sometimes they have a hard time adjusting to it. (Amy, Student)

> My mom always tells me, "You have to stop and live in the moment."…So, I was like, "You know what? This is a new experience for me…Let me just kind of

> calm down and relax and live in the moment…make connections." It's not always about boom, boom, boom, fast pace and see everything as much as possible…So, for me, it was more of learning the language and learning the culture, but also adapting…I remember just sitting at a park and just being immersed, seeing the people walking and talking and being with their families…That whole trip, for me, was really humbling and it really made me reflect and pay attention to living in the moment. (Maheera, Student)

Faculty also viewed study abroad as providing the potential for students to develop new attitudes and dispositions as they processed their experiences. Examples include learning to be cooperative, humble, and inclusive.

> One of the things that I noticed is an increased need and development of the ability to cooperate. Because they have…to learn to cooperate with a variety of things and people…So, they learn, what we all did as children, which is learn how to play well together. They don't know how to do that anymore as well, I think. So, I think that's something that comes with these experiences. (Lee, Faculty)

> It's my job to have my students have a greater comfort than when they left working in places and people across differences, and a greater sense of humility that they don't know everything and that ours might not be the best or only way…Because, I think the biggest thing I want my students to learn from a healthcare, public health perspective, is humility…I have all these students who are going to come to India for four weeks and save and change the lives of children, right? The whole White savior thing. What does that say about the Indian people who, again, for millennia, have been doing this? What they need is a White 21-year-old from [the U.S.] to come in and tell them how to do it? (Sarah, Faculty)

> It makes them learn how to depend on themselves, and how to work in a group, to really depend on other people. But it also teaches them within that cultural aspect of how to make new friends, with people that are different than they are. So, I think it breeds the inclusion bug, also. (Alison, Faculty)

Negative Personal Outcomes. Several faculty described possible negative outcomes from study abroad, including reinforcement of stereotypes, lack of change, or shutting down and not being open to different perspectives, ways of living or working, or conditions. Connie, for example, reflected on her frustrations and challenges in guiding her students through their encounters with difference.

> I think that the first trip reinforced stereotypes that I did not want reinforced…There was this huge culture shock on how different child rearing was approached, and then we were placed in a very urban poor…dealing with issues of poverty, and I didn't have the tools for them to deal with what was happening…It was too much for them, and it could've been that the group was too large to make the connections that I needed to make to be able to push through that. There could have been multiple factors...so it was hard to make those connections...and you could never get past that. (Connie, Faculty)

Marianne described a similar phenomenon where students' stereotypes were reinforced during their study abroad experience.

> Sometimes I think that happens in Belize…where they think, "These poor people because they don't have this, and they don't have that." And yet I'm like, "Yes, but look what they have." Let's talk a little bit about that part of it too, so that's kind of interesting thing…Sometimes...they don't get the right sense from the trip that you would hope they would. (Marianne, Faculty)

Several faculty described how, in some cases, as some students grew, and their perspective was transformed in positive ways, other students experienced no change in how they interpreted cultural difference. For example,

> For some…there's a big, big change in how they look at the China…Some people, they still stay with their interpretation. The way they interpret the Chinese culture. They still have this framework. It's not possible just in one trip, or ten days, already to change your view, right? So, they still keep their view…I saw it changing, but also I saw it stay still. Maybe in the long run they would change, in how they interpret the culture. Sometimes I was excited, but sometimes I need to retreat. (Mei, Faculty)
>
> About halfway through, all of a sudden, the light bulbs start going on and they begin. Does everybody get there? No. Absolutely not…I think we were there eight days, nine days. That's probably about the minimum that you could go to really begin to get that sort of impact, because I think it takes a couple days, as you'll probably see. They're just, "This is so different"…They're just paying attention to how much different it is from where I'm coming from. (Emily, Faculty)

Faculty discussed how students might also shut down emotionally in response to observing difficult circumstances. Sarah provided one example of one of her students:

> We would sit around the dinner table and have those conversations..."Yeah, that was really incredibly crappy to watch those two men be called names. Or, to know that there is no room, no role in this society for children who have disabilities other than to beg for money, right?…" And she just really wasn't willing to have any of those conversations. And it was obvious that she was really unhappy, and…instead of engaging in those conversations, just sort of shut down…It makes sense that people have those emotions, but if that's where you end up, that's not a great place to be. (Sarah, Faculty)

The faculty who mentioned these negative outcomes suggested they had tried to guide their students through these challenges but had not been successful. They indicated they would like to explore further how to work with students to avoid, mitigate, or overcome such unintended results.

Theme 5: Understanding Identity

During the focus groups and interviews, several students and faculty mentioned learning outcomes related to developing a comparative understanding of their own identity and how, through their travel to other countries, different identities can be perceived in other cultures. Many research participants mentioned what they learned about how identity can influence lived experience in other cultures, and how that compares with their own lived experiences. Students, for example, discussed how they grappled with their family heritage and connections to the host country and how their actual or perceived race, gender, nationality, or religious has shaped their perspectives and how they are perceived or treated by other within the home and host contexts. In some cases, students described how they had experiences related to an intersection of group identities, for example, race, gender, and U.S. nationality. Faculty similarly related how their students learned about how their status as U.S. Americans, or of certain racial, gender, or sexual orientation groups influenced their worldview, and how, in turn, they are viewed by others outside of their group. What follows are examples of student learning abroad through different lenses of identity.

National Identity. Several students and faculty described how students, through their intercultural experience, became more aware of how U.S. Americans are sometimes perceived Some students sensed hostility from local people that they attributed to their being American or foreigners.

> They hear your accent or the dialect that you're speaking in and they would immediately just be like, "Oh you're American, what do you want?" Which was kind of frustrating because you want to try, you want to be in the culture and try and speak their language, try and understand what's going on. They were so short-tempered with us, everywhere we went…When they saw you were American they were just like, "Okay, leave." (Carrie, Student)

Two faculty members indicate that, while students might encounter other people's assumptions about U.S. politics, they have an opportunity to represent to local people a greater diversity of characteristics and political views than stereotypes about Americans would suggest. Describing their time with students in their host countries, they commented:

> Of course, anything that the U.S. does is not right, doesn't matter what it is...It was fascinating, because I remember [we] got bombarded with, "Oh, your government did this, your government did that"…You read in the news what happens in the U.S., and the assumption is that the U.S. population is highly involved in the political climate. The reality is that most people are not, because we're too busy working…We read the headlines, the best any of us can do is vote…So, trying to explain to people that a lot of the citizens of the U.S. feel borderline powerless to change anything. (Scott, Faculty)
>
> When you think about intercultural [learning]…it is cultures giving to each other. When our students go places, everyone they meet learns something, too. There's this sharing that one, not all Americans are rich…They often think that American

> women are loose…I think it gives the opportunity for our students to get to share with the world, that's really not how everyone is, and not everyone in our country…Students to get to see some of that in politics, too, and to be able to share that information and that experience with others is also really important. (Alison, Faculty)

Racial/Ethnic Identity. Several students and faculty expressed discoveries and challenges related to their racial identity, sometimes intersecting with other identities. Several White, female students, for example, described first experiences being an ethnic minority in their host communities. Chelsea describes her experience:

> Going off of the sticking out thing…once we got into Java and we were in the temples…with the little schoolchildren that were following me and taking pictures of me because I was blonde and people shove their babies in your hand and take a picture of you because they've never seen a White person before…That's the first time in my life I've ever felt like a minority. Had those roles reversed. I grew up in a really small White town…Going there and having the roles reversed is definitely eye-opening…It was insane. I'm not a celebrity…It makes me uncomfortable. (Chelsea, Student)

Another White student, Amy, suggested that, beyond some pre-departure guidance from past student participants, she had not been prepared sufficiently for this experience of being in the minority and the attention she attracted. She reflected on how some level of just getting use to the staring and attention was necessary, in the following comment:

> We weren't warned enough, in a way. Just by the students that went in the past. They explained occasionally how people would ask for photos, but they didn't mention the staring. Honestly, India was like the best experience of my life, so it didn't prevent me from having a good experience, but it took some getting used to…I can't get mad, it's just what they’re doing. They're just curious, is what someone from India explained to us. (Amy, Student)

An African-American student in the same focus group pointed out how, while she felt like a minority in the U.K., she was accustomed to being in the minority, in terms of her racial identity:

> I had like the opposite experience. I was one of the only Black person in the area, and…I understood why people went crazy about James Bond not being played by a Black actor. There are no Black people in the area. It just rang with me, and I was like, no one is my same color…It wasn't just not my skin color, but I was one of the minorities. (Beth, Student)

When asked how students could be prepared to be a minority in the host country, she explained,

> I kind of feel it's one of those things that you have to experience it and then react to it in your own way...I was prepared already, because that's like a normal thing for me. Being the minority. So, it wasn't that much of a shock. I guess for people who aren't used to it, it is a shock...It's really hard to explain to someone without actually being there with them. (Beth, Student)

Most faculty did not mention having encountered students grappling issues related to their racial or ethnic identity. Two faculty, however, related how their students experienced the host culture in negative or surprising ways due to their racial identity. Joel, for example, told a story of how his students had learned about how race can be perceived differently in another context:

> In terms of race, the African diaspora is kind of, to many of our White students, an unexplored history. So, many of our White students equate African American with Black. But, London has a hugely cosmopolitan culture, with many people of African origin, who would not identify as African American at all: West Indian, or African. I mean, there's actual tension between West Indians and Africans in the city of London itself. So, our students got to glimpse some of that. In one particular [instance], there is a very politically conscious chocolate store, Brick Lane, that is very Afro-centric, and our students got see these very, these beautiful murals, that were in the back of the store…And, it was an interesting moment of cultural learning that could only have happened through their own exploration. It wasn't on our itinerary. I thought that was very cool. (Joel, Faculty)

Sarah reflected in a follow-up interview on some of her students' encounters with race-related challenges while abroad. In one case, for example, she told of how one of her students, who was from Ghana, "talked about how uncomfortable it was being Black in India." She spoke in depth, too, about her own development, both in understanding how race plays out in other cultures and in her pedagogical approach to guiding students through their experience. She reflected self-critically on her sense of failure when, early on, she did not talk to students about identity to prepare them for challenges related to how race and ethnicity are constructed in the host country.

> See, I feel like I just have a really acute sense of all the ways in which I have really [messed] up…I just feel this acute sense of needing to fix it... and learn from it and I try to be less stupid each time…It never occurred to me...I assumed I was taking brown students to a brown country. Of course, that would be seamless. Right? Because like race, there are two things, that's White or Black. Face palm. (Sarah, Faculty)

She describes her own learning about how students experience racial identities differently in the host countries than in the U.S.:

> By the time you get to be an adult, even if you're only a second-year college student as an adult, you have a pretty good sense of what your identity means here. And it may not always be good, you know, there might be ways that it's uncomfortable or unpleasant, or people are rude or racist, but you sort of know what it's going to be...But traveling with students, it's sort of like, well let's see how that's going to be. (Sarah, Faculty)

When the travel with her to India, however, they confront different perceptions and assumptions about race:

> In India, but also in Haiti, race and identity and ethnicity are very different than they are in the U.S. So, I will [talk to students about identity]…It starts when I first start interviewing students, to talk to them about the process and thinking about, you know, how will you be read in India?…I've had this experience before where I've brought students who identify as Latina or students who identify as mixed, go to India and people are like, oh no, of course you are Indian, because you are so beautiful…your family must be Indian. And at the same time, I've had students who identify as mixed be read as White or students who identify as Black, but American be told that they're African. (Sarah, Faculty)

She also works with White students to process their experiences being minorities, often for the first time in their lives.

> When I bring students to Haiti, being White…small children cry when they see me...they are scared. And medium-sized children stand on the side of the road and point and yell, "Blanc, blanc," and people come running to see me and my students who are White, because we are White. And so again,…what does it mean to be White in Haiti, which is the only country to successfully rebel from slavery and overall?... There's all of this sort of...history and stuff that in the U.S. we don't have to think about, or can think about in predictable ways. (Sarah, Faculty)

She therefore introduces her students to the possibility of some level of dissonance between how they have experienced race in the U.S. and how they will be perceived or treated in India, while authentically admitting she might not be able to understand the experiences here students of color might face abroad:

> It’s really fascinating because just when I, as a professional, thought I was getting a little bit good at navigating race and identity here, as a White woman. I'm now finding myself in India all the time with students of color and saying to them upfront, "I do not know what your experience will be like"…And so very early on it starts this conversation of this will be a thing, but I don't know what kind of thing it will be…But sort of having that conversation of, it will not be the same and the assumptions that I could make about it will probably not be accurate, so I'm going to try not to do that. And because we don't know what to expect, here's the sort of range of possibilities and let's talk about how we might handle those. And how we'll, on a day-to-day basis, say, “What is that like?” (Sarah, Faculty)

And so, over the years taking students to India and Haiti, she has concluded that regardless of with which race or races students identify, she must prepare students for their encounters with different perceptions of race, even if how those conflicts will manifest is uncertain.

> The big take home I've gotten is that none of us can ignore race while we are there. Regardless of what our race or identity or experience in the United States is. So again, even my White students, you know, if you're a blonde woman in India, your experience is different. And the things that people will think about you are different. (Sarah, Faculty)

Gender Identity. Some of the students mentioned confronting issues related to their gender while abroad, including harassment and alienation, and coping strategies they developed to deal with the it. In one focus group, female students compared stories:

> Amy: I was grabbed once, but it was obviously not okay. It was during the day after school, walking back. That's why you never walk alone. You walk in a group. I was with another girl. It was just something that happens, so you just have to let it go, as annoying as it is…We stuck out being White women with blonde hair. We stuck out a lot.
>
> Susan: I agree with that…Going out at night, you definitely want to keep your belongings safe. Even if I was walking with a couple other girls I was friends with, we would still get, you would hear a group of guys saying stuff in Italian. It was kind of unsettling. We would stay together.
>
> Chelsea: At some of the clubs, some of the guys were really touchy. It was a little too much.

In the comment below, a male student related his experience feeling excluded by norms around separation of genders while in India.

> One of the things we did was we worked with orphanages. And again, they were very gender segregated, so…the girl children weren't as accepting to me…as they were with the women, because they were more comfortable around them. I had long hair at that point, so they weren't sure what I was…I received a lot of criticism, I saw a lot of staring…One of the first questions that I got asked was whether I was a guy or a girl. At first, I didn't really care, but sometimes it just keeps happening, and it gets really annoying…I couldn't interact with them as much as the girls. The girls could play hopscotch, or play little outdoor games with them, or play patty cake or something like that. I couldn't do those things. (Abdul, Student)

A few faculty discussed the nature of their students' learning around gender norms and related issues. Emily related how some male students, when they met a female physician who had long fingernails, made certain "sexist comments" questions, such as, "How are they able to be a doctor with those long fingernails?" Female students, on the other hand, sometimes took note of how, in the host country,

> The men can be forward, but with a possible exception of one of the women, that wasn't a new thing. They had all experienced that so that wasn't an, "Oh, my gosh," kind of a thing. It was just like, "Here, too." (Emily, Faculty)

She wondered that if gender and other identity issues emerge on these trips, “is that something we need to think about or is it something we need to actively work on?”

Sarah reflects on how she aims to support her students’ development of comparative perspectives, where they strive to learn and understand how gender is construed in the host country culture, while questioning their assumptions about what takes place in their own, U.S. society.

> We spend a lot of time talking about what's fair, and the sexism that students perceive in India, but they don't perceive in the United States. They'll talk about women having to cover their heads with scarves in parts of India, and how that's sexist. Then, we'll talk about how women in the United States are getting breast jobs to be 16. There's sexism here, too, it's just that we grew up with it and it's just what we do. It's just different. One of the things I think they get is constantly…it's the same but it's different. All those compare and contrast moments that just naturally happen force students to think about what are the things they've never questioned before. (Sarah, Faculty)

Sexual Orientation/LGBTQ Identities. None of the students described having experiences or learning related to their sexual orientation or LGBTQ identity while abroad. A few faculty, on the other hand, spoke in depth about their experiences supporting LGBTQ or gender queer students. Kate described how she and her co-leaders struggled to support a student who self-identified as being a non-binary gender, as follows:

> The person in question had…a non-binary gender, so the pronoun that person preferred was ‘they.’ That's something where in Britain, that doesn't happen, so no one was using the proper pronoun for this person. So, they [the student] would get very persnickety about that and we tried to explain this early on to say, "People in the UK haven't really accepted this or dealt with it or found a way to navigate this. So, you need to understand that not everyone's going to use the pronoun that you wish, and you can certainly correct them. But in passing, people will assume you are ‘she’ because you look like a she, so try not to be offended; they are just not quite there yet." (Kate, Faculty)

Another faculty member in the same focus group noted that in U.S. society, we have much room to improve as well, and asked the other members how, when in visiting a place that is "not as far along as we are, but is moving in the right direction," a faculty leader can support a non-binary gender student. Sarah, in her follow-up interview, addressed this question, about which she had given substantial thought as she gained more experience leading student groups to India and Haiti. She discussed how she guides students as they navigate different norms around sexuality and sexual identity in the following comment:

> I have that conversation pretty openly, too. And I will tell my students that none of them are allowed to engage in behaviors that are going to cause us difficulty with our partners... So, we're going to spend three days at a convent that is run by nuns, and obviously nuns have very traditional Catholic views on what is appropriate for sexuality. And the fascinating thing is that the nuns would not allow male and female students to room together, even in the same building because that would be inappropriate. I had a trip where I had three students who were lesbians who all stayed in the same room because nobody reads that there. (Sarah, Faculty)

She describes how, on an earlier trip, when she had less experience leading students abroad, she felt she had failed to prepare students who identified as LGBTQ:

> I had a gender queer student who came to India…to my discredit, I didn't have a good enough conversation until [the trip]...And the student didn't tell me they were gender queer until we were on the trip. So, I didn't have the opportunity to...So, to this student, I said, "People are going to want to know, are you a boy or are you a girl? And those are really the two options. People don't have a sense here of gender queer. There is a third gender. But it's what we would think of as trans women"…And I will say you are gender queer, but people won't know what that is. And it may make them uncomfortable around you and so,...what would you like to do and how should we handle that?" And I talked to them about it and they said, "Oh no, it's okay, you can call me a girl." And they were wearing leggings and *salwars* and clothes that read in India as girl clothes, so that worked just fine. And the student decided they were okay with it. But in hindsight, I wish I'd had the ability to let them know that beforehand. (Sarah, Faculty)

From that experience, Sarah has developed an approach where she has a conversation with all the students in the group prior to departure about sexual orientation and gender queer and trans student identity in the Indian context, as a way to prepare the students and explain the norms and perceptions they might experience while abroad.

Family Heritage. Two students discussed how they learned about their families' cultural heritage during the time studying abroad. Both described these as emotional experiences, as they gained a new understanding of how their families' heritage had shaped them and their family members. One student remembered, as she travelled in areas of Spain from which her family had come, connecting with the history, art, and daily life of previous generations

> I remember standing there touching it, thinking, "This is a piece of me…So I'm touching it. I'm just touching it, thinking, "I'm feeling history. I'm seeing history. I feel, can think of my people passing through in their old garments, and their old things, just their clothes, and the atmosphere." (Maheera, Student)

Another student described an emotional process of discovering aspects of his parents' culture of origin, as he tried to discern how various aspects of the society might have influenced their behavior, attitudes, and personalities. He described his process of learning about his mother's culture of origin as follows:

> I had to find out for myself. I think people learn through experiences, and that's what I was doing. And [my faculty leader] was there as a great resource and a supplement to that, for me to understand identity, to find my identity. To figure out who I was, to figure out who my family was… And I was able to get those answers. And I kind of figured I would get a sense of that, but by the end of trip I gained more than I had expected. In addition, I didn't think it was going to change me that much. (Abdul, Student)

Religious Identities. A few students talked about how they experienced their host culture through the lens of their faith or religious background. In one focus group, students discussed learning about different norms, expectations, and practices around religion, and how they experienced them given their own religious identities.

> I feel also, it's a very Catholic place in Italy, too. I feel like I ran into a lot of older Catholic people, too, who were very judgmental, and I feel like that made me realize too, to take that with a grain of salt. I can just get over the fact that their trying to push their religion on me. (Susan, Student)

> We had a few students on our trip that weren't religious and didn't affiliate with any religion. They were getting comments about that. Even professors…On all of our sheets with class, it would be your name, your birthday, and your religion. [My friend] was like, “I don't have a religion.” They didn't understand the concept of that because it's such a religious area…They didn't get that. They thought that was funny, and she had to let it go, but it shows that you take things with a grain of salt. (Amy, Student)

None of the faculty, on the other hand, mentioned student religious identity.

Class Identity. Some faculty described how students grappled with issues related to class identity abroad. Joel, for example, raised a different way in which students negotiated actual or perceived differences in how class identity in the U.K. as compared to the U.S.:

> We went to the UK, and sociolinguists have told us the British accent has high cultural capital here [in the U.S.]. So, we had students trying that on while they were there. I'm thinking of a graduate student I have who works at a warehouse, puts on a nice dress, and comes to class here. Completely riding the British accent, just really trying to figure out what to do with that…really wanting to be in a different set of codes. I would love to lean more into exploring what that means, because the class system is more complicated in Britain, and manners are associated with higher class, which is associated with moral purity, and natural right to lead…We have class system, of course, but the correlation between manners and privilege is more muddled…So, our students were picking up on that, because, especially in London, kind of omnipresent sense of manners, that does cross social groups. (Joel, Faculty)

Joel suggests the need to support students as they encounter and learn about these differences, providing some direct education on expected behavioral norms, while helping them process what was happening.

> Americans, deservedly, don't have a wonderful reputation abroad… so a little bit of direct education and how to behave from our tour director, I thought was probably wise, but it was also interesting to see students coming from modest backgrounds and moving into a place where they associate lots of capital and trying to figure out what to do with that. But, again, I think we could have been more meta about that, to bring some awareness into what was going on…Well, in Britain, there's still an aristocracy, that predates the rise of the Bourgeoisie. And, that's why they seem to still look to for a kind of...cultural leadership. (Joel, Faculty)

In contrast, Connie described how two of her students had difficulty relating to local conditions, or even to her, apparently because of their more socio-economically privileged backgrounds:

> They just couldn't clean. They had to clean something at the daycare, and I had to have a serious talk with them and I found out later…that the girls were complaining about me later, because I made them clean and they said, "Well, I'm so sorry I'm not from a low socioeconomic status like yourself." Like, because I knew how to clean I must have been from a low socioeconomic status. (Connie, Faculty)

Connie then described to her focus group that how, as instructor, she felt challenged by this type of attitude:

> I don't know how to deal with the amount of privilege some of our students have and how to confront that privilege and find ways to not have them look down at somebody because they don't have hand soap…It was too much for them and it could've been that the group was too large to make the connections that I needed to make to be able to push through that. (Connie, Faculty)

Understanding Social Construction of Identity. As Sarah discusses, students begin to understand, through her study abroad course, how the different identities discussed above are socially constructed by societies and by individuals, and by themselves, stating,

> The thing I love about going to India, and even more in Haiti, is that you're constantly having to assess what is appropriate behavior based on your gender, based on your race, based on the tone of your skin, because race in India is not the same thing here. So, I'll bring three students who all see themselves to be African American here, but in India, they are racialized in very different ways. One will be told they are African, and one will be told that they're probably Indian, and one will be seen as White, right? Because race is different there…And, sexual orientation and gender identity. In Haiti, sexual orientation never gets to come up, because it's so stigmatized. And gender is different. So, I think what I'm trying to get is not that my students have this experience and now, BAM!, they understand race, or they understand sexism, or they understand people who speak different languages, but that they understand that all of those things are sort of socially constructed and are constantly changing, depending on the society and the context. (Sarah, Faculty)

She therefore aims for her students to gain an awareness that identity itself is socially constructed, and to learn how to adapt their behavior, and their expectations, to respond appropriately, to "be able to think about what the difference is and how you're going to respond to that in a way that moves you forward." Identity becomes a lens for students to learn about themselves, their home culture, and the host society.

When asked how faculty can guide their students as they confront these identity related and social justice issues, she responded that she has ongoing conversations with students about how different groups might be marginalized within a culture, how that compares with how members of those groups are treated in the U.S., and the role they, as visitors can or cannot play in addressing injustices. As she states,

> So, what I try and do when we have those, "I hate what they're doing here" discussions, is sort of have the conversation..."Yes, it makes me really uncomfortable too, and it's not what I would endorse if I were in charge, or if this were my culture. I would work really hard to change this. And let's talk about the ways this mirrors the treatment that women, queer people, people with disabilities, experience in the U.S"…I use the word 'hubris,' right? Like, what

> kind of arrogance is it to assume that you could come to a country for a week or a month and make a meaningful difference. And know enough to know how the difference should be made. (Sarah, Faculty)

Additional Themes Related to Learning Outcomes

Additional themes relevant to Research Question 1 on student learning outcomes emerged as outliers of interest because they have implications for the process and scope of learning outcomes. The first relates to how student learning outcomes are defined. The second relates to learning outcomes for faculty and how they influence faculty teaching.

Defining Student Learning Outcomes. Although faculty were not specifically asked in the focus groups or interviews about the process for defining student learning outcomes for their faculty-led programs, two faculty commented on the subject. Tony talked about how it is difficult to articulate what the outcomes are, but they are more than what students expect:

> I couldn’t even come up with a phrase for although I can see it in their eyes and I hear it in their voices and I know the enthusiasm…I think a lot of them go thinking they're going to have some cool cultural experience but it's always more than they expected, what we've been talking about. (Tony, Faculty)

Sarah, when asked about the learning outcomes for her course, talked about how she wants students to define their own learning outcomes:

> The other thing is that I struggle with is I have a list ... I tell my students, here are the things I want you to get from it. The same way that I've understood it's not my job to go to Haiti and say, "Here's what you guys need." If my students feel that they've grown from the experience and it's helped them in ways that weren't the ways I chose, does that mean that it wasn't a valuable experience? You know, certainly as a professor, it's my obligation to have learning objectives for my students and have desired outcomes. And maybe mine shouldn't be the only decision…And if a student makes progress in ways that ... I don't know—you know, if a student comes back and says, "What I've learned is America is great and everybody else is terrible," I'm certainly not going to feel like a success. But if a student says, "I really learned to think about people and differences in ways that I hadn't before.” (Sarah, Faculty)

Tony’s comment suggests that defining student learning outcomes for study abroad programs can be challenging for faculty. Sarah’s remark indicates that faculty-defined outcomes might not necessarily align with what students expect to gain from their study abroad experience.

Faculty Learning Outcomes. Although student learning outcomes were the focus of the faculty focus group discussions and interviews, some themes related to faculty learning and development emerged. Faculty were asked how they themselves benefit from leading study abroad leadership. Several faculty responded by describing ways in which they gained knowledge and skills that they then infused into their teaching and scholarship. Emily, for example, spoke of how, through collaborating with international partners on a study abroad program, faculty were able to move out of their own comfort zones and “expand their horizons” through “a more authentic experience,” as they themselves worked with colleagues at partner institutions to offer their courses. Nancy related how she was able to return to campus after leading her trip and integrate what she had learned about the economics behind soccer doping allegations into her course, using international case examples to expose students who could not study abroad to global content. Other faculty similarly discussed how their own learning while leading students abroad has influenced their teaching in general:

> It rejuvenates my own pedagogy…especially because I'm teaching in those classrooms [in Costa Rica], alongside my students…You have to rethink about how you approach your curriculum in an entirely different way. (Connie, Faculty)

> It infuses my curriculum, what I bring into the classroom in terms of peoples and processes…It certainly influences what I do, my work, the research that I’m engaged in and evidence of that with some things that took place with shows or exhibitions and the work in Belize with the Maya group. All of that came from the Study Abroad experience. It all started there. (Chris, Faculty)

> For me to learn about [the Indian education system] has kind of enhanced my understanding of education…It has, in ways I can't even express exactly, but it's affected the way I think of American education…It has made me think about what we do and why I think maybe this is successful, and this is not successful. And also, the bigger project of what to do with young, high school aged Americans…I've had to think about that and reflect on it, and that's been instructive for me. (Sam, Faculty)

Many of the faculty echoed Bob's comment below, about how they have derived significant personal and professional satisfaction from leading and teaching students abroad because of the growth they see in students.

> Just watching students blossom and grow and see things and just real learning that you hoped when you got into teaching, you thought maybe this was what teaching would be all about and then find out well maybe not as much. You see people really grow and change and mature and experience things and they're excited. You know all the good side of teaching is on display, I think, for the most part… Obviously there's some things that happen that aren't so great, but that comes with the territory, but the highs are the highest highs I've had in teaching. The most growth, the most wonder, the most enthusiasm on the part of the students, and that makes it worthwhile to me. (Bob, Faculty)

Research Question 2: Factors Influencing Learning Outcomes

The study participants articulated four categories of factors that influenced study learning abroad, including 1) student-centered teaching approaches, 2) faculty leader expertise, 3) student behaviors, and 4) institutional support for faculty influenced the extent to student learning objectives were achieved. Each will be discussed in this section.

Factor 1: Student-Centered Teaching

Students and faculty described aspects of course design and pedagogy that are consistent with student-centered teaching. These include designing the study abroad courses with pre-departure meetings to discuss content and prepare students for their intercultural experience; provided independent learning opportunities; guiding student reflection; and authentic course activities facilitating engagement with local people and culture.

Course structure: Pre-departure "pre-enforcement" of content. In the focus groups and interviews, students and faculty reflected on how the structure of their course supported their learning. Many students whose courses included a pre-departure course component with substantive content found the preparation and information provided to be helpful. As the student comments below suggest, they appreciated learning about various aspects of the history and culture of the destination country, gave them an opportunity to ask questions about what to expect during the program:

> I learned so much about the culture, down to their money. Everything they did, was so purposefully done to include so much of their culture…I didn't feel like I was going into this blind, not knowing anything or anyone, having no basis or foundation. It made me feel more comfortable about the trip. (Rebecca, Student)
>
> Diane held a once-a-week [session]...She would pick a theme about Mexico to teach us about, just so we were prepared before we went…She addressed a lot of different things. She addressed our concerns...I didn't realize how important it would be until after the perspective stuff ... she was warning us, "You know, you're going to change your views on certain things, and it's going to open your eyes to a lot of stuff"…It was helpful for that, but also to just learning about the culture. (Lisa, Student)

Another student, Robert, a graduate student in the field of history education, reflected on the effectiveness of structuring a course with pre-departure content and assignments, calling it "pre-enforcement":

> Preparing for the stuff we're going to see was super important and helps keep the students on their toes when we actually went…They actually have this one funny word that I just adore, where they'd call the pre-trip homework, the *pre-enforcement*. There's this dominating paradigm in pedagogy and the scholarship of learning and teaching right now about engaging with students' incoming ideas about something…Engaging with students' preconceptions is super important. In

> a way, to engage those preconceptions is to get ahead of them…Where the educators there or the students themselves would have to deal with their own preconceptions, but sort of guide those preconceptions before they get there. So that is pre-enforcement, reinforcing things before you go somewhere so that you're a little more ready…so you have something to draw on. (Robert, Student)

One student seemed to feel that her pre-departure meeting was inadequate because it was too general.

> Mine was in a room like this and it was just basically [the study abroad advisor] and he goes, okay, this is what to expect in a different culture, but, I don't know. Be ready. It was pretty general. (Susan, Student)

Faculty, too, discussed how, by incorporating a pre-departure component in their course design, they were able to prepare their students in different ways for their time in the host country. During pre-departure sessions, faculty aimed to prepare students by providing course content, history and other background knowledge of the destination country, and practical guidance on navigating the local context, and setting expectations for student conduct. Some faculty talked about how they had tried to set expectations for what they would experience, emotionally and in their daily lives. Below are several examples of faculty observations about the value of offering pre-departure course content;

> I think we did a pretty good job in the one credit pre-departure thing with some of the things that we needed to open their eyes to or make them think about paying attention to. What I found was that the light bulb, if you will, came on at different times for different students and some of that I think was just Cuba. They had a really, really, really difficult time wrapping their brains around some of the politics and some of the way the economy works. (Emily, Faculty)

A few faculty offered strategies they used during these pre-departure sessions to prepare their students for their physical and emotional experiences. Two faculty mentioned how, by providing images, photos from the local context, they helped students visualize what to expect. Another suggested assigning readings and reflection papers to prepare students with course content. Another, Jim, spoke of developing a checklist of topics to cover and emphasize. Sarah spoke of the approach she has developed, which was to describe the range of experiences students might feel:

> The only thing that I've been able to consistently do that feels like it's a pretty good thing to do, is to sort of confess my own ignorance up front and say, "Here's this range of experience and everyday we're going to talk about this and what it's like and some days it will be good and some days it will be bad, and some days we're not going to be sure how we feel about it." (Sarah, Faculty)

She has found this approach of speaking authentically, but not definitively, about what students will experience while abroad, because they will not likely internalize it until they themselves encounter the local context and the challenges they might face there:

> You can tell people things and they will not believe you until they experience it…My just telling you before you go that this is going to happen...part of it is, I think, human nature not to believe it…There's a bravado, I think, about it, in the pre-departure stage, where it's easy to be like, "Oh no, that's not going to affect me," or, "Oh, I know all about that"… So, for me, starting gently the first couple of days, and just sort of easing into, "Well remember, this is the part we talked about, where this is going to happen." Means fewer meltdowns. (Sarah, Faculty)

Sam, who leads students to India, similarly described and his co-leader speaks authentically with students during pre-departure meetings:

> We try to share with them as much as we can of our own experiences. We can't tell them what it's like to be students there, because we've never been students there…We try to do whatever we can to humanize it say, "Oh okay just this, and this." But not to sugarcoat it, because they're already a little uneasy even if they have an interest in India. But here it's mainly giving information we put together, adding to it year by year. (Sam, Faculty)

Some spoke of how, when they did not include pre-departure sessions, or when the content of their meetings was not rigorous enough, they had felt their students were not as prepared.

> I honestly wish we had a quarter course so that they had more in depth of that culture going in…We had several pre-departure meetings. We had them do assignments and the pre-departure meetings were like an hour, hour and a half, two hours long and they would present like some cultural learning about it but seemed like, pardon my language, like half-assed in a way…Like five minutes about the food in Spain. That really doesn't get you much. (Nancy, Faculty)

> I think over the course of my career bringing students abroad, I'd done really well with physically preparing them for the trip. And so, they'd have the right stuff that they need and academically preparing them. And I wish I had done better culturally preparing them. I think it's something that I've only recently become aware of, that I thought…that cultural growth is going to happen just as a result of the trip, but it doesn't ... More could happen if you prepared them culturally…so that it's not just happening accidentally…I think it could happen more if you were deliberate about it…So, ask them to observe their own culture first and then specific things in the other culture. And I wish I had done more of that. If I was starting over again, I would do more of that. (Bob, Faculty)

Students and faculty therefore suggested that pre-departure meetings in which the leader provided substantive content on the culture and history of the host country, set expectations for the trip, answer questions, and introduce the course disciplinary content so students could be prepared for what they saw and learned. General informational meetings were perhaps not as useful.

A small number of students and faculty in the focus groups mentioned having a post-return phase of their course. Comments during the focus groups and interviews suggest that post-return activities have been limited primarily to informal social gatherings and student-to-student peer advising and outreach activities, which have been useful in helping students reflect on their experiences and maintain relationships developed on the trip.

> One of the most useful things is…we ask all the students to come [to the campus study abroad fairs] and they do. And they spend the entire time just reliving the experience…Any time…a student approaches us, we connect them with the alums…That lets them relive it and to bring it out of themselves more…So, I find it facilitating their ability to talk to other students and be the recruiters which also

> helps with their self-confidence allows them to get more out of their own experience. (Lee, Faculty)

Several faculty indicated that they would like to do more post-return; although, finding time to gather students once they have returned and the next term has started has been challenging, as Angela suggests:

> I also think we could do more post-departure…They did a reunion…The students, after they came back, they had a meal at [the other faculty leader's] house. I kind of wish that [I had]. I was so overwhelmed—we came right back, the semester started right up...I wish I had. Because I think it would have brought some closure. (Angela, Faculty)

Increased independent learning opportunities. Both students and faculty explained the importance of providing students with time for independent exploration and learning, coupled with the tools they need to make connections and process what they were seeing and experiencing individually. This, according to both students and faculty, requires balancing guided and independent learning.

Scheduling free time for independent exploration. Both students and faculty spoke positively about the impact free time for independent activities fostered learning growth in students. In some cases, students and faculty mentioned how their trip itineraries were too intensive, and that free time both gave the students time to rest and process their experiences, while also giving them opportunities to learn unplanned lessons and develop personal skills and attributes through learning to navigate and pursue personal interests.

Students frequently referred to how the intensity of the trip schedule influenced their learning and growth. Some students thought their course itineraries were over-scheduled and so intensive and exhausting that their learning was negatively affected. Several students, for example, expressed frustration with the intensity of their course itinerary, which left them exhausted after long bus trips or packed schedules.

> Our stuff started really early…We always went on long trips, so we'd have to be there at 6 o' clock in the morning, and then we'd take a four-hour bus ride. It was, at times, painful, because I'm not a morning person… We went on this 16-hour field trip…We could have skipped the nine-course dinner we had. It was so long, and [the faculty leader] kept talking to the Italian people, and everyone was sleeping outside, waiting for the bus. If we had nixed that part of the day, it would have been a nice winery trip. But that one was a little bit overkill. (Samantha, Student)
>
> I know that there was a lot of frustration with miscommunication about our excursions… And we were all planning on going out to lunch, and we didn't have that time to eat. So, then we were hungry...And then we were getting yelled at and rushed, and it was frustrating…And it's a little nerve-wracking trying to run from place to place. (Rebecca, Student)

Yet even students who felt their schedules were over-packed with activities expressed an appreciation for their experience:

> We were exhausted. But it's so worth it. It's honestly so worth it…In the moment, you're not too fond of that 7 o'clock in the morning alarm, but then you get there and you're like, "Wow, this is totally worth it." I would've been sleeping for the three hours that I was exploring the Frida Kahlo Museum. Good stuff. (Rebecca, Student)
>
> I don't know if I'd cut anything. I think, we just packed so much in that it…was just so tiring. But everything that we did was really cool, so I don't know what I'd cut out. (Jamie, Student)

Many students described how they benefitted when their program incorporated unscheduled time during which they could choose their own activities. Students spent their free time in a variety of ways. The following are some examples.

> I really like rock climbing, so one of my goals was to go to a gym and I went by myself and it was a complete, different experience. People from all over the world were at this gym…So many people were talking different languages, which was really cool. (Beth, Student)
>
> I walked around Dublin by myself. I went all the way to the ports. I found the European Parliament in Dublin. I walked to the stadium where they had the soccer games…And I saw a lot of different things I wouldn't have seen…And it reminded me of things that we learned over there throughout school. And I was

> like, "I made the connection"…Definitely nice to do your own thing sometimes…because you get to embrace everything a little bit differently, compared to when you're in a group…You get to change your mind, change your aspect on how these people are living." They're not just structured in these busy, got-to-go places. (Michael, Student)

Some students described how their experiences during that time led to their personal growth in terms of learning to manage time, maturity, and learning to navigate in an unfamiliar place:

> We got to experience more of the culture by ourselves…We did go out when we were there,…because that was our only time to interact with people our age. We also got to pick the restaurants we wanted to eat at and go to the places that we wanted to see rather than what was on our tour. So, it was more personalized, what we wanted to do…It's definitely the maturity factor that comes with traveling. (Carrie, Student)

> When I had a free day too, we planned a few days in advance, the whole day out with all the trips, who was going to drive us, how we're going to get there, where are we going to go for lunch. Everything, so it was kind of cool just doing that on our own. And kind of figure out how to travel. (Erika, Student)

Faculty leaders, like the students, discussed the value of providing students free time to explore their new context independently. According to their comments below, this provides students with a chance to navigate and solve problems on their own, to explore areas of interest, and to experience “happenstance opportunities,” or critical incidents where they can learn in unexpected ways about the culture, the history, identities, and other, unplanned lessons.

> You need time to explore on your own, and that's the point isn't it? Is that you have to have the free time just to rattle round wherever you are and figure things out. (Kate, Faculty)

> Students in this 21st century, they're very tapped in. So, we scheduled some free time, especially when we were in London, and they found amazing ways to use that time. They were not hitting the pubs, they were going to the British Museum, and seeing the Rosetta Stone, which was not on our itinerary, but which they had

> a unique opportunity to do. And they found their way there without our guidance and found their way back. They were fantastic, in terms of their own, self-guided parts. (Joel, Faculty)

In one focus group, two faculty, while supportive of the idea of providing free time, mentioned concerns about potential risks of allowing students to have free time, particularly related to safety.

> Mei: When we are there, the 21 days are very, very structured. We arranged everything. On the one hand, it was very exciting, and we covered a lot; on the other hand, it's kind of exhausting. They are exhausted, so we are thinking, how much time give them the exploration?...You come to another culture, right? To explore…I am concerned about the safety part, if you make it less structured. So, how structured, how much free time, or down time, or rest time, or exploration time, how to balance that? That's a thing that I keep thinking.
>
> Angela: I think we all struggle with that.

Sam spoke of the importance of pushing past these safety concerns, because the benefits outweigh the risks:

> I don't want to be with them the whole time. I want to say after a while,…"This is yours, do what you want with it. Be safe, don't be foolish, don't get in trouble," and all these things…You do the best you can to get them ready… So, I tell each of them, "Go out and find your own India, whatever that is...you should do that entirely on your own"…It's a wonderful experience…And they're all doing it in different ways…Part of that is sort of my philosophical approach to education…The student kind of matures, develops on his or her own, in quiet, private ways. And we assist that, however we can, but they've got to do it, because they're getting out of here after four years or so, and then I don't have anything to do with that after that. (Sam, Faculty)

Giving students the tools to make connections independently. Related to the idea of giving students free time is giving them the tools—whether information, course content, or question prompts—to make connections between what they have learned and what they have experienced. Both students and faculty discussed this pedagogical approach in the focus group and interview.

Several students talked about how their faculty leaders had helped them make connections between what they had learned in previous courses and what they were seeing and experiencing while abroad.

> All the places we went to without a tour guide, the professors would say, "Hey, remember learning about this in the fall? Think about that when you're looking at this stuff." Which was really kind of cool because it made you actually think about that connection. (Jamie, Student)
>
> And then Professor Chang, he's a history professor, and I took his Chinese civilization class in the fall or spring…So, it was cool with him because we're history buddies and he pulled me aside and he'd be like, "Remember when we learned about this emperor." And I was like, "What?" And he's like, "That's where he died"…He would just tell me really cool things. (Krista, Student)

Maheera, a recent graduate, reflected on how now, as an elementary school teacher, she would like to make those connections for her students, as previous instructors had helped her do.

> It's tricky because...as a teacher you always think that you want to give kids information. You're like, "Oh, if I give them all these things...they can learn so much." But a lot of times…they have to go out and learn for themselves…I would say just giving kids the tools where they can learn to appreciate the culture themselves, and still just be there if they have questions, or they need anything…exposing them to certain things and letting them make their own connections is more meaningful than me telling them.
>
> I think I try to that a lot of times with my students, too…I just try and make connections, and just try to give kids the power, give them a voice…just to acknowledge that, I think is really powerful. Again, I think if I'm traveling with students, just to give them different options…Even now sometimes I can come back and I'm like, "Oh, I remember this," and you're still making connections. You're still developing as a person or as a student. (Maheera, Student)

In contrast, two students in one of the focus groups commented on how, when a professor dominates the dialogue, they convey a lack of trust in the student' ability to ask their own questions and frustrate them as they tried to communicate in their own words.

> Krista: One critique I would have is, one of the professors when we were in [the host country] and were able to talk to the government officials, they kind of took over the conversation. I know I had questions and there was an international studies major who wants to work for the government, and he had questions. But this professor kind of took over the narrative and I think maybe they…didn't think we could do it. That was the only thing.
>
> Carrie: I had a teacher like that on my trip, too. And every time we went to go talk to someone, you'd be asking questions, but then once it started slowing down, she would immediately jump in and, or she would try and re-word your questions to make it easier for them to understand but the questions were straightforward. There was no reason to do that. She just felt like she needed to be in every single conversation. So, she'd be like, "Oh, she meant this," and we're like, "No, no, no, I meant what I said. He understood me, it's fine." That was kind of annoying.

These students' comments indicated a desire to have room to explore and ask their own questions and learn independently.

Some faculty in the focus groups discussed this same approach of helping students to make their own connections and shape their own learning. The role of faculty leaders, their comments suggest, is to ask the right questions and give them the tools they need to answer those questions for themselves, ask their own questions, and build their skills. As Sarah stated,

> I think that telling people things never works as well as showing them, and showing people things doesn't work as well as helping them discover it on their own. (Sarah, Faculty)

Emily, in a follow-up interview, reflected similarly on the role faculty leaders can play in supporting student reflection and making connections:

> I think the role of a faculty member is to be able to ask the right questions. You can't tell them what to see, but you can point some things out and then ask the question, facilitate the reflection because…If you tell them…that's just me telling them that. They're not really getting that, so what are they seeing? What are they doing? The skills part is different, not the cultural competency part, in that I think you have a real or a more defined role in figuring out what are the skills they should be getting from this experience and what are the activities you need to do

> to help them get those skills, or reinforce those skills, or apply them in a different context, or see how others apply them. That's more direct and easier. (Emily, Faculty)

She then provided the example of her trip co-leader, John, whom she felt was highly skilled at asking questions to stimulate student reflection and making connections:

> I just remember it was one day in the bus and John, he was having one of those challenging days. He stood up and he basically asked this question…asked them to think about something in a different way. He wasn't telling them how to think about it. He was so frustrated, because they were still so focused on, "This is not us." I can't remember his words, but I remember standing there going, "Wow, that's good." And then he just sat down. And two days later, when we were having a group conversation, you saw okay, which of the students really thought about what he had asked, and which of the students blew him off? (Emily, Faculty)

This takes skill, she said, and is a potential area for faculty leader development:

> I don't think that's easy…That may be an area for training. How do you frame the questions? How do you come up with the questions without telling them what it is they should be thinking?...Because some people are just inherently better at that than others. If people are doing it as pairs of faculty, you can have one person who's really good at the question part of it and somebody else is who's really good at the skills part, a complementary team of people that get everybody to the same place. (Emily, Faculty)

Balancing Guided and Independent Learning. In the same vein, some students and faculty talked about the effectiveness of balancing guided and independent learning, so students could make their own connections, while having the faculty accessible to respond to questions and give suggestions. Students made the following comments illustrating this point:

> There was this good mix of guided learning and then also free roam, letting go of the bike, letting them engage with it on their own…The professors sort of trusted us. We had half a day of guided learning and half a day of individual of learn how you will, "Please keep in mind what we talked about this morning." I think that was a good mix, because it was pretty fifty/fifty most days...By the level of student engagement that I saw that definitely worked, I think…that sort of

> teaching in the morning, freedom in the afternoon method really worked. (Robert, Student)

> I think a lot of the times she was there when you needed her, but she also knew when to step back and let us take over, and let us do our thing. Because she knows we're college students…and we'd try to make the best decisions as we can. And she was kind of there as an advisor, as well as a figure to be there when things are a little tough, we don't know what to do, and we have no direction…She was there whenever I needed her. And wasn't there when I didn't need her…She gave me space, and I think I was able to figure it out and kind of find my own way, and understand more about myself, and who I want to be, and what I want to be. (Abdul, Student)

Several other students described how their faculty leaders made themselves available, as the students processed what they were seeing and experiencing, to answer questions and provide information. They felt their faculty were approachable, whether because they had patient and open dispositions, or because the study abroad course format itself provided students and faculty to get to know and feel more comfortable with one another. Rebecca, for example, conveyed how she felt a sense of safety in asking in approaching her faculty leaders and guide, because they welcomed and respected student questions:

> He fully mapped out everything for us that we needed. He explained everything, and he was patient…Which is really important, because if you have questions about things, or you're unsure of something, you want them to be respected, those questions to be respected…I did not feel like it was a super scary adult I could not talk to ... mind you, I am an adult, but you always obviously respect your professors, but sometimes I don't even want to approach [them]. (Rebecca, Student)

Robert attributed his comfort with approaching his faculty leaders to the breaking down of the teacher-student hierarchical relationship traditionally found in the classroom setting. He maintained that the study abroad setting, where students and faculty intermingle over meals and experiences, relaxed what he called the “student-teacher authority paradigm,” and this aspect of the course contributed to student learning.

> We would always…go to a museum or site or something…and the professors would be sort of intermingled in the group and talk to us and then if they wanted us to take note of something say, "Remember we read about this thing?” So, it's another level of …"Hey look, engage with this. This is important"…I think something also just about working with your professor which is something important…to deconstructing the student-teacher authority paradigm…We were largely cohabiting with these professors. There was not a classroom so to speak...it's much more sort of socialist almost, because these professors were intermingled with us, and seeing things with us, and having dinner, and lunch with us, and talking to us about things. Being that available was super-important. (Robert, Student)

Faculty similarly discussed finding a balance between guided and independent learning. Karen, for example, described how she gradually increases student independence, after helping them develop their skills.

> I think if a course is designed well, then it starts out with a little time on their own, teaching them how to do things, and making it safe. Then at the end, you give them a day, or two days, to figure their lives out, do what they want to do there… We have an expression at Outward Bound, ‘dunk 'em and dry 'em.’ It's the idea of, you throw them in, but also be there to dry them off. (Karen, Faculty)

Alison similarly describes the role of faculty as facilitators in striking this balance between structured activities and independence:

> It's really finding those opportunities. It's facilitating, right?...I can't teach them everything. I can take them to an opportunity. I can't make them drink the water, of course. But you can facilitate an opportunity where they get to be a leader, where they get to be a learner…Each of those things will breed their confidence, “Oh, I was able to do that. I can now do this”…It's an amazing thing to watch. In the beginning, it's very structured because they're gaining that confidence. We start to give them a weekend day off… But you build it in slowly. So, it's kind of like sending them places on their own a little, without always being with them. You provide those opportunities as the program goes. (Alison, Faculty)

These faculty therefore take an approach where they immerse students in new, confusing, and sometimes uncomfortable situations, and then help them learn to operate independently.

Thus, both students and faculty emphasized the value of giving time for students to learn independently, both by giving them time and space to explore their new context abroad on their own, and by giving them the tools to come to their own conclusions and make their own connections. Students and faculty suggested finding a balance between guided and independent learning, with ample opportunities to encourage reflection on both planned and happenstance opportunities.

Guided reflection. Many students and faculty study participants attributed achievement of learning outcomes to activities aimed at eliciting reflection. They frequently mentioned how specific assignments, such as journaling, as well as planned and impromptu group discussions, helped students process their experiences and interactions while abroad. Faculty guiding student reflection, through question prompts and facilitated discussions, were particularly effective in fostering student learning, according to both students and faculty, as illustrated in the following comments:

> Probably the most important thing to facilitate that's with intercultural learning is this I think what I call in my thesis perpetual probing of thought and cultural engagement. (Robert, Student)
>
> Of course, the other piece, and the reason I am so passionate about study abroad, is that it opens their minds. They are writing you these reflections and the ones that are upper level Spanish, they write it in Spanish, and the ones that aren't, write them in English. I see that they are seeing things and thinking about things that they didn't think about before. (Diane, Faculty)

In the focus groups and interviews, study participants were asked if any of the course assignments supported their learning. Both faculty and students about the effectiveness of reflective journal assignments, some of which they completed using photos or video, or in blog format. Others appreciated assignments such as research papers, pre-departure readings, and activities in which they were required to navigate a new place. Several faculty spoke about how these reflections provided a means to assessing student learning and growth; although, the focus groups did not discuss whether any faculty used rubrics for assessing student learning outcomes when reviewing the assignments. As one faculty suggested, a variety of assignments can be effective:

> It’s a combination of the assignments that you have, and how that helps them facilitate reflection, and learning in some different ways, both pre-departure, during, after. We try to make it so during collecting their thoughts, they don't have anything to do while they're there, because ours are short-term, two weeks, fifteen days, or so. (Francine, Faculty)

What follows is a description of some of the most commonly mentioned types of reflective and experiential assignments described by students and faculty.

Journals. To many students, the journal assignments provided them an opportunity not only to remember what they had done on a given day or on the trip as whole, but also to reflect on their experiences as they happened, and process what they were learning and feeling. As one student framed it, journaling was a way to encourage students to “externalize their thoughts.” In many cases, the faculty leader provided question prompts or some other direction as to how to approach their journaling, such as comparing and contrasting the host culture with their own.

> Journaling definitely helps. I think everybody should be journaling at least once a week while they're abroad…It helps just to look back at it...It brings you back. It makes you think that you're there again…I journaled a lot while I was there because in the afternoon…we would go on different excursions. Things would happen so fast that you leave and you're like, what just happened? What did I just do? (Tanya, Student)

> One of things we had to do was keep a journal…I really liked that because I think I have a lot of feelings, one of them being anger. And that was one way I could kind of get rid of it, and just kind of let it go. And I was comfortable, and Dr. Sarah gave us a choice if you wanted her to read it or not. She didn't have to even grade it or anything…Because she knows that this whole trip would bring a lot of new feelings, sadness, anger, pity, everything in the spectrum…And she wanted us to document all that…just to see how we were doing and what she could to better the situation or how we felt. She'd give us feedback. (Abdul, Student)

In several cases, students talked about how their faculty leaders asked them to journal specifically on the course subject matter. Some, for example, were asked to write about their chosen research topic, noting their observations and thoughts related to that topic. They would then draw from their journals when writing their final paper. Several of the students in Spanish language programs were required to write their journals in Spanish to practice, and their faculty leaders reviewed and give feedback on their entries.

Faculty similarly described the value of reflective journaling. Chris, for example, who has led close to 20 groups of students to multiple countries, described how he had developed, over time, his own system for guiding students in their reflection through journaling:

> One of the things that I found more recently than in the early years was how important it was to acknowledge the experience as it was happening. And I've developed a whole system what I was calling the 'reflective journaling.'…I'm still amazed at how open and willing students are to share their experiences and to try and acknowledge them and articulate them. I found that that is a useful tool in the post-trip phase to bring that. How do you bring that back so that it stays alive and what are the strategies to do that?…What's happened? What's different in your life today than it was back home? And what do you see around you in terms of what you're experiencing? That sets the tone for the reflected internal part. I love the journal aspect, because I love something tangible that you can hold on to and then I tell them keep this. That in 20 years, if you want to read the stories, you're going to remember. (Chris, Faculty)

As faculty leaders described, most study abroad courses involved some journaling component; however, their journaling assignments varied, requiring from daily to weekly journals; to offering students a range of formats, such as written to photo to video; to having students determine their focus to providing question prompts or topics on which students should reflect; to requiring a focus on a particular research topic.

Research Papers. Several students and faculty who spoke about their research papers found these assignments useful in reflecting on what they had learned through their course. Faculty leaders often gave students a choice of topic linked to their experiences and learning abroad. Students felt the process of writing their research paper helped them continue to learn and process after they returned to the U.S., as Robert observed in the following comment:

> If you can channel that passion into some sort of post experience projects, events. Or the paper. The paper would be a crystallization of that definitely, anything after that gets you to look back on something because that is also something super important for education, and history education specifically is the importance of hindsight and reflection…Looking back on the whole experience would give the student a lot of hindsight that I think would just help them going forward, in what is already a very helpful experience. (Robert, Student)

Several faculty talked about how their students' final research papers gave them insights into what the students had learned, the epiphanies they had had.

Readings. Some students discussed the value of pre-departure reading assignments in facilitating pre-departure setting of the stage for the context in which they would be learning.

> We also had to read part of the *Ramayana* before we went, which was kind of cool, because we did focus a lot upon that and how much the stories intertwined in everyday Indonesian culture. (Erika, Student)

> We would have online readings and assignments and discussion posts that we were responsible for participating in and getting done...and those were all supposed to get us ready for the sort of cultural learning we were going to be doing in England…And we would go to sites and locations associated with the readings we did, as a sort of meta step above cultural learning that we did…That

> was definitely helpful. That combination of preparing for this trip making sure that you're surrounded with the literature that we were going to be studying and the historiography that we were going to be studying, plus actually going there and seeing it and the engaging with it on that tactile personal level. (Robert, Student)

Several faculty discussed readings they assigned pre-departure, as a means to introducing students to the course content and the context within which they would be travelling. Kate, for example, described a unique approach to readings, where the students had the opportunity to meet the scholars whose work they had read prior to their trip.

> I had them read three different historians who commented on different aspects of gender, the century. And then they met those people when they went over. So, they read [one scholar’s] article on gender and secret space, and we met [her] in Canterbury, she took us around Canterbury. And they read [another scholar’s] piece on charters. And then we met [him] in Manchester. And they read [a third scholar’s piece] on the wake in gender and masculinity, and then met her in York…I did not think that would be their favorite thing; I thought it's too geeky for them to care, because I love these people, and they're incredible historians, but that's me. But they loved that part, they went crazy for that part, which was kind of fun. (Kate, Faculty)

Video and Photo Projects. Several faculty commented on how they encourage, or allow, students to use photo and video technology and techniques to document and reflect upon their experiences, or specific topics. Alison and Francine, for example, described how they integrated technology and reflection in their courses:

> I also have, again, intentionally…paired them with children that were 12, 13, 14 years old out in the Transkei. They did an academic project…a photovoice project…Photovoice is an opportunity where you can use pictures…to tell a story. We use it oftentimes in needs assessments, and communities where perhaps people were not as literate. So, we have them take pictures to tell their story. It can be a theme, or you can just ask them to take pictures of their life…The kids took pictures that were telling their story, of this is what I think about that…Within this setting, it helped our students to have the opportunity to mentor some younger people and teach some things. (Alison, Faculty)

> One of our assignments is a photo journal, which I had read other programs that do, and we thought that it might be a good assignment. It's worked out really, really well for us…The photo journal is they pick one photo each day…They're revelations to read, after… Some of them will do a voice-over video log…The photos and then the captions that are associated with their high, low, lesson learned, why is it an important lesson that you learned? I think that's, again, one of the ways that is a planned facilitation of the outcomes that you're hoping to get, of forcing them to reflect on it. (Francine, Faculty)

Navigating Back/Scavenger Hunts. Two students mentioned how they had participated in scavenger hunts and found them helpful in encouraging them to talk with local people and find their way in an unfamiliar location.

> Then, we also, the second day that we were in Bali…[did] a scavenger hunt type activity. We broke off into teams and then we were sent to this Saturday market, which was this huge street full of little shops and fruit stands and stuff. No one was speaking English and we had to go around and ask like, excuse me, where is this? What is this? You're forced to talk to people from the area and that was...it was insane. But, it was really fun. Super fun. Literally throwing us out there is a really good way to introduce yourself to it from the very start. (Chelsea, Student)

> One of my professors was actually Italian; she was a local. She had us do markets and a scavenger hunt kind of thing around the market. No one spoke English, so it was challenging but, they were all such sweet people that they were helping us with everything and we had to journal about it afterwards and fill out some questions. It was cool. It was really fun. (Susan, Student)

One faculty member, Chris, described how he encourages students to learn to navigate through an assignment requiring them to find their way back to their accommodations, using primarily nonverbal communication:

> One of the great challenges I give to my students is that they have to go out especially in China…and figure out how to get back. Please take me back to this place in Chinese and on their own. And they would have to do it at least once during their experience. And then come back and we talk about that. (Chris, Faculty)

Faculty described other types of assignments to foster student learning, such as in-country presentations on various topics, course content-related case studies, or development of lesson plans to use in the classes they were visiting.

Reflection Prompts. As discussed above, many students felt required journaling effectively facilitated reflection on and processing of their experiences while traveling. Students reported a variety of ways in which their faculty leaders themselves engaged with the journaling assignments. In some cases, faculty did not require students to turn in their journals, which one student consider helpful, but "just an exercise," while other faculty provided specific questions, or prompts, to guide their reflections or required a mixture of guided and more open-ended reflection. Students Rebecca and Lisa each described their journaling assignments:

> The journals were…comparisons to the United States… And you have to do a thorough evaluation, but it was nice, because looking back on it, it forced me to look at it while I was there, so I can continue to appreciate it more. But also, she would make notes on it too…it was really helpful. (Rebecca, Student)
>
> They were pretty specific. You couldn't just write anything. She wanted you to write about cultural observations, and if you didn't she would give it back to you, and she's like, "No, what's different?" (Lisa, Student)

Erika contrasted the difference between being asked to journal, at first without guidance on what to cover in her entries, and later, after receiving more specific directions on about what to write. At the beginning of her trip, her faculty leader asked the students in her group to write a journal, without specific guidelines. For Erika,

> That was kind of difficult for us because we didn't really know what to write for a journal entry so, a lot of the first days we were there we were just like, Okay, at this time we did this, or we ate food here and stuff like that. (Erika, Student)

Halfway through the trip, however, after collecting and reviewing the journals, the course leader made the following observation:

> ‘This is not how I want you to be writing your journal entries. I don't want a just detailed list of what you did that day. I want what you did, how it made you feel, what it made you think.’

Erika described how this guidance transformed her journaling into a higher impact reflective process, as follows:

> I definitely think I absorbed a lot more after I started writing about kind of what I actually experienced and how that was making me perceive the culture and just all of that rather than just when I was listing things. Because when I was listing things I just had to remember what we did throughout the day, whereas, when I was actually writing about it, I don't know, it was more in depth and I actually realized, Oh, this was something very big that I did experience. And I didn't realize that in the moment, but as I'm reflecting on it, oh that's really cool or oh, that's something really big that I wouldn't have experienced had I not been here. It's just really cool to recognize that. So, it definitely made me aware while we were there. (Erika, Student)

Several faculty discussed the ways in which they use these journaling and other assignments and activities to facilitate student reflection on their experiences abroad. In some cases, the discussions are unplanned and impromptu, and in others, faculty have integrated reflective group discussions and individual assignments into the design of their course. Faculty encouraged reflection with either more general questions or more specific questions designed to elicit more meaningful student reflection. Below are examples of question prompts or topics faculty asked their students to address to encourage more depth and quality of reflection:

- “What are expecting to get out of the course and the travel?”

- “Add depth to your analysis. When making observations or comments, address why you think something is the way it is. Ask a local person for their views.”
- “Compare how something is done in the local context and in the U.S.”
- “Reflect on your personal growth, a specific phenomenon, where you are now, and after these ten days, how you want to modify, what you learned.”
- “What was your experience like? What were the hard parts?”

A few faculty stated that more general, unstructured assignments yielded less depth of reflection, and quality of reflection varied across students. In one faculty focus group, when asked if the journal assignments were effective in accomplishing student learning outcomes, faculty leader Emily reflected on how assigning a general reflection paper, without guided questions or prompts, was not as effective.

> I think it could be more effective. It was our first time through…They were supposed to be keeping a journal, not necessarily every day but most days…Now, we told them they could just reflect in general. I think we came up with three prompts for those who had trouble thinking about how you reflect. Various quality…I think I would probably go with an all-prompt reflection rather than, “So here's a bunch of prompts, choose one or two, as opposed to just letting them think about whatever.” I think they have a hard time with that…I think they're necessary, because I think it gets them to try and focus a little bit on something outside of themselves, but I think there could be a variety of different ways that could be better than what we did. (Emily, Faculty)

Diane, who had led many groups of students abroad, had a hybrid approach she had developed where she both gave students questions suggested by a colleague and also gave them an opportunity to choose their own topics.

> I like the idea of having prompts that then they can choose from. I'd done it both ways, giving them prompts and then telling them you know choose something that calls your attention to it and think about it. I do have a handout that I give them that was written by one of my colleagues, which I think is excellent. It gives two different examples of what reflections could look like and sort of critiques one of them. That still isn't enough. Some people get it, and some people sort of

> don't. I try to emphasize that I want analysis not just observation and this last time I said, I felt that it was pretty simple, but I said look, analysis usually begins with the question why, "Why do you think it's this way?" Maybe you probably don't know, but you should ask your Mexican parents. It's a way to get them also to ask people there. I like that. I'm going to make a list of prompts. (Diane, Faculty)

The students' and faculty leaders' comments suggest that guiding student reflection through questions and subject-matter prompts catalyzes more meaningful introspection and learning.

Group Discussions/Debriefing. Two students mentioned how their faculty leaders regularly held group debriefing sessions to reflect on the day's learning. For Abdul, these discussions, with the support of the faculty leader, were instrumental as he reflected on his identity and Indian heritage.

> [The] group discussions and one-on-ones. And they're timed perfectly, did them every other night for the group discussions and one-on-ones were once a week…It helped me, and I think it could help some other students…The reason why I say that is because I had to find out for myself. I think people learn through experiences, and that's what I was doing. And Dr. Sarah was there as a great resource and a supplement to that, for me to understand identity, to find my identity. To figure out who I was, to figure out who my family was…The meetings we had, the discussions, all were huge factors into that. (Abdul, Student)

Michael discussed more informal nightly briefings, usually in social settings, where his group processed their days and strategized the next steps in their projects.

> Almost every night we would have a debriefing…So, we'd get together, maybe four people go out to dinner. And it'd be, like, how we felt about things…So, we were able to talk about, "I didn't like this." Or, "What do you guys think about that." So, we were able to help each other and build off of that. And [the professor] would come in and chime in and give his two cents about how he felt we felt, or how better we should do, or how we can structure ourselves, or how we can turn the tables. (Michael, Student)

In both cases, the students described their faculty leaders and peers as resources as they processed what they had seen, learned, and done for themselves.

Several faculty also discussed the importance of group discussions. In some cases, these discussions have been purposefully planned throughout the course, often with specific question prompts. In other cases, these discussions were impromptu. Over the course of the focus groups, a theme emerged that combining an individual reflection activity, such as journaling, with guided group reflection was an effective approach. Sarah related how she held nightly debriefing sessions, so students could process how they were thinking and feeling about their experiences during the day:

> As part of the process in India…we do really hard stuff, so we had to always debrief…We're working with children who were starving and children who are stunted. What was that like? What were the hard parts? Debriefing and journaling are both necessary, because journaling is kind of a private thing and, when they debrief at night, they realize that everybody hated that, or everybody really struggled with this, or everyone felt like an asshole because they just bought $100 sandals to wear to India, and a family could live on that for a month. (Sarah, Faculty)

Joel described how, on the first iteration of his program, there had been impromptu group discussions that were so helpful that they are purposefully scheduling more group processing for the next trip.

> There's a lot of processing, sort of, impromptu processing, where it was all kind of mutually educative. I appreciated that a lot. I just appreciated the kinds of insights they were bringing and reflections they were bringing to what they saw that wouldn't have necessarily occurred to me right away. It was mutually enlightening. I like that…So, our students journaled…but we didn't, besides impromptu and small group settings, work their reflections to deepen them. So, in our plans for this coming winter, we're building in time in the itinerary for whole group processing and, so that was a learning moment for us. (Joel, Faculty)

Emily and Hannah similarly attested to the benefit of group processing.

> One of the things that was good about having those mandatory meetings, a) we got to remind them that this was an academic experience, but b) it allowed us to ask questions to try and begin to analyze what they had seen that day or what they had heard or what they had saw. That was good, but it also, since they were coming from a variety of different majors, when they began to talk about things

> from their own perspectives, that was really nice. There were some nice conversations that happened among the students, “Oh I didn't see it that way, I saw it this way, not a challenging, but from a different lens…It was difficult sometimes…but I think that was well worth it. (Emily, Faculty)

> We’ve done some reflective conversational reflection at the end of the night…where they reflect slightly different than the sheets of paper that they’re given some type of a prompt just to get them thinking. And the conversational reflection has been better, we found, than just having them write at the end of each night, so just talking with each other has pulled out a lot. (Hannah, Faculty)

In the following comment, Chris described how he combined reflection and peer mentoring to help students process their emotions and thoughts while adjusting to their new environment:

> You could almost graph the emotional curve, the excitement and the build of the initial week when we reach a crescendo and then it would begin to wane…And oftentimes they're so emotional, I mean really emotional, and even crying to the point where they can’t … It's almost the inability to communicate how they're feeling or what they're experiencing truly. Those are the right moments for our reflective conversations at night…And so, I’ve developed a system with reflective journaling where we do that all the time now, nightly with discussion groups, and we’ll have a topic that I call ‘The lens’ that they're looking through the day and then we’ll talk about that that evening. (Chris, Faculty)

Here he mentions a guided activity he calls “The Lens,” which he described later as follows:

> One thing that I started in my own classroom here and…we actually do that on the trip… we pass around the bowl or something with little folded up notes and they have to come up with a phrase or a whatever it is. I call that ‘The Lens’ that they have to look through for that day. So, it might be Architecture. It might be Families. It might be Food. It could be any number of things. And then they kind of own that. And we all have the same experience. But now they have to go back to that lens throughout the day…And then they’re going to have to present at night…And that I’ve developed into a kind of more of a fun thing, but it’s really serious; it’s amazing how in depth they get…It’s like a trait for them all of a sudden…Yeah is a big deal. (Chris, Faculty)

To Chris, this activity allows students to focus on one aspect of what they are observing and experiencing, breaking down what can be an overwhelming experience. By having the students then come together at the end day to share their individual and group experiences, combining the view from multiple lens into one bigger picture, the students can be gaining a broader understanding of their experience. Chris talks about “how powerful it is if they learn to see and experience all of this with some aid, with some structure,” because “they have a role in…how they assimilate it.”

Modeling self-reflection and humility through authentic teaching. Faculty member, Sarah, in her follow-up interview, spoke in depth about how she strives to be authentic and model both self-reflection and the sense of humility she has developed personally and professionally, over years of working with communities internationally. For Sarah, being authentic and acknowledging areas where she needs development models the humility community health educators need to have when working with communities.

> I have a lot invested in being really authentic with my students…I tell them, and I'm really upfront about this, that part of the reason I spend at least a month or two every year in Haiti and in India and in places like that is because it teaches me humility. I'm a college professor, which means…even if I don't know very much, people are still going to listen to my opinion…And so, I tell my students, part of the reason I do this is to learn humility and to realize that I really don't know everything. And that in India and in Haiti, five-year-olds know more about their community than I do. They speak the language much better than I do. And if I want to be helpful, I need to remember that I don't know everything. (Sarah, Faculty)

Using this authentic teaching approach, she tries to model her own self-reflection to foster in her students their own reflection and humility, and a recognition that, when their experiences are challenging, they are not alone.

> I tell all of my students my horrible India failures…It is not effortless for anyone, and if somebody thinks that they are completely culturally competent in someone else's culture, it's not that they're perfect. It's that they're being so unreflective, so closed, that they're not seeing where they could do better. And so, I think, modeling that...And the fact that you've got faculty people who are willing to say, "Here are the things that are hard. Here's the ways in which I wish I could do better. Here are the things I'm still working on doing better." (Sarah, Faculty)

Sarah suggested that faculty who lead study abroad trips have their own opportunity to grow as people and as educators:

> I think that traveling abroad and studying abroad, leading trips abroad can help faculty be better faculty, because...even if it's a country you know very well, even if you're a faculty member with multiple nationalities and you're bringing people to a country where you've lived or where you grew up or that is also your home, you're still bringing people who don't know it there, and there's still going to be all of this stuff that you have to deal with that you've never had to deal with before. And so, I think that, if people are willing to acknowledge that, it can be really helpful…To the students and to the faculty themselves, right? To be able to say, "Oh, here are things I don't know or here are ways in which I'm not effective." (Sarah, Faculty)

Sarah therefore suggested that faculty consider this authentic teaching approach, as it can validate to students that intercultural experiences can be challenging, and that everyone, even faculty, can learn through these challenges and also mistakes.

Maheera, a student, reflected on how her instructor, Diane, had acknowledged her own ongoing learning process in a similar way:

> Diane reminded me, you're learning the language and you're willing learning to appreciate something that other people take for granted. [Diane’s] been studying Spanish for so long, and she said there are things that she's still learning, and things that she's still figuring out and finding out. So, she really helped me just, I guess, say goodbye to the negative thoughts and really appreciate what I was learning and what I was getting myself into. (Maheera)

Students and faculty therefore suggested that having students reflect on their experiences is an effective way to catalyze student learning and introspection. Faculty leaders encourage student reflection with varying levels of intentionality, including though individual assignments, such as journaling, and having regularly scheduled or impromptu group discussions. Several students and faculty indicated that activities in which the faculty leader guided that reflection through specific prompts or lens through which the students were to view their experience were more effective than just general reflective assignments, without discussion. Modeling reflection and humility is an approach one faculty member uses to model and encourage student reflection.

Authentic engagement with local people and culture. Both students and faculty talked about how more authentic ways of engaging with the local culture contributed to student learning abroad. Many students and faculty credited student's interactions with local people and their participation in cultural excursions led by local experts as facilitating student learning about the culture, language, and daily life.

Host families. Of the 11 programs represented by the student participants, three included accommodations with host families. Almost all the students who lived with host families mentioned how that aspect of their program was a positive factor in their learning. They explained how their host families were sources of support in various ways, such as by being available to answer questions; teaching them about local history, culture, and family life; or providing them with an opportunity to practice the local language. These students expressed appreciation that their hosts were willing to open their homes to them and guide them in their learning and adjustment to the new context.

> We stayed with a host family in Jogjakarta…The first day, we were all kind of like, this is weird, because we're in somebody else's house…Every day we'd come back, and they'd be like, "How was your day? What did you do?" They would offer us food that they made. The last day that we were there, we all cooked traditional Indonesian food together…I think we valued the host family situation a lot more, because you get so much more out of it…It was beautiful. I definitely took way more out of that… People letting people into their house, like that. (Chelsea, Student)

> One of my fondest memories with my host family was that one weekend that we had off, they took us to the mall and showed up the best ice cream spots. Different little, cute family stuff with us. I loved that. I loved forming those personal relationships with people. The fact that they would take the time out of their lives to do something like that for us, was really, really cool. (Tanya, Student)
>
> But as we went along in our home stay it was so nice...And then it was just nice having our host parents and when they made meals for us…I would so much rather be in this position than in a hotel. It just allows you to kind of dive more into the culture and have such a greater experience. (Erika, Student)

Another student spoke of how living with a host family facilitated language learning:

> It helped with my transition because it was my first time traveling alone without my mom. It was nice to feel that family sense, and they were there for you. Anything you needed, any explanation of anything, they were there… My host dad did speak English, but we spoke mostly in Spanish. And some of the girls that lived with me hadn't taken Spanish before, had in high school, and they picked it up and they were just talking. It's incredible how fast, I guess by being completely submerged into language. (Rebecca, Student)

A few students who did not have an opportunity to engage with local people in these categories expressed regret that they had not had the opportunity to do so and recommended that these opportunities be integrated into future iterations of their courses.

Pairing with Local Peers. In some programs, students had the opportunity to meet with peers in their age group. The structure of their engagement varied across programs. In one, they met with other students from host universities for discussion sessions and peer-to-peer presentations; in another, students interacted with local young artists in more social settings; in a third, students worked alongside university students from multiple countries on projects. Some students and faculty reflected on what they learned through this interaction with peers in the comments below:

> It was the group of artists and a lot of the artists were younger, so then we were able to connect with them. And they were pretty much our age so that's kind of when we got to make those connections… It kind of showed us what kind of an

> impact people our age are having within their own country and it's really cool. (Erika, Student)
>
> I loved working with people of different cultures because I really got to experience their takes on certain things, their view on life. And we talked about everything under the sun. From what they like at home, to what their schools are like, to what foods...foods were definitely a big topic…trying new things we definitely…and how their home dishes compared to ours. How the Europeans have a better food policy…no MGOs, they're saying. (Michael, Student)

Several faculty explained how pairing students with local peers was an effective approach to facilitating student learning in her study abroad course:

> Human interaction is the theme of the whole trip…So, our students, we wanted them to talk to the college students, to see what is their perspective of China and Taiwan…Those interactions are really helpful…Everywhere we go…we already contacted the [student] volunteers…[For] our students, it just makes all of life much easier…On the way, they were chatting about all the things that were introduced to them…Very helpful…Our students, they really, really want to interact with the students. With the local people there. Much less with us…With peers. (Mei, Faculty)
>
> In Cape Town, we work with the University of Cape Town, and I get them connected with an HIV center on campus, or somewhere else where there are students. They go out with them. I send them along, they make a new friend, and they come back the next morning at breakfast…That way they actually get to go out in a safe way to enjoy the culture and learn. They always come, and they're like, “Guess what we learned about them?” (Alison, Faculty)

Two students, upon hearing from their fellow focus group members out their interactions with peers, expressed regret that they had not had the opportunity and recommended that such opportunities be incorporated into future trips.

> Carrie: We didn't really meet people our age which is something I would rather do…I would definitely add a student-to-student perspective, like, maybe go to the universities...So, then you could actually work one on one with the other college students…The people we were talking to were all corporate executives. They were 40, 50 years old. I can't really relate to that on a personal level…Being able to get a student view or a younger person view of that culture would just be more interesting, I think…Those kinds of connections, because then you'll meet people

> your age and you'll be able to interact with them differently than 20 of you listening to one man talk...
>
> Jamie: I would say the same thing, too. We weren't really with any other groups of people our age. Even when we went to do tours of the different places it was elementary school kids or adult groups from other countries. There wasn't any really time that we could talk to anyone our age.

Faculty member, Joel, remarked on the idea of pairing students with peer mentors: “I would love for that to be built in somehow.”

Jamie continued by suggesting that even the presence of peers on tours would be useful, recommending that local scholars providing tours bring some local students along with them. Another student, Krista, made specific recommendations about the design of peer-to-peer activities. First, related to the theme of incorporating freedom for independent learning, she suggested that faculty leaders provide a venue for students to interact independently, without their faculty present, so that they could have an open conversation.

> We had a lot of student interaction, but the culture in China specifically is very different. It's all very much respect and we're very curious. American students, we don't have the same filters and you could definitely tell that certain Chinese students wouldn't want to answer some of our questions because the professors were there. So maybe trusting us not to get out of hand and get out of the room so we could ask those questions and certain things… There was one part where one day they did because I think they're finally catching on and Professor Chen started it off, setting it up. Giving the background like why we're there and what they want us to talk about. And then they left, and I feel like there was meaningful conversation. (Krista, Student)

Krista recommended that when students were paired with local peers, that some effort be made to select student based on their common major or interest.

> The students that we talked to were mostly English majors, and I get that because they need to be able to speak English…So, certain questions I would have as a history major, they'd be like, "What? What do you mean?" So, mixing it up, because then that also brings different perspectives, like a poli sci major's going to

> have a different perspective on Taiwan than a history major. Just that diversity. (Krista, Student)

Student and faculty insights into engagement with peers suggest that designing opportunities to facilitate such interactions will both support student learning and give students memorable, meaningful experiences to foster student satisfaction with their program.

Engaging with Local Community Members. In individual interviews, students, Michael and Maheera each discussed how, when they had free time, they learned about the local culture and patterns of daily life by purposefully engaging with local community members. These students described how they had connected with others and having opportunities to learn about the local language and culture through informal conversations.

> We ran into a lot of families over there. Especially in Dublin. Everywhere we went, we met families, and we talked to them…whether it's in a bar setting or café or something like that...[We'd] ask some questions, we'd talk about daily life or just what their plans were for the day. They were like, "What are you guys doing today?" "Oh, we're going to go to see this museum over there, or just walk around town." Then they'd be like, "Why don't you stop by here? I know a good spot to eat over here" or, "There is great desserts in this direction." And it would just built off of that. And we'll be like, "Well if you ever come to the States, you've got to definitely go by New York City…And it was just a back and forth conversation. It was definitely worth learning and talking about. (Michael, Student)

> You don't really get to appreciate a place unless you…can go somewhere and see familiar faces. Because I would always go someplace...I remember having my friend and I calling it our café, because we would always go, and the people would be like "Oh, I remember you. How was your day?" Those kind of experiences, and I think that was more memorable, because then I can build conversation, and go back to the same places and see the same faces. So, for me, it was more of learning the language and learning the culture, but also adapting. (Maheera, Student)

These opportunities to connect with local people are examples of additional ways students used their unscheduled time during study abroad courses.

Engaging with local guides. Similar to engaging with local peers and community members, some students and faculty suggested the involvement of local guides in the course travel as a supportive factor in achieving the learning outcomes they discussed in the focus groups and interviews. These local guides played various and overlapping roles, from providing orientation to the program and navigating the local context, to serving as a sounding board and resource when students had questions about its history and culture, and generally being the "go-to" person when students wanted guidance or suggestions for how to spend their free time. The student and faculty comments below reflect how local tour guides supported authentic engagement and student learning:

> On the very first day, they sat us all down and they talked us everything that we needed to know. I guess it's one thing to hear from people here at [the College], but it's another when you're actually there and someone that's from the town is okay, listen, this is true, and this is going to happen so just be prepared. It gave me the right mentality…Okay, I know what to expect and I know how to handle myself…It gave me that peace of mind. I've heard the real deal now. I can go about my way… You trust them. They live there. Their families are there. They know what they're talking about. (Tanya, Student)
>
> There was a family there that runs a transportation business…One of their kids take care of our students the whole time we're there…[He] is probably 24 now. He's been young the whole time, so he also is somebody that can facilitate them having the experience of others their age might have, but also teach them a little more about what has happened [during Apartheid]…So, they have the opportunity to interact with him and his family, and learn a little more about that on their own. (Alison, Faculty)

In these comments, the students and faculty suggest that their tour guides served as proxies with whom students could engage, perhaps to a limited degree, with the local community, providing a connection with the host city and culture.

Cultural Excursions. When asked in the focus groups and interviews about what factors supported their learning, most students related how they learned more about the local history and culture through planned course excursions that were coupled with instructional content. The following are representative student comments:

> We did a lot of hands-on learning. We went on a lot of field trips, which was really cool, because we went to big wineries and then little mom and pop wineries and stuff. People who sell wine out of their house. And it was nice to see the difference, a lot of the places here are just big wineries…And these people were willing to sit down with us and talk to us about why they got into the wine making business and…and how it affected them, and the kind of business they do…We went to all the different churches, we went to Assisi, which is all churches, and went to six in one day, just because it's just the culture there. And I feel like I'm better for it. I understand the Italians better, and also the religious culture globally. (Samantha, Student)
>
> I liked our excursions, we went to...the sun pyramid, the moon pyramid, we went to these…old archeological sites before colonialism took over and everything. I learned a lot about that…And it was interesting to hear from them, and from people that are indigenous, just more about the feeling of it. (Lisa, Student)

Faculty spoke less specifically of the cultural excursions, instead focusing on their pedagogical approaches. In general, however, both student and faculty comments on the value of engagement with local people and cultural sites suggest that including these aspects in the design of study abroad programs can influence student learning in a positive way.

Factor 2: Faculty Expertise

Both students and faculty suggested factors related to faculty teaching and content expertise fostered student learning abroad. Factors in this category included faculty teaching style and their familiarity with the context in which they were travelling. Faculty also discussed factors that prepared them to lead study abroad, as well as gaps in preparation, for which they recommended several types of professional development.

Faculty teaching style. Several students pointed to how their faculty leader's teaching style and disposition influenced their experience and their learning abroad, and some faculty made similar observations. Some students felt the kindness and comfort their faculty exuded contributed to their higher level of comfort in their new context and learning to navigate, as expressed in the following comments:

> She was a very warm and welcoming professor. She was just really inspirational, the things she would say to us. I still carry those things with me. What she taught us. She definitely had an impact…That comforting aspect was definitely there with Lee and Sam, too…It was great having them there and they were really super-supportive the entire time. They're also so calming in a hectic and chaotic place like India…I'm really happy that they were our guides there. (Amy, Student)

> It's her personality, and it's the way she teaches and the way she understands. I feel like she can get to know a student better on a certain level than some other professors. And I think that's what we like about her so much. And I think that's what makes her so special and such a good professor. (Abdul, Student)

Another student, in contrast, described how the disposition of one of her three faculty leaders affected the learning atmosphere negatively, as follows:

> Having her there kind of killed the mood a lot of the time because she wasn't very enjoyable to be around, so that kind of stunk. So, just making sure that the professors that you're putting there are going to have a good impact on the program…I mean the other two were great, so it was like a balance, but when she was doing the certain trips or the certain tours, it was just like, ugh, she's going to talk again for two hours. (Carrie, Student)

Several faculty also talked about the influence faculty style and disposition can have on student learning, describing supportive traits, such as patience, approachability, flexibility, "contagious enthusiasm," and "level-headedness," as the following comments suggest:

> Having the enthusiasm is contagious and that's something that I think then becomes in part the students' experience, because they see how excited you can be about the silliest nuances of wherever you want to be. Whether it's processes or

> just cultural norms. That, to me, is really thrilling…I just can't begin to stop being effervescent about something that might have happened. (Chris, Faculty)
>
> As I've said to you, I [am] a fairly kind of sober-minded, realistic, pragmatic person, and “Okay, let's not get too excited about anything because you never know what's going to happen”…Because I want them to be taken care of, I don't want anything to happen…I think it helped me gain certain level-headedness about the whole thing…I had a certain measure of confidence, knowing what I did about Indians and everything else. But I still always want to be careful. So, that's how probably that would be a big part of my preparation. (Sam, Faculty)

Faculty therefore suggested that by being enthusiastic, flexible, and adaptable when coping with new or challenging situations, they served as role models for their students.

In one focus group, faculty discussed how having a balance of dispositions and skills across co-leaders can support student learning.

> We had a real heavy nurturer. I was kind of in between, and then we had somebody else who was like okay, tough love…Having multiple leaders I think is good, and if you think about putting together or the pair of leaders that complement each other, that's one of the things we had very well on the trip to Cuba. There were three of us, we had three different styles, we were three different types of people, and together, I think we were able to serve the students in the best way possible. And on those days where one was tearing their hair out, we had somebody else who was comfortable enough to step up. (Emily, Faculty)
>
> There were two of us for most of the trip, and the third joined us in the very end…Both of us have worked rec programs, both of us have worked camps, and so when we needed to take out our nurturing hat, we could do it and kind of take turns doing it, and when we needed to give them the tough love, or a combination…We could both kind of change and switch off who had to be the nurturing role. We could both kind of put on that counseling hat when we needed to. (Nancy, Faculty)

Faculty familiarity with context. When asked during the focus groups to talk about factors that should be considered when developing a study abroad course, a few students recommended that the faculty leaders have familiarity with the local culture and setting.

> She's very knowledgeable about the trip because she's done it so many times…I feel like [these courses] work so well, because the professors we go with have been there before. And they know the people, and they have connections…That's why I felt so safe with Diane, she knew where we were going, had done it before. (Lisa, Student)

> I think I just felt really comfortable the whole time. It was really nice having her there, too, because she kind of led us around and knew what to do. She knew the culture and everything. That was really good, too, but at the same time, I don't know how a trip would be if only [the other faculty leader] led it. Just because she wasn't as accustomed to everything. (Chelsea, Student)

One student, Krista, told her focus group how the professors co-leading her group each had a personal connection to the three cities they visit, so she learned about the local history and culture "right from the horse's mouth." She described how her history professor, for example, with whom she had taken a class on campus, related his personal and family history during the rise of Mao:

> We had a long train ride, and I sat next to him and he told me how he had lived through the revolution, Mao's rise, and his father was part of the Communist Party and was in prison by the Nationalists…That's amazing to have that first-hand perspective...You hear of the purges and… his house got purged. And he told me a story of the Communist Party just knocked on his house, on his door and his father was like, "Go take a walk." And Professor [Chang] said he hid books because he didn't know what they would take…I'm like, "I had you the whole semester and you never said any of this. That'd just be an awesome thing to say to our class." (Krista, Student)

A few faculty also discussed the importance of being familiar with the context in which they would be leading students:

> I think [the students] appreciated the fact that I had already had a little bit of experience there. And they felt confident in the fact that I could navigate the country, I know the local customs. (Hannah, Faculty)

> For better or for worse, since I grew up there, I have a fairly decent understanding of how things get done, so you prepare them ahead of time. And we encourage them to ask questions, and usually I make a list with other faculty members of the most important things to be aware of such as, nobody stops at the stops at a stop

> sign, so do not expect a car to give the pedestrian the right way…Things that we take for granted, very small things. (Scott, Faculty)

Karen discussed why she conducts a planning visit to the study abroad destination before taking students, to ensure she is thoroughly familiar with the setting and the logistical arrangements.

> I wouldn't take students to a place I hadn't been before. Even just like who are we working with. I need to still be comfortable. If the person I'm meeting at the airport, and what's this place look like…I need to have a good feeling about who is operating this because I want to feel like they're safe. If I don't feel they're safe, I can't be taking students into a rural area of Costa Rica and somebody gets hurt. (Karen, Faculty)

These student and faculty comments suggest that faculty who lead courses abroad should have some familiarity with the setting and knowledgeable about the local culture, both to support student learning and assess and manage risk.

Faculty preparation to lead study abroad. In the focus groups, faculty were asked what had prepared them to serve in the roles associated with faculty study abroad leadership and teaching. In response, most pointed to their own travel experiences or student affairs experience.

Many faculty talked about how they themselves had studied abroad as students. Other faculty related how they had conducted research abroad, participated in fellowship programs such as Fulbright, or travelled with family or for work as professionals. Most faculty commented on how they wanted to offer their students the opportunity to travel and learn abroad so they could achieve the various academic and developmental outcomes discussed earlier.

> It fills my sail, to be in a different place, abroad especially, but even just exploring new places…I went abroad after I graduated and lived in Australia for a year…It always perplexes me, people who don't travel. Some of them want to travel, and

> they don't, they think it's hard…So, I thought, well, what's a good way to get students that can maybe not take a whole semester…I'll make shorter, had a long experience in knowing that's where the greatest value is. Where are ways that we can open a door? (Karen, Faculty)

> I was an athlete in college. My coach highly discouraged me from traveling abroad, so I couldn't travel abroad…So, I didn't have the opportunity. I did start traveling the U.S. and then traveling abroad after grad school…It was incredibly life changing for me, and I had always kind of regretted not studying abroad…I wanted to try to create those opportunities for students, specific to my discipline in sport management. (Francine, Faculty)

Another faculty member, Sam, spoke of how he had observed his faculty leaders on his undergraduate study abroad course, and how that helped him develop his approach to leading students abroad.

> I was very carefully, closely attuned to what my instructors were doing. They were all... role models ... but I observed them carefully. I wanted to know what they were like...I talked to them, I was eager to learn, "What is this like for you?" So, all of that, when I thought about being involved here, it all came back to me like, "What did I like about it? What made me curious?" So, just as a matter of being personally receptive to what the whole experience would be, that helped. (Sam, Faculty)

Another faculty leader, in contrast, talked about her study abroad experience being formative in terms of learning what *not* to do when designing an overseas course.

> There was way too much lecturing and there were way too many museum after museum after museum…I mean, not that the museums are bad, but you'd rather do your own thing in there, see what you want to see. And I think especially in Belize, is it really good to take them on a variety of things and then there's the cultural part you talk about…I think it's more effective in that type of trip, than the one I went on. It was just a little too dry and a little too focused. (Claudia, Faculty)

Others mentioned that they developed their pedagogy and study abroad course leadership skills through trial and error, as they gained experience, as illustrated by the following comment:

> About two years ago, we started the study abroad program…We had 15 students. We took them to Greece. We had a lot of initial, "Well, we hope we're doing the right thing. Is this right, is this wrong?" So, it was a little bit of trial and error because all three faculty members that went had not really done a Cortland before. So, we're trying to figure out what works, what doesn't work, what's okay, what's not so okay. (Scott, Faculty)

A few faculty pointed to their experience in student affairs, youth recreation programs, and parenting prepared them to support students, particularly with pastoral care through their learning about and emotional adjustment to the new context in which they were traveling. Connie and Scott, for example, made the following comments:

> I'm one of those like parents that spent a lot of time in like camp settings, so I very much saw myself as like an overnight camp counselor which had that nurturing that you might not be of a parent but if you're working with camp. (Connie, Faculty)

> I think faculty members that are parents might be better equipped, simply because they have gone through their own experience of what happens and how do I deal with this and to anticipate, maybe, have heard stories from other parents and be maybe a little bit more understanding or have more patience. I know that other faculty members were like, “I'm not going to deal with this, I don't care. They're grownups”. They are, but they're not. I mean you and I know that just because you're 18, you're not a grownup. (Scott, Faculty)

Faculty professional development. Some faculty, noting areas for further skills development related to leading student abroad faculty, made the following recommendations about areas for professional development.

Training. They suggested training topics such as basic counseling for students in distress, training on Title IX requirements and supporting students who reported sexual assault or harassment, how to frame questions to prompt student reflection, and general guidance on managing their courses and their students. The following are illustrative faculty comments:

> I do think a little of counseling training prep…[in] the pre-departure for all…faculty leaders. If there was even just a half an hour component on…some situations that might arise, based on what you expect from an international capacity, but then also from the counseling side of how you would deal with it. Think of de-escalation, because if you've got a student who's escalating, you've got to figure out how to de-escalate them…and perhaps first responder mental health. While we're not counselors, but we're there, so how do we handle this? (Francine, Faculty)

Scott emphasized the need to work with an expert on counseling, rather than just having a group of faculty leaders identify strategies with a facilitator, to ensure that leaders learn about best practices in student support:

> I think having a collection of scenarios and literally, either have a counselor from school sit with five, six faculty members and say, "Okay, here's a scenario. What would you guys do?" And have possible answers come back and then have the actual trained therapist tell us, "Well, this is what might be beneficial for the student." They can give you an educated opinion versus six, ten of us in the room arguing what's right and what's not…So, from that point of view having actual trained [College] counselor tell you, "Well, this is what we think will be best for the student, for example." Or best for the group, because sometimes they don't go hand in hand. (Scott, Faculty)

Emily suggested professional development related to guiding student reflection:

> That may be an area of training. How do you frame the questions? How do you come up with the questions without telling them what it is they should be thinking? Because some people are just inherently better at that than others. (Emily, Faculty)

Another leader, Sarah, reflecting on her own growth as an educator, suggested that faculty could benefit from training on strategies for working with diverse students as they confronted issues related to identity:

> Growing up as a White person in the U.S., I never really had to think about race or ethnicity until I was an adult, working with students of color…I was so much more interested in professional development around how to talk to students about issues of race and ethnicity after I'd had a couple of conversations and realized how bad I was at it. How little my life had prepared me to do that…And it's not fair to expect that faculty would know how to deal with all of these issues that

> they've never had...especially if they've never talked about them. Especially if their own lived experiences have never made them deal with it. (Sarah, Faculty)

Faculty peer mentoring. A few faculty discussed how they had reached out to experienced faculty leaders on campus or at other institutions. These mentors gave them guidance on course and curricular design, supporting students while abroad, and managing student issues that arise. In the focus groups, several faculty discussed ways in which mentorship could be built into the program design, in terms of rotation of leadership, or coordinated at the institutional level in terms of offering a mentorship program or faculty learning community.

> I had a mentor who started this program. We co-led together the first time. For me, it was her, and her guidance…Having a mentor really helped me. Here, if maybe there were a mentorship program for folks that wanted to do that abroad. (Alison, Faculty)

> I had never talked to anyone else who had led a study-abroad before then, before I threw myself into the deep end. Even little things of, that's how we did it. I never would have seen that coming, and it did. And since then, we've had, I can't tell you all of the random ridiculousness that has happened. It all works out. (Francine, Faculty)

Part of the mentoring, Emily suggested to her focus group, would be to make any faculty member considering leading students abroad aware of the demands of developing and running a course.

> From the perspective of a department chair who might be talking with other faculty members who might want to do this: I don't think until you do it, you appreciate the amount of work it is to put together the trip. I know I didn't. That's something folks have to be very aware of. The [international] office provides great support, but it’s still mostly on you…If you want to pursue this, this is above and beyond what you're already doing…Also...the responsibility for the students when you are in the country is something you have to think about…I don't know what you can do to prepare folks for that, because I think that's mostly something that you have to experience, which is why…the model that we're using is you have experienced folks and then you rotate in a less experienced person. (Emily, Faculty)

Francine talked about how a learning community could lead to collaboration on programs and sharing information on other opportunities, even beyond study abroad, such as fellowships.

> I think a faculty learning community would be good…I know I've talked to a couple other people, and even if it's just, whether it's a formal or informal networking, and mentorship aspect of just knowing that that's something that you had. (Francine, Faculty)

Faculty study abroad opportunities. In one focus group, faculty suggested that faculty considering leading students abroad be provided with opportunities to participate in study abroad courses as co-leaders, in almost an apprenticeship model, to gain experience and confidence under the mentorship of a veteran leader.

Faculty participants' suggestions on ways to prepare faculty, including training, a mentoring program, a learning community, bibliographic resources, and faculty study abroad opportunities will be explored further in Chapter 5.

Factor 3: Student Attitudes and Behaviors

In some of the focus groups and interviews, students and faculty discussed student attitudes and behaviors as a factor influencing student learning on faculty-led study abroad programs. In one focus group, two students who participated on different trips discussed how the negative attitudes of some of their peers within a group influenced the learning atmosphere.

> Jamie: Your mood definitely plays off the mood of everyone else on your trip. So, all the guys are like, "Oh, we're at another stupid museum. We don't want to be here." Complaining the whole time just makes your time less enjoyable…Like miserable people walk around London together. (Jamie, Student)
>
> I think our professors, by the middle to the end of the trip, were starting to figure that out, because for most of the museum visits after that, they were like, "Okay

> you have to do this, but you don't have to do it together." So, everyone that didn't want to be there were out in fifteen minutes, but I was there for three hours. (Carrie, Student)

Faculty also talked about how the behavior and attitudes of students could either support or hinder learning on the course. Most faculty related how impressed they had been with how their students had conducted themselves during their trips. Some, however, described how some students' attitudes and behaviors sometimes interfered with individual or group learning:

> We had some students, I guess it's a small victory, we probably had three students who really saw it was a way to have a vacation in Cuba, even though you can't have a vacation in Cuba. They were a little annoyed that we make them get up and be on a bus at 8:30 in the morning, that they would go out and enjoy the cultural night life of Cuba, quite a bit. Finally, they began to realize that there was an academic portion of it. We had to read them the riot act one morning. (Emily, Faculty)

> They become mischievous after a while. If you've got two weeks, I don't know how long, but maybe about two weeks they're engaged, and they're really engaged. Then after that they begin to get into a routine that isn't always healthy, which we found it's Costa Rica and I think in other places as well. When it's a shorter period of time, they just want to be engaged with everything that they're experiencing, then after a while they get into maybe some things that, okay you've gotten beyond the learning experience. (Tony, Faculty)

Here, Brian raises a point about student behavior that emerged frequently throughout the faculty focus groups and interviews. The behavior of greatest concern to many of the faculty was student alcohol consumption. Some faculty have discussed problems with students who struggle with alcoholism and drugs, perhaps on top of mental health issues, and having to support students and manage student drinking. Faculty related how students would attend required activities but would be hungover to the point of being sick, which affect not only those students, but the whole group. Alcohol abuse was not a problem on all courses, either because of student choice, lack of access, or faculty management strategies; however, several faculty raised concerns about students drinking to excess on their trips. The comments below illustrated how student drinking affected the students and the group learning experience:

> It was a fun morning for them, shall we say, but they were there, they were dressed professionally, they were throwing up in every garbage can they saw but they were there, and they were doing it as best as they could. (Nancy, Faculty)
>
> [A student] confided to me that he was smoking so much [marijuana] in the U.S. and he had to, literally overnight, not be able to access it. Which apparently brought a lot of panic attack feelings to him, which then he tried to fix by excessively drinking…There were at least four of them that's confessed, "That's how much we do, we cannot cope right now unless we drink."…I don't think they realize it because they're so used to themselves being able to smoke or drink. They cannot even imagine what it would be like, not to be able to smoke or drink…And then, they hit a wall. And then obviously you affect the group or your faculty members and vice versa…What a student told me it's like, "I was doing so much cocaine I couldn't function without it and all of a sudden I can't even find it." (Scott, Faculty)

This is a topic on which some faculty indicated they would like guidance and support. Faculty described different approaches with respect to managing drinking. One spoke of how, after several years of leading student groups abroad and occasionally confronting issues related to alcohol abuse, he had developed a no-alcohol policy. Several others, on the other hand, pondered the role of faculty in trying to control alcohol use, and felt they could not prohibit alcohol if the students were of legal drinking age in the host country.

> There's a different drinking age where they're going. And so, all of a sudden, they're legal. You can't really tell them, or you can, but no, you don't. You can't do that. (Emily, Faculty)
>
> A drinking and having a good time attitude…is really tricky to contain, because most of it happens after midnight. I had discussions with both [faculty co-leaders]. I said, "But what do we do? Do we stay up till 4:00 a.m. waiting for them? Is that

> part of our responsibility?" And they go, "No, as long as we do due diligence and we tell them not to and we stay up till 11:00 p.m. If we leave them in their rooms, then we cannot really stand guard in the hallways." But the next day we find out, "Yeah, we woke up or we got out at 1:00 a.m. came back at 7:00 a.m."…Just their bodies would show up…Again, when it's their free time. How do you tell them? (Scott, Faculty)

Some faculty conveyed different strategies they had used, or suggested using in the future to influence the amount students drank alcohol:

> My rule is that you come to breakfast with a smile on your face. If you come crappy, we're going to have a conversation, because I can't control what they do at night. Don't come hungover. And if you do, smile, so I don't know. (Alison, Faculty)
>
> Putting my health hat on, personally and mostly in the department, we come from a harm reduction perspective. And so, part of me thinks that that's a conversation that has to happen both with the faculty leaders, but also the faculty leaders with the students…To expect that the students are going to be absolutely, perfectly behaved from a health behavior perspective is unrealistic. Having some realistic conversations about being safe…Along with that…alcohol's a big part but there are other health behaviors that have an impact…We hear this all the time, but it's a package of "let's look at types of health behaviors and where we're going." (Emily, Faculty)

Scott and Emily, in their individual interviews, each described how part of their strategy for managing risks associated with student alcohol use was to ask their students to watch out for others, aligning with campus bystander intervention campaigns:

> We had little groups of three or four literally looking out for each other, but it takes a while to figure out who is the more mature in a group of friends…Life happens. But I think the group system, grouping them together, works really well. Ideally having the groups connected to one of the faculty members during it. (Scott, Faculty)
>
> And some of that is how to take care of each other. That's the other part of it too. Honestly, that, from a bigger perspective, I think that is of equal importance. And I know they get some of that when they're here [on campus], but even more important, I think, when you're in a different and a new place. (Emily, Faculty)

The effect alcohol abuse can have on the learning and experience of both individuals and groups is an issue of great concern to faculty. Some faculty have developed different ways of managing these concerns, but several others expressed interest in exploring how to deal with them more effectively.

In contrast to the faculty participants' frequent references to student drinking, no student study participants mentioned student drinking as being an issue. In fact, only one student mentioned the use of alcohol at all, in then only as it related to faculty consumption. Susan described a certain awkwardness drinking with their professors:

> It was different seeing the culture, like, you should drink? You could have one drink at every meal, as long as you pace yourself. The first meal we had with our professors, we were like, "Does anyone want to order a drink?" And our professor's like, "Can we order a bottle of wine?" "Okay, I guess it's okay"…It was very odd. Drinking with our professors. (Susan, Student)

This student therefore indicates a level of discomfort with her faculty drinking.

Factor 4: Institutional Support of Faculty

Faculty discussed several institutional factors influencing their teaching and capacity to support student learning abroad. This is perhaps a less direct factor influencing student learning, but notable in terms of implications for policy and practice that will be discussed further in Chapter 5.

Administrative/logistical support. Several faculty mentioned that the logistical and administrative support provided by an international office can give them more time and freedom to focus on designing their course curriculum.

> We didn't really need [the international office] to help us build curriculum or…to help us build connections to the people that we needed over there. What we really needed [the office] to do is help us with logistics, and [they] were fantastic about that. (Kate, Faculty)

> [The international] office was incredibly supportive, especially to our group of faculty members who'd never led a study before…They had our backs in a lot of different ways, but…really provide a lot of resources for us to be able to do this, we couldn't have done it without them. So, I can't really think of anything they didn't do for us to be honest with you, because between the planning meetings and helping to recruit students and the study abroad fair, all the other stuff, but even more importantly sort of the non-public elements of what they do in terms of helping us make connections to different entities overseas and even just helping with the crazy book keeping…It's incredibly supportive. (Joel, Faculty)

Funding. Several other faculty recommended their institution increase financial resources to support development of study abroad course curricula that can effectively achieve student learning outcomes. In one focus group, faculty mentioned a few existing study abroad development grant opportunities, one within the institution, one within the state system, and one through an employee union. These, they remarked, can be models for future funding awards.

> What can we use: Opportunities for funding, even if it's an application process. If I want to go and explore a new program in India…I don't know if it's through the school, or study abroad, or there's other information, if it comes to [the international] office about grants, or travel support. (Karen, Faculty)

> A lot of my connections come from conferences. My favorite conference these days is European Association of Sport Management…The whole program is probably going to cost me $3000…Every little bit helps in my eyes. Because I do apply for small grants, and I've kind of worn that out…But even if it was us advocating to administration that there should be some sort of funding…One of the [state system's] initiatives is increasing global education. So, if that's truly a priority, then put your money where your mouth is. I'm not saying give it to everybody, but make it an application process of, this is available, maybe you'll get it, maybe you won't. (Francine, Faculty)

Some faculty suggested raising faculty leader salaries, emphasizing that the financial benefit of the instructor salary was not high enough to be what motivated them to develop and lead their study abroad courses. Rather, the impact on students and themselves in terms of learning, growth, and enjoyment motivated them, as Tony remarked, “If you're paid anything when you go on these things, it sure as hell isn't worth it, as far as that goes. So, you're only doing it for the kids, for the students.”

When asked if offering increased salary would motivate more faculty, Emily, who is a department chair, responded that it depended on the individual faculty member and on the culture of their department.

> I do know some faculty will respond to that. Other faculty would not respond to that realistically—what you would be able to give them wouldn't really be worth it…I'm not sure. I think there may be other ways. It's never a bad thing, but if the issue is workload, I think something like that is really not going to make a difference. It's a nice reward if it's something you wanted to do anyway, but I'm not so sure it would get people who don't want to do it to actually do it…Partially, it's a culture thing, I think. (Emily, Faculty)

Faculty recognition. A few faculty mentioned that institutional recognition of the contributions they had made towards internationalizing the campus would support them; in contrast, when it was absent, it was discouraging:

> The benefits don't outweigh for me the consequences. It’s one of the reasons I'm no longer doing the Costa Rica program, because it’s emotionally draining, it’s incredibly emotionally draining. As a lecturer, even in my portfolio review, they wouldn't even consider any of the work that I did with Costa Rica, because it’s not part of my primary teaching responsibilities. So, I was doing a lot of work and not having a department that really appreciated the work that was being put into that…It was a slap in the face. (Connie, Faculty)

Some faculty, however, suggested how sometimes, despite lack of recognition for their efforts to leading study abroad courses, it is worthwhile, for themselves and for the institution.

> I think it's interesting that it's at once probably the most exhausting kind of teaching and yet the most rewarding at the same time. So, it's funny people will often say, "Oh, you went to Belize for a nice vacation that must have been great." I say, "Yeah, I fell asleep in my dinner plate when I got home. I was that tired." (Bob, Faculty)

> I think what would be more helpful, too, is also a culture where the faculty who are doing this work are acknowledged to be doing something transformational above and beyond even teaching, right?...Spending four weeks in India with a dozen students 24/7 is a different kind of teaching than teaching three online summer classes, and it's a different level of intensity and teaching. I understand that there are financial constraints for rewarding them monetarily, but acknowledging that in other ways. [Interviewer: Tenure, promotion?] Exactly, and service…It's our job as faculty and staff not just to teach things and grade papers, but also help develop whole people and again, that transformational learning experience ... how is this not key to everything we say we want to be doing? And I don't know that that gets acknowledged. (Sarah, Faculty)

These faculty comments suggest that institutions can support faculty leaders, and the transformational work they do leading students abroad, by acknowledging their efforts, providing incentives through grant opportunities, as well as including this work in tenure and promotion considerations.

Summary of Findings

Student Learning Outcomes

The study participants identified several student learning outcomes from study abroad, and student and faculty views generally aligned. First, participants from both groups described the applied learning that took place on study abroad programs, providing students with an opportunity to enhance their understanding of what they had learned in their on-campus courses, applying and developing their knowledge and skills in specific cultural contexts.

Second, students and faculty discussed ways in which students gained, through this applied form of learning, insights into their fields of study and future careers. Students were able to explore career options, gain skills, develop a comparative understanding of professional practices across contexts.

Third, students and faculty described how, through participation on study abroad programs, students can gain a comparative understanding of different cultures and a deeper perspective on their own culture and their own assumptions and biases. This enhanced understanding can foster their ability to understand and manage multiple perspectives in ways the will support them personally and professionally.

Fourth, students and faculty spoke about many ways in which students grew personally through a variety of affective, dispositional, and behavioral transformations. Many students, for example, gained empathy, life skills particularly related to navigating new contexts, confidence, resiliency, and positive attitudes. Faculty described that some students, on the other hand, did not change or had more regressive outcomes, such as reinforced stereotyping.

Finally, a fifth theme that also relates to both personal development and comparative understanding, is that students gained, through their time abroad, an increased understanding of identity-related issues. Identity serves as a lens through which students can reflect upon their own self-identity, and develop a comparative perspective on norms, perceptions, and behaviors related to identity in other contexts and in their home country.

In addition to student learning outcomes, faculty talked about their own learning outcomes from leading students abroad, including expansion of their horizons, rejuvenation of their pedagogy, gaining and infusion of knowledge that the infuse into all their teaching, and substantial personal satisfaction at watching their students learn and grow.

Comments by two faculty suggest that defining student learning objectives for study abroad can be challenging. They can be difficult to articulate or might not necessarily align with student views. This study reveals that student and faculty views do, indeed, align in many respects.

Factors Influencing Student Learning Abroad

The study participants identified four factors that supported, or, in some cases hindered, these five overarching student learning outcomes. First, students and faculty noted several student-centered pedagogical approaches faculty leaders used to help students achieve learning objections, such as engaging students in course and cultural content prior to travel, increased independent learning, guided reflection, and authentic engagement with local people and culture. Pre-departure course content and meetings, for example, provided course content and background information to prepare them for their travel experience. Students and faculty both talked about the need to provide students with free time to explore on their own or in small groups, but also provide them with the tools they needed to make connections between the course content and their independent experiences, balancing guided and independent learning. Study participants also mentioned the effectiveness of different types of assignments, such as journaling, research papers, and group discussions, facilitated student reflection, particularly where faculty provided questions or subject prompts to guide reflection at a deeper level. One faculty member suggested that faculty adopt authentic teaching techniques by modeling to students by telling them about their self-reflection, challenges, and growth. Both students and faculty discussed how students learn through more authentic ways of engaging with the local culture, through engagement with local people and cultural activities and sites.

The second factor influencing student learning related to faculty expertise and familiarity with the cultural context. Faculty also discussed ways in which their own personal or professional experiences had prepared them to guide students through their study abroad experience, or where they felt they needed professional development.

The third factor suggested by both students and faculty related to how certain student attitudes and behaviors influenced the extent to which they learned abroad. Although, most faculty expressed appreciation for how their students conducted themselves while abroad, many of the faculty were concerned about the extent to which some students on some trips used alcohol, suggesting several different approaches to managing the problem.

Fourth, faculty suggested ways in which their institution can support their teaching, and therefore student learning, though professional and program development grants, increased compensation, and recognition of their intensive efforts to offer international opportunities to their students and promote transformational learning.

Chapter Five: Discussion

This chapter includes a discussion of the findings in relation to the scholarly literature framing this study. Implications for leadership and practice in intercultural learning and teaching are presented, and areas for future research are suggested.

The purpose of this study was to determine stakeholder views of factors influencing student learning in faculty-led study abroad programs. This dissertation builds upon the existing research on intercultural teaching and learning by examining student and faculty views on learning outcomes achieved on study abroad programs and factors they believed supported or hindered realization of those outcomes. The role of faculty as cultural mentors was also explored.

The following are the research questions:

1. In what ways do student and faculty stakeholders describe the student learning outcomes achieved through participation in faculty-led study abroad programs?
2. What do faculty and students view as factors influencing student learning outcomes in faculty-led study abroad programs?

This research was undertaken using a constructivist grounded theory approach, based on Charmaz's model (2006, 2014). Constructivist grounded theory is a methodology used to collect and analyze data, identify emergent themes, and construct an understanding of the phenomenon being studied (Charmaz, 2006, 2014, 2017; Charmaz & Bryant, 2007). It is based on the view that people make meaning of their experiences to construct their own understanding of reality (Charmaz, 2006). This approach was chosen to discover what students themselves define as their own takeaways from study abroad, what learning outcomes their faculty leaders aim to foster through their study abroad courses, and what aspects of these programs both students and faculty believe catalyze those outcomes. Taking a constructivist grounded theory approach to research design is consistent with the constructivist notion, supported by research, that students learn interculturally through self-reflection on how they themselves construct meaning out of their study abroad experiences (Vande Berg et al., 2012).

By using a constructivist grounded theory methods, the researcher has sought to recognize and interpret multiple student and faculty perspectives, asking open-ended questions to allow participants to reflect on and define what matters to them and how they experience intercultural learning and teaching. The aim is to give voice to students, who have not typically been included in the shaping of campus internationalization policies and programs (Fakunle, 2019; Leask et al., 2018), and to faculty, who have also been overlooked in the development of campus internationalization processes (Hunter et al., 2018).

Summary of Findings

The first research question was: *In what ways do student and faculty stakeholders describe the student learning outcomes achieved through participation in faculty-led study abroad programs?*

Key themes emerging student and faculty focus groups and interviews include the following:

1. **Applied learning of course content:** Study abroad programs provide opportunities for students to engage in applied learning in ways that allow them to develop their knowledge and skills in a specific cultural context.

2. **Professional development:** These programs offer students opportunities to explore career options, gain professional skills, and develop a comparative understanding of professional practices.
3. **Comparative understanding of cultures:** Through these programs, students can gain a comparative understanding of different cultures, their own culture, and their own assumptions and biases in ways that allow them to manage multiple perspectives.
4. **Personal growth:** Studying abroad can students to undergo a variety of positive affective, dispositional, and behavioral transformations, but, as some faculty observed, can also lead to negative outcomes for some students, such as reinforced stereotypes.
5. **Understanding of identity-related issues:** Studying in different cultural contexts can lead to an increased understanding of identity-related issues, which serve as lenses through which students can reflect upon their own self-identity and develop a comparative perspective on how different identities are perceived in different contexts.

Faculty also reflected on how they themselves developed as teachers through leading and mentoring students through their intercultural learning.

The second research question was: *What do faculty and students view as factors influencing student learning outcomes in faculty-led study abroad programs?* Key themes suggested by students and faculty related to the following factors:

1. **Student-centered teaching and learning:** Faculty leaders used, with varying degrees of intentionality, several student-centered pedagogically to help students

achieve learning objections. These included engaging students in course and cultural content prior to travel, increased independent learning, guided reflection, and authentic engagement with local people and culture.

2. **Instructor expertise:** Faculty expertise and familiarity with the cultural context has a positive influence on student learning abroad. Faculty recommended several areas for professional development in training, particularly in course design, intercultural teaching strategies, and student support.
3. **Student behaviors:** Some student attitudes and behaviors influenced student learning and the group educational environment. Faculty noted how most of their students exhibited an admirable level of maturity and collegiality; however, they expressed concerns about the behaviors of some students, particularly related to alcohol use. Some offered suggestions for how to help students manage such behaviors.
4. **Institutional support of faculty:** Universities and colleges can support faculty their intercultural teaching, and therefore student learning, though professional and program development grants, increased compensation, and recognition of their contributions to campus internationalization mission and transformational student learning.

What follows is a discussion of how these finding align with the literature on intercultural learning and teaching, faculty development related to internationalization, and transformative leadership.

Alignment of Findings with the Literature

The research findings align with Vande Berg et al.'s (2012) experiential constructivist framework for student learning abroad, and Sanderson's (2008) framework for internationalization of the academic self. These are complementary frameworks because each emphasizes the way in which one's self has agency in making meaning of one's own experiences and developing one's own competencies. Both frameworks also focus on authentic, student-centered teaching and learning, where the teacher is a cultural mentor and a model of authentic self-reflection for students as they learn. In addition, the study findings suggest that a third framework, transformational leadership (Downton, 1973; Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985), applies to intercultural learning and teaching.

The findings related to independent, reflective learning align closely with the experiential constructivist framework examined in-depth in Vande Berg et al.'s edited volume, *Student Learning Abroad* (2012). These authors take a critical view of past and current approaches, such as positivism and relativism, while providing evidence-based strategies for fostering intercultural learning based on individual learners' needs. The experiential constructivist framework emerges from the works of scholars such as Berger and Luckmann (1967), who assert that individuals make meaning of their world based on their own perceptions and interpretations of events and phenomena. As Creswell (2014) describes, each person, often with others in his or own cultural group, learns from continually reflecting on experience and the environment through the lens of their background, prior experiences, their needs and interests. Constructivist research aligns with this pedagogical approach to intercultural learning, because the aim is to rely as much as possible in participants' perspectives and how they make meaning of the phenomenon being studied (Creswell, 2014). This research sought to determine how students and faculty engaged in study abroad programs make meaning of their experiences learning and teaching abroad.

Vande Berg et al. (2012) explain that the primary goal of student learning abroad in this framework “is not…simply to acquire knowledge but develop in ways that allow students to learn to shift cultural perspective and to adapt their behavior to other cultural contexts” (p. 18). Experience is not sufficient; students must reflect on their experiences, and how their own cultural and genetic makeups have shaped how they perceive the world. Paige, Harvey, and McCleary (2012), in their discussion of the Maximizing Study Abroad (MAXSA) Project, suggest that student-centered and constructivist pedagogical approaches support intercultural learning and development. Through this approach, MAXSA instructors sought to “enhance learning by making the material more relevant to the students’ own experiences abroad at different points in time” (p. 326). This aligns with research and practice related to student-centered learning, where “learners find the learning process more meaningful when topics are relevant to their lives, needs, and interests, and when they are actively engaged in creating, understanding, and connecting to knowledge (McCombs & Whistler, 1997, in TEAL Center, 2010). The role of the instructor is as a “cultural mentor” who provides “food for thought” questions to spur critical reflection and gives “detailed, individualized feedback” meant to encourage students to reflect more deeply and critically as they connected their personal experiences to the course material. Students are at the center of learning and teaching strategies, but instructors retain a strong role in encouraging student reflection to connect experience with cultural and content learning.

The study findings on student and faculty participants views of learning outcomes and effective pedagogies echo the goals and approaches the experiential constructivist framework describes. The key themes relating to student-centered learning pedagogies, emphasizing individualized, reflective learning supported by active, authentic faculty mentoring and authentic cultural engagement, support the experiential constructivist pedagogical approach to study abroad program design described by Paige et al. (2012). Both students and faculty in this study talked about the value of independent, or individualized activities that students themselves select based on their interests. This finding is consistent with the student-centered learning approaches developed for the K-20 classroom (TEAL, 2010). Learners interact with their faculty leaders, peers, and local people to share learning. Furthermore, they "integrate what they have learned with prior learning and construct new meaning" (Moffett & Wagner, 1992, in TEAL, 2010) through reflection guided by their instructors through "questions and tasks the stimulate learners' thinking beyond rote memorization (TEAL, 2010, p. 2). Students in this study talked about how their instructors were effective when they listened to and respected their perspectives, and when they provided structure without being too directive, features of student-centered, constructivist pedagogy (TEAL, 2010). Faculty also helped students "connect the dots," incorporating prior learning with what they were seeing and experiencing in the study abroad context. Both student and faculty participants described how students developed comparative perspectives and underwent transformations in attitudes through reflective activities, such as journaling and group discussions, with the guidance of their instructors.

One finding from this study, while aligning with the experiential constructivist framework, suggests an area for further research and development for professional practice that has not been emphasized in the literature on student learning abroad in a comprehensive way. This relates to the theme of identity-based learning, where students, with faculty support, reflect on their own identities and how they are perceived across contexts, as a lens for cultural learning. Student and faculty study participants frequently talked about confronting issues related to their identities while abroad, suggesting an avenue for intercultural learning and self-discovery. A growing number of resources for students and international education practitioners provide resources and guidance on identity and diversity in study abroad. Diversity Abroad, for example, which was founded in 2006, has taken a leading role in promoting access and support of student from diverse identity groups. Their online Diversity Abroad Guide (n.d.), for example, provides information and guidance for minority, economically disadvantage, first generation, LGBTQ, and adult students, heritage seekers, women, students with disabilities, and student from different religious traditions.

Academic research on identity and study abroad is emerging, with an increasing number empirical studies being conducted on the topic. Some scholars have addressed issues related to identity (Ellwood, 2011; Gieser, 2015; Kim, 2009), and particularly national identity (e.g., Dolby, 2004; France & Rogers, 2012; Savicki & Cooley, 2011) and language heritage identity (Benson, 2013; Jackson, 2008b). In a study on U.S. students' American identity in Australia (2004), for example, Nadine Dolby discusses the ways in which a group of students negotiated their American identity, concluding that the ways that these students negotiate "this 'encounter with an American self 'is the most significant component of these students' experiences in Australia" (p. 151). France and Rogers (2012), in a case study of U.S. students traveling to Cuba, argue that study abroad programs, when designed appropriately, can produce a critical pedagogy providing students with an opportunity to reflect critically on their notions of national identity and "encounter, examine, and renegotiate their American identity" (p. 92). In this study, Sarah, one of the faculty participants in this study recounted the myriad ways in which students will experience their identities abroad, as culturally defined norms shape local perceptions of and assumptions about those identities. This suggests that identity can perhaps serve as a lens for intercultural learning, a high-impact practice for engaging students in learning about themselves, different cultures, and their place in the world.

The themes related to authentic and effective faculty teaching and development relate to Sanderson's "Internationalization of the Academic Self" (2008) and other literature on faculty and internationalization. Sanderson (2008) asserts that internationalization requires not only organizational change at the institutional level, the focus of much of the literature on internationalization. It also requires individual transformation on the part of faculty. Sanderson, and others propose that faculty leaders, too, must take responsibility for developing their own intercultural attitudes, knowledge and comprehension, and skills (Otten, 2003; Sanderson, 2008). He describes how the "substance of how staff, themselves might 'become internationalized'" is not adequately addressed in the literature. He proposes a framework for internationalization that focuses on the individual teacher level, combining authenticity (Cranton, 2001, in Sanderson, 2008) in teaching with cosmopolitanism (Rizvi, 2005). Authentic teaching requires faculty to reflect critically on how their own worldview, and those of their students, are shaped by their own culture. Cosmopolitanism requires faculty to “embrace a cosmopolitan ethic” (p. 294) by developing their intercultural knowledge, awareness, and skills.

Other scholars have reinforced Sanderson’s call for faculty to internationalize themselves. According to Gopal (2011), developing these competencies “is an ongoing process that involves the deconstructing and reconstructing of one’s fundamental values, beliefs, and perceptions” (p. 378). The role of the faculty leader, according to the experiential constructivist paradigm, is to nurture the skills of self-reflection and reflexivity, or having a critical self-reflection on one’s intercultural interactions (Littlejohn & Domenici, 2007, in Gopal, 2011). Tervalon and Murray-García (1998) similarly suggested that faculty strengthen their cultural competency be through cultural humility, which requires lifelong self-reflection and appropriate changes in behaviors and attitudes. The faculty in this study revealed many ways in which they guide their students in their learning abroad, and ways in which they themselves seek continually to improve their teaching and leadership, through their own reflection on how students are learning and experiences their time abroad and what they themselves are experiencing as teachers and learners.

This study revealed that faculty participants do strive to teach in authentic ways suggested by Sanderson (2008), Gopal (2011), and others. They think reflectively about their teaching and learning, and their students’ learning. Faculty member, Sarah, in particular, discussed her development as a teacher, and as a study abroad leader in particular, and how she has learned to foster student reflection and reflect on her own biases related to her identity as a professor, a White person, a woman, and a U.S.

American. As an educator, she strives to be authentic with herself and her students about her own reflection, her mistakes, and her growth through those mistakes, as a way to model reflection and humility, but also to validate their struggles grappling with challenging situations and culture shock. Similarly, Chris and Diane, longtime study abroad leaders, each related how they have developed their teaching over many years of leading students through trial and error and self-reflection. Consistent with a cosmopolitan ethic, many faculty in this study talked about how they learn continually through their own travel and through study abroad teaching, learning more about their students, what they know, and how they learn, and how they develop their knowledge about aspects of the local country and culture. One conclusion from this study is that faculty engagement in designing and teaching study abroad courses provides an avenue for them to develop themselves in relation to internationalization, because they typically are the primary architects of their courses and, in the process of facilitating their students' reflection and intercultural learning, they themselves are self-reflective and gain comparative perspectives on their discipline.

The findings of this study are also consistent with the transformational leadership framework (Bass, 1985; Bass & Avolio, 1990, 1994; Bass & Riggio, 2006; Bennis & Nanus, 1985, 2007; Burns, 1978; Downton,1973; Kouzes & Posner, 1987, 2002). Student and faculty participant views on roles faculty play in the intercultural learning process resonate with definitions of transformational leadership in the literature. Northouse (2013) traces the evolution of the transformation leadership, a term first coined by Downton (1973). Burns (1978) brought the framework to prominence, and Bass (1985) further extended it by focusing not just on leaders, but also followers in the transformation process, arguing that "followers and leaders are inextricably bound together in the transformation process" (Northouse, 2013, p. 186). Transformational leaders focus on "assessing followers' motives, satisfying their needs, and treating them as full human beings," moving followers to "accomplish more than what is usually expected of them" (p. 185). Beyond the more transactional leadership, such as that exhibited by teachers when they give grades to students, transformational leaders consider catalyzing change of followers in other ways, based on emotions, values, ethics, standards, and long-term goals. Transformational leaders work "to understand and adapt to the needs and motives of followers" and are "recognized as change agents who are good role models"…who are "attentive to the needs and motives of followers and tr[y] to help followers reach their fullest potential" (Northouse, 2013, p. 186, 214).

Bass (1985), extending the focus to include followers, contends that transformational leader provide intellectual stimulation, encouraging "followers to be creative and innovators and to challenge their own beliefs and values as well as those of the leader and the organization…and encourages followers to think things out on their own and engage in careful problem solving" (Northouse, 2013, p. 193). They also provide individualized consideration, where the leaders carefully listen to individual follower's needs, acting as coaches and advisors while assisting their followers "to become fully actualized" (Northouse, 2013, p. 193). Transformational leaders set high expectations for their followers and help them develop a sense of confidence and self-efficacy," and empower followers and nurture them in change" (p. 199). In the process, these leaders are themselves transformed.

This transformative model of leadership aligns with the experiential constructivist framework where learning is individualized to be relevant to the student and their needs, and where faculty play a key role in guiding, in a less directive way, students in their self-reflection and meaning-making as they shift cultural perspectives. Sanderson’s (2008) model for authentic, cosmopolitan internationalization of the academic self, where internationalization is a process of transformation for both the students as followers and the faculty as leaders. Similarly, the study findings fit well within the transformative leadership framework. Faculty study participants, for example, articulated a common vision for what they hoped to accomplish in taking students abroad, exceeding a more convention goal of building student knowledge in the content area, to aiming for a more holistic transformation of student perspectives, understanding through applied learning, and personal and professional development. Student and faculty comments suggest that the study abroad format provides a uniquely high impact venue for shared learning, where faculty are approachable and supportive of individual student learning. Many of the faculty provide students with the time and space to explore and learn independently, but also offer tools with which to evaluate their intercultural experiences. Faculty study abroad leaders are therefore mentors, coaches, and advisors who center teaching and learning on their students, inspiring students to make meaning of their individual experiences.

Implications for Pedagogy and Practice

This dissertation builds upon the existing research on intercultural learning and teaching (J. Bennett, 2008; M. J. Bennett, 1986, 1993; Deardorff, 2009; Kappler Mikk & Steglitz, 2017; Sanderson, 2008; Vande Berg et al., 2012) by exploring, from the perspective of students and teachers, the learning outcomes achieved through study abroad programs and factors supporting those outcomes. The goal is to inform individual and institutional strategies for fostering student intercultural learning and supporting faculty as they design and offer intercultural courses. Several implications for pedagogy and professional practice in the field of study abroad emerged from this study, as described below.

Clearly define student learning outcomes.

During the focus groups and interviews, students and faculty spoke in depth about how different dimensions of personal growth were learning outcomes of study abroad. Several students spoke of how they were surprised by the nature and extent of their personal development through their study abroad experience. Most faculty, emphasized that it was this development of student intercultural attitudes and skills that motivated them to establish their study abroad courses. Similarly, several students and faculty spoke about how students learn, through their experiences abroad, about aspects of their identities, gaining a comparative understanding of how these identities are perceived abroad and at home.

The emphasis that both students and faculty place on the personal growth and identity dimensions of learning abroad suggests that faculty consider developing and articulating these outcomes, in addition to outcomes related to content, comparative understanding, and professional development, so that the stated outcomes more authentically and comprehensively reflect actual goals. The challenge in doing this is that outcomes related to personal development can often seem vague or impractically difficult to achieve or measure. As one faculty study participant, Sarah, suggested, for example, use of the term “cultural competency” is problematic, because it is vague and implies a technical skill that can be “checked off” once learned, or what Stone (2006) called “lower-order skills.” To overcome this challenge, it is recommended that faculty and study abroad professionals develop a set of suggested measurable, achievable student learning outcomes from which faculty study abroad leaders can draw and adapt. Determining ways in which to measure and evaluate these outcomes will be critical to determining whether these outcomes have been achieved.

Some results of this study suggest pathways for developing these outcome templates or evaluation rubrics. First, as one faculty leader, Sarah, suggested, faculty can consult with students on what they themselves aim to learn through their study abroad experience, whether content, culture, or growth related. In this way, faculty can include outcomes that are relevant to their students, while amplifying their voices, which have, as Fakunle (2019) argues, “are the least heard in internationalization-related discourses,” despite the fact that “the key aspects of internationalization that attract the most attention relate to learning in international contexts, interculturality and mobility.” (p. 1). Leask et al. (2018) suggest reframing these discourses by including diverse stakeholders in order to achieve “any form of internationalization that is inclusive and accessible rather than elitist and exclusive” (p. 2).

This is not to suggest, however, that students alone should define learning outcomes for study abroad. As Hunter et al. (2018) argue, faculty, or academic staff, “have the most important role to play in the internationalization process, as they are key to the curriculum and its delivery” (p. 1). For this to happen, they contend, faculty require professional development related to the international and intercultural dimensions of the curriculum. They also “require help to design and assess effective internationalized learning outcomes” (p. 1).

The second pathway for defining student learning outcomes from study abroad is to use the outcomes identified in this study as a framework. Faculty can develop, as appropriate to their discipline, outcomes related to applied learning, professional development, comparative understanding of cultures, personal growth, and understanding of identity.

Other student learning outcome frameworks and assessment rubrics exist that might be suitable for some institutions to adopt and adapt. The American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAU&C) VALUE rubrics, for example, provide one set of tools for evaluating global learning (2014) and intercultural knowledge and competency (2009). The results of this study align substantially with the benchmarks included in these two VALUE rubrics, the Global Learning rubric and the Intercultural and Competence rubric, which can perhaps be adapted for the institutional context and used to evaluate student learning on individual programs and across campus curricula. The Global Learning rubric (AAU&C, 2014), for example, includes as a competency Global Self-Awareness, which relates to “the continuum through which students develop a mature, integrated identity with a systemic understanding of the interrelationships among the self, local and global communities, and the natural and physical world,” which relates to the learning outcomes identified in the study, comparative understanding of cultures and personal development. The Intercultural Knowledge and Competence rubric (2009), “suggests a systematic way to measure our capacity to identify our own cultural patterns, compare and contrast them with others, and adapt empathically and flexibly to unfamiliar ways of being" (AAU&C, 2009). One of the AAU&C competencies includes Perspective Taking, which they define as the ability to engage and learn from perspectives and experiences different from one's own and to understand how one's place in the world both informs and limits one's knowledge. The goal is to develop the capacity to understand the interrelationships between multiple perspectives, such as personal, social, cultural, disciplinary, environmental, local, and global" (AAU&C, 2014). This aligns with the personal development outcomes expressed by students and faculty.

It is therefore recommended that study abroad leaders work with students to identify learning outcomes that are meaningful to individual students and appropriate to the course content and timeframe, the discipline, and the institutional context. Where helpful, they can use existing frameworks, such as the AAC&U VALUE rubrics, or develop their own through processes such as the one used in this study. As institutions and accreditation agencies increasingly call upon instructors to articulate clearly defined learning outcomes, campus internationalization efforts, with support from international education offices, can support faculty study abroad leaders and students who participate their international programs by providing resources and suggested rubrics that faculty can adapt for their study abroad courses, as appropriate to their learning goals and disciplinary focus.

Incorporate authentic, student-centered pedagogical practices.

Student and faculty participants in this study indicated a number of student-centered pedagogical approaches to support student learning abroad. Based on both student and faculty views about factors positively influencing learning abroad, it would be useful for faculty leaders incorporate the following practices as the design and teach their courses abroad:

1. Design courses with scaffolding for learning, through adequate pre-departure content and reflection, “perpetual probing of thought,” and post-program debriefing.
2. Foster and support independent learning by providing student time for self-directed exploration, while supporting that learning by providing tools for analysis, self-reflection, and connection to the course content. From students’ observations during the focus groups and interviews, it therefore seems that faculty, in designing their itineraries and courses, might consider what amount of free time and in what form would best facilitate independent student learning. They might also consider providing some guidance to students in advance of the trip as to what activities to pursue and how to plan their own excursions or travel. Further, they might incorporate reflective activities so students can process their independent experiences, in addition to the planned ones, making themselves available to answer students’ questions as they arise.
3. Encourage and guide reflection (Gross & Goh, in Mikk & Steglitz, 2017; Vande Berg et al., 2012) through reflective activities, such as journals, blogs, and group discussions, using purposefully developed question prompts.
4. Teach authentically by modelling self-reflection and humility, and through honest and open discussion of personal challenges and growth, as suggested by faculty study participant, Sarah, and Sanderson (2008).

5. Combine reflection and support for identity-related learning through pre-departure discussion and reflective activities with relevant guiding prompts encouraging student to consider identity as a lens for cultural learning. In this way, students can gain awareness of their own identity and discover other cultures.
6. Engage authentically with local people and cultures. Based on the positive feedback students gave about their experiences engaging with local host families and peers, faculty leaders might therefore consider including such opportunities in their course design. The level and format of such shared learning activities can vary to include more formal discussions, more free-flowing discussions through social events and partnering on tours, or intercultural collaboration on projects.

Provide opportunities for faculty professional development.

The themes that emerged related to learning outcomes and factors influencing achievement of those outcomes, suggest that professional development related to experiential constructivist, student-centered, authentic pedagogy would support program effectiveness and student learning. Several of the faculty in this study related how they had already developed these types of approaches in their teaching, applying them to their teaching both on-campus and abroad. Most faculty, however, acknowledged that study abroad was a unique format requiring specialized approaches they often learned by trial and error. Several faculty, for example, described how they had developed activities to guide students as they processed their individual experiences over the course of years. A purposefully designed professional development strategy could expedite and enrich faculty learning, particularly for novice study abroad leaders, and strengthen programs.

In the course of this study, participants suggested specific mechanisms and content for further professional development of faculty. Faculty recommended offering training workshops, peer-to-peer mentoring and faculty learning communities, and faculty participation as co-leaders with veteran leaders in an apprenticeship arrangement. Specific recommendations for training topics included supporting students through emotional and other crises, on guiding student reflection, on managing student behaviors such as drinking, and on helping students navigate identity-related learning. A combination of shared faculty learning and training by experts in student-centered learning, transformative leadership, student support, and liability and risk management can facilitate multi-dimensional faculty leader development in support of student learning and program effectiveness. It is also recommended that faculty continually develop their own intercultural understanding and knowledge related to host culture norms and practices, so they can guide their students in their learning and engagement with local people.

Support healthy student behaviors.

In several faculty focus groups, faculty participants discussed their concerns and experience managing student behaviors that had a negative effect on study learning, particularly alcohol abuse. Faculty described various ways in which they tried to manage such behavioral problems, such as instituting no-alcohol policies, requiring full participation regardless of alcohol consumption and its effects, and harm reduction and prevention education. Institutions can support faculty leaders and students in mitigating these issues by developing clear, written policies or guidelines related to alcohol use during study abroad programs, and by supporting harm reduction education through pre-departure programs and materials. Equally important, institutions must clearly define the legal obligations and potential individual and institutional liability and risks associated with alcohol use and other behaviors, so faculty leaders understand their role and responsibilities. It is recommended that faculty also develop an understanding of both laws and cultural norms related to alcohol use in the host country, while also considering the impact of their own alcohol use on student perceptions and behaviors.

Provide institutional support for faculty development

During this study, several faculty suggested a variety ways in which institutions can support their faculty study abroad leaders, an idea supported by research on internationalization of higher education (Blaess et al., 2012; Gopal, 2011; Paige & Goode, 2009). University and colleges can foster faculty professional development through training opportunities, providing travel funding for program development, encouraging peer-to-peer mentoring through faculty mentor programs and learning communities, and recognizing faculty commitment and contributions to transformational teaching and leadership in tenure and promotion decisions, through awards, and public relations outreach.

Research Limitations

This study has several limitations. It was a grounded theory study, which raises the question of whether it resulted in the generation of theory. The answer requires clarity on the notion of what constitutes ‘theory,’ as some might understandably assume that it means development of a new or cutting-edge theoretical or conceptual framework. That was not, however, how grounded theory was initially conceived by Glaser and Strauss (1967), nor is it how current grounded theorists, such as constructivist Charmaz (2006,

2014) sees as the end point of grounded theory research. Grounded theory is the "purposeful systematic generation [of theory] from the data of social research," where "theory is derived from data, and not logical assumptions" (pp. 28-30). Glaser and Strauss (1967), however, consider theory to be a process, rather than a "perfected product" (p. 32), that builds understanding about a certain phenomenon along the way. Charmaz (2014) similarly suggests that grounded theory methodology yields a range of outcomes, and while it does not always generate theory, "using the method will still enable you to increase the analytic import of your work and the speed with which you complete it" (p. 2). As Charmaz argues, grounded theory methods can culminate in a 'grounded theory,' which she defines as "an abstract theoretical understanding of the studied experience" (p. 4). And yet, while the researcher's goal or outcome might be to develop new or expand on existing theory, it might also be a less ambitious effort to understand or find solutions to a problem, write a report, or complete a task. Whatever the researcher's goal, she contends, grounded theory is a research process that provides "systematic, yet flexible guidelines to collect and analyze qualitative data to construct theories from the data themselves" (p. 1), to understand better how people make meaning around a particular phenomenon. Grounded theory research can reach the heights of new theory or conceptual framework, or it can, on a lower level, support or contribute to a better understanding an existing one, help identify areas for further exploration, or simply contribute to understanding of a phenomenon. Charmaz cautions that whatever level of theory construction you reach, to reflect critically on the level you reach: "Just try to be aware of where you go, what you do, and how far you raise your analysis into theory construction" (2014, p. 16).

With that advice in mind, the researcher has reflected on which level of grounded theory was generated through this study. The main objective has been to understand how students and faculty make meaning of shared experiences related student learning abroad. Although a growing number of emerging studies related student learning abroad has informed an understanding of learning outcomes and factors influencing those outcomes, the grounded theory methodology has afforded me the opportunity, both as a novice research and a seasoned study abroad professional, to gain a deeper understanding of how individual students and faculty themselves have experiences learning and teaching abroad. Using grounded theory methods, the researcher has listened to these stakeholders as they made meaning of their experiences in focus groups and individual interviews. Simultaneously, on an ongoing, iterative bases, conducted a constant comparative analysis, reflecting on emerging themes in pursuit of greater understanding, and perhaps, a central theory or conceptual framework.

Ultimately, this study did not generate a new theory related to student learning abroad; however, it perhaps did bring into sharper focus several existing frameworks within the field of international education and how they interrelate. The findings resonated with the three existing frameworks discussed earlier: experiential constructivism in study abroad (Vande Berg et al., 2012), internationalizing the academic self (Sanderson, 2008), and transformative leadership (Bass, 1985; Bass & Avolio, 1990, 1994; Bass & Riggio, 2006; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Burns, 1978; Downton,1973; Kouzes & Posner, 1987, 2002). By connecting these three frameworks, however, the research has perhaps contributed to an understanding of how study abroad can be, and in many ways, already is, a student-centered venue for learning and teaching. This can help faculty identify ways in which they can design and teach their courses to support their student learning objectives, starting with actually identifying and articulating what those learning objectives are. It can also identify areas for training and resource development for faculty, so they can optimize achievement of learning outcomes, such as applied learning of content, to developing comparative perspectives, to personal development growth and understanding of identity. Training can focus, for example, on student-centered learning strategies, authentic engagement with students and communities, and pedagogical design features, from strategies and structures for “pre-enforcement” of content and concepts, down to the level of specific suggested activities and reflective questions to pose to students.

The study findings have also brought forth three particular areas for further exploration that emerged as being significant to students and faculty in the study. The first is how to build into study abroad programs time, space, and instructional support for independent student learning. The second is how identity and learning about oneself and how identities are perceived across cultures can serve as a lens for gaining a comparative perspective on the world and one’s lived experiences and views. As Dr. Teresa Miller, Senior Vice Chancellor for Strategic Initiatives and Chief Diversity Officer of the State University of New York, stated in a conference of senior international offices at state universities, “We are putting marginalized students on the margins for the sake of learning” (Miller, 2019). We therefore need to consider how to appropriately and ethically support students of diverse identity groups as they select and travel to program destinations. The third is how can we help students gain perspective on poverty, privilege, and associated issues of social justice and inclusion in ways that both maximize student learning, while even more important, respond to ethical concerns about how we engage with the communities and people with whom we engage in these contexts. Student and faculty participants indicated that these three components of their experiences studying abroad provided opportunities to learn and develop, suggesting they might be areas to explore as high-impact, student-centered pedagogies.

Another limitation relates to how the study design, implementation, and interpretation of results were influenced by the researcher's own positionality, biases, and values. Maxwell (2013) describes qualitative research, a primary feature of this study, as being "primarily concerned with understanding how a *particular* researcher's values and expectations may have influenced the conduct and conclusions of the study (which may be either positive or negative) and avoiding the negative consequences of these" (p. 124). Charmaz echoes this notion, suggesting that if grounded theorists "start with the assumption that social reality is multiple, processual, and constructed, then we must take the researcher's position, privileges, perspective, and interactions into account as an inherent part of the research reality. It, too, is a construction" (p. 13). Explaining possible biases and strategies for dealing with them therefore becomes important.

This research and the findings were influenced by the researcher's values in several ways. The constructivist framework suggesting the people make meaning of phenomenon resonates with the researcher, and it influenced the choice of constructivist grounded theory and interpretation. This study is also influenced by a belief in the imperative of providing students with quality, meaningful, and effective intercultural learning experiences, as opposed to providing mere travel opportunities. Students often pay high fees to study abroad, with the promise of developing intercultural competence, but they often return unable to articulate what they have learned and experienced (Paige & Goode, 2009), beyond using platitudes such as “life-changing” and “amazing.” It is possible that the professed transformational, educational benefits of internationalization are not coming and fruition, which is born out in the literature on student learning abroad (e.g., Vande Berg et al., 2012). This research was therefore designed to foster greater understanding what institutions and international education offices specifically can do substantially more to foster excellence in student intercultural learning and development.

In this study, the researcher has carefully considered how one’s role as an international educator and study abroad practitioner can influence the study design, data collection, and interpretation of results. Through over two decades working in this field, the researcher has come to value and promote study abroad as a high-impact practice for transformational learning and development. To a great extent, this was based only on personal experiences and on anecdotal evidence. The research topic stems from a desire to understand, through research-based evidence, the processes and outcomes in student learning abroad. The researcher has worked to mitigate this bias, by framing objectives of the study to the participants as being to encourage faculty and student participants to reflect critically, and not only positively, on their study abroad experiences. In addition, by incorporating member checking of emerging themes throughout those discussions, the researcher has attempted to verify participant views about their experiences participating in or leading study abroad programs.

An additional limitation of this research relates to the fact that the results are not generalizable across populations and institutions engaged in study abroad. It is focused on one public institution and a limited number of student and faculty study abroad leader respondents, and so the results cannot be generalized to the broader population of faculty within the United States or in other regions or countries. As is typical for qualitative research, this was a study of a small number of individuals in a single setting, using purposeful sampling. The results can therefore not be generalized or extended to a larger population across contexts (Maxwell, 2013). In fact, the results cannot necessarily be generalized within the context of the institution where the study took place, because the sample did not represent the population of returned study abroad as a whole in terms of gender. Comments, particularly by students, were largely positive, and did not elicit many negative or critical views, for example, on the learning outcomes, program design, or faculty teaching style perhaps because those who agreed to participated had had positive experiences, or perhaps because they were reluctant to offer a critique of their faculty. Where it can be useful, however, is that it suggests an explanation of "the *processes* operating in the context studied that may well operate in other cases, but that may produce different outcomes in different circumstances" (p. 138). To better understand the themes emerging from this study and determine whether they apply across institutional contexts, further study is therefore needed.

Areas for Future Research

Several areas for potential future research have emerged from this study. First, because the study findings are not generalizable to other higher education institutions, replicating the study at other institutions could yield further refinement in understanding of student learning abroad and provide comparative data on how the processes of student learning abroad function across contexts. Furthermore, this study was based in the U.S.

context, so replicating in different national or cultural contexts could yield new theories or frameworks based on a comparative perspective.

The second direction for further research is to explore student intercultural learning outcomes and factors influencing achievement of those outcomes through other types of international education activities. The focus of this study is on the short-term, faculty-led format of study abroad programs that have become the most popular model for study abroad in the United States. Study abroad and student mobility is by no means the only model for internationalization of higher education institutions and their curricula. In recent years, discussions and scholarship related to campus internationalization have centered on providing other, primarily campus-based activities, such as engaging international students, collaborative online international learning (COIL), language study, courses with global content, and other global engagement programs across the college experience. In addition, longitudinal studies of outcomes for study abroad alumni can provide insights into learning outcomes and impact for participants in these activities over time.

A third area for further research would be to explore in greater depth particular pedagogical approaches and strategies that study participants felt were or could be effective in supporting student learning. Focused research on the role of independent learning in study abroad, for example, could yield ideas for how to build in both unstructured time and effective instructor support for individualized student learning. Another area for exploration relates to student identity abroad and effective pedagogies for using identity as a lens for students to learn about themselves and compare cultural perspectives. More stories are needed to understand, inspire, and prepare diverse students and their instructors for their learning and teaching experiences abroad. And finally, the frequency of faculty study participant comments on their desire for their students to develop comparative understanding of poverty and privilege indicates that this is an important outcome to some faculty leaders. Research on effective, critical pedagogies related to service learning that both optimizes student development while addressing ethical concerns around entering communities are necessary.

A fourth area for research relates to student behavior, particularly around alcohol and other behaviors on study abroad programs. Several faculty identified this as an area of concern, particularly as it relates to student health and safety, and the learning environment. Research on effective interventions, such as pre-departure education, faculty or institutional policies, or response could yield further insights into this topic, and best practices for addressing it in a way that supports student learning, health, and safety abroad.

And finally, further research on faculty development related to designing and leading study abroad courses can support them in internationalizing their academic selves, as suggested by Sanderson (2008). Studies can be designed, for example, to assess faculty development outcomes from peer mentoring through faculty learning communities or training.

Conclusion

In this study, as the student and faculty participants reflected on their experiences learning and teaching abroad, a picture emerged depicting study abroad as a transformative opportunity for students to learn and apply knowledge, gain comparative perspectives, and grow as individuals. Students and faculty, reflecting on their experiences, indicated a number of different ways in which these outcomes where achieved through student-centered teaching that incorporates guided reflection, independent learning, and authentic engagement with peoples and cultures. Faculty expertise, coupled with professional development and institutional support, can further catalyze intercultural learning and bolster intercultural teaching effectiveness.

Designing and teaching study abroad courses also extends to faculty rich opportunities to internationalize their academic selves, as Sanderson (2008) advocates all university teachers do. With these programs, faculty usually have a high level of autonomy to define student learning outcomes and design their course curricula and structure to optimize those outcomes. Faculty study abroad leaders in this study described how they themselves were transformed in different ways through their engagement with their students and the local cultural settings in which they guided their students. They, like their students, gained insights into the host countries' cultures, histories, language, and people, developing their own cosmopolitanism (Sanderson, 2008). Faculty leaders can rejuvenate their pedagogy, as one faculty study participant described her experience, often developing an authentic style as they self-reflect on their own culturally-influenced frames of reference and biases alongside their students.

Internationalization of higher education provides campuses with "a meeting place of many cultures where valuable intercultural learning can occur…where new ideas and ways of thinking are formed as a result of engagement with culturally different others" (Leask, 2009, p. 219). However, as institutions of higher education internationalize, they need to assess critically how intercultural learning and teaching are occurring, what factors influence that learning, and how to support it further. To develop international programs, expand student mobility, and recruit international students without reflecting on these questions risks missing shared learning opportunities within campus communities. And given the integral role students and faculty play as participants in and intended beneficiaries of internationalization processes, they must be included in the discussion.

Bibliography

Altbach, P. G., & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11* (290-305).

Anderson, C. L. (2016). *Instructor influence on student intercultural learning during instructor-led, short-term study abroad* (Order No. 10153243). Available from Dissertations & Theses @ CIC Institutions; ProQuest Dissertations & Theses A&I. (1816207112). Retrieved from http://login.ezproxy.lib.umn.edu/login?url=http://search.proquest.com.ezp3.lib.umn.edu/docview/1816207112?accountid=14586

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. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2005.10.004

Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U). (2009). *Intercultural knowledge and competence VALUE rubric.* Retrieved from https://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/intercultural-knowledge

Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U). (2014). *Global learning VALUE rubric.* Retrieved from https://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/global

Baer, J., Bhandari, R., Andrejko, N., & Mason, L. (2018). *Open Doors 2018 Report on International Educational Exchange.* New York: Institute of International Education.

Baghramian, M., & Carter, J. A. (2016, Spring). Relativism. *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy.* E. N. Zalta (Ed.). Retrieved from http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/relativism/

Bartell, M. (2003). Internationalization of universities: A university culture-based framework. *Higher Education, 45*, 43-70.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1990). The implications of transactional and transformational leadership for individual, team, and organizational development. *Research in Organizational Change and Development, 4,* 231-272.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd Ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bennett, J. M. (2008). Transformative training: Designing programs for cultural learning. In M. Moodian, (Ed.), *Contemporary leadership and intercultural competence: Exploring the cross-cultural dynamics within organizations* (pp. 95-110). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Bennett, M. J. (1986). A developmental approach to training for intercultural sensitivity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 10*, 179-196.

Bennett, M. J. (1993). Towards ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In. R. M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the intercultural experience* (pp. 21-72). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press, Inc.

Bennis, W. G., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge.* New York: Harper & Row.

Bennis, W. G., & Nanus, B. (2007). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge* (2nd Ed.). New York: Harper & Row.

Benson, P. (2013). *Second language identity in narratives of study abroad*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire : Palgrave Macmillan.

Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1967). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. New York: Anchor Books.

Bhawuk, D. P. S., & Brislin, R. (2000). Cross cultural training: a review. *Applied Psychology, 49*(1), 162-191.

Biraimah, K. L., & Jotia, A. L. (2012). The longitudinal effects of study abroad programs on teachers' content knowledge and perspectives: Fulbright-Hays Group Projects Abroad in Botswana and Southeast Asia. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *17*(4), 433–454. http://doi.org/10.1177/1028315312464378

Blaess, D. A., Hollywood, K. G., & Grant, C. (2012). Preparing the professoriate to prepare globally competent leaders. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, *6*(2), 88-94.

Bryant, A. & Charmaz, K. (2007). *The SAGE handbook of grounded theory*. Thousand Oak, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.

Charmaz, K. (2000). Grounded theory: Objectivist and constructivist methods. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 509-535). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.

Charmaz, K. (2017). The Power of Constructivist Grounded Theory for Critical Inquiry. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *23*(1), 34–45. http://doi.org/10.1177/1077800416657105

Childress, L. K. (2009). Planning for internationalization by investing in faculty. *Journal of International & Global Studies*, *1*(1), 30-49.

Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. L. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques* (3rd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Crosling, G., Edwards, R., & Schroder, B. (2008). Internationalizing the curriculum: The implementation experience in a faculty of business and economics. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, *30*(2), 107–121. doi:10.1080/13600800801938721

Crossman, A. (n.d.). Positivism. Retrieved from http://sociology.about.com/od/P_Index/g/Positivism.htm

Deardorff, D. K. (2009). Implementing intercultural competence assessment. In D.K. Deardorff (Ed.), *The Sage handbook of intercultural competence.* (pp. 477-491). Washington D.C.: Sage Publications, Inc.

Deardorff, D. K. (2012). Building intercultural competence: Building an interculturally competent faculty. *IIE Networker*, *2012 Spring*, *39*. Retrieved from http://www.nxtbook.com/nxtbooks/naylor/IIEB0112/index.php?startid=39

Dey, I. (2007). Grounding categories. In A. Bryant & K. Charmaz (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of grounded theory* (pp. 167-190). Thousand Oak, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Diversity Abroad. (No Date). *Diversity abroad guides*. Retrieved from https://www.diversityabroad.com/guides/diversity-and-inclusion-abroad-guide/racial-ethnic-minority-students-abroad

Dolby, N. (2004, May). Encountering an American self: Study abroad and national identity. *Comparative Education Review*, *48* (2), pp. 150-173.

Downton, J. V. (1973). *Rebel leadership: Commitment and charisma in a revolutionary process*. New York: Free Press.

Ellwood, C. (2011). Undoing the knots: Identity transformations in a study abroad. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *43*(9), 960-978.

Evans, G. L. (2013). A novice researcher’s first walk through the maze of grounded theory: Rationalization for classical grounded theory. *Grounded Theory Review, 12*(1), 37-55.

Fakunle, O. (2019, February 15). Students: The missing voices in internationalization. *University World News*. Retrieved from https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20190212144121925

France H., & Rogers, L. (2012). Cuba study abroad: A pedagogical tool for reconstructing American national identity. *International Studies Perspectives,13*(4), pp. 390-407. doi:10.1111/j.1528-3585.2012.00478.x

Friesen, R. (2012). Faculty member engagement in Canadian university internationalization: A consideration of understanding, motivations and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 17*(3), 209-227. doi:10.1177/1028315312451132

Gieser, J. D. (2015). A sociocultural investigation of identity: How students navigate the study abroad experience. *Journal of College Student Development 56*(6), 637-643. Retrieved from https://muse-jhu-edu.ezp2.lib.umn.edu/article/595563

Glaser, B. G. (1971). *Status passage*. Chicago: Aldine.

Glaser, B. G. (1978). *Theoretical sensitivity*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. G. (1992). *Basics of grounded theory: Emergence vs. forcing*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. G. (2007). Doing formal theory. In A. Bryant & K. Charmaz (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of grounded theory* (pp. 97-113). Thousand Oak, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Glaser, B. G. (2012). No preconceptions: The dictum. *Grounded Theory Review, 11*(2): 1-6.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A.L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago, IL: Aldine Publishing Company.

Goode, M. (2008 Winter). The role of faculty study abroad directors: A case study. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, Winter 2007-08, 149-172.

Gopal, A. (2011). Internationalization of Higher Education: Preparing Faculty to Teach Cross-Culturally. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 23*(3), 373-381.

Green, M. F., & Shoenberg, R. (2006). Where faculty live: Internationalizing the disciplines. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Hammer, M. R. (2012). The intercultural development inventory. In M. Vande Berg, R. M. Paige, & K. H. Lou (Eds.), *Student learning abroad: What our students are learning, what they're not, and what we can do about it* (pp. 115-136). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Hand, E., Ricketts, K. G., & Bruening, T. H. (2007). Benefits and barriers: Faculty international professional development. In *Proceedings of the 23rd Annual Meeting, Association for International Agricultural and Extension Education, 148* (153).

Harvey, T. A. (2013). *Facilitating intercultural development during study abroad: A case study of CIEE's seminar on living and learning abroad* (Order No. 3589036). Available from Dissertations & Theses @ CIC Institutions; ProQuest Dissertations & Theses A&I. (1429798838). Retrieved from http://login.ezproxy.lib.umn.edu/login?url=http://search.proquest.com.ezp3.lib.umn.edu/docview/1429798838?accountid=14586

Hudzik, J. (2011). Comprehensive internationalization: From concept to action. Washington, DC: NAFSA.

Hunter, F., Jones, E., & de Wit, H. (2018, November 2). The staff who are overlooked in internationalisation. *University World News*. Retrieved from https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20190212144121925

Jackson, J. (2008a). Globalization, internationalization, and short-term stays abroad. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *32,* 349–358. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2008.04.004

Jackson, J. (2008b). Language, identity, and study abroad : sociocultural perspectives. London: Equinox Pub.

Kappler Mikk, B., Cohen, A. D., & Paige, R. M. with Chi, J. C., Lassegard, J. P., Meagher, M., & Weaver, S. (2009). Balancing challenge and support. In B. K. Mikk, A. D. Cohen, R. M. Paige (Eds.), *Maximizing study abroad: An instructional guide to strategies for language and culture learning and use* (pp. 114-125). Minneapolis, MN: Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition, University of Minnesota.

Kappler Mikk, B., & Steglitz, I. E. (2017). *Learning across cultures: Locally and globally* (3rd Ed.). Washington, DC: NAFSA: Association of International Educators.

Kim, Y. Y. (2009). The identity factor in intercultural competence. In B. Kappler Mikk & I. E. Steglitz (Eds.), *Learning across cultures: Locally and globally* (3rd Ed.) (pp. 53-65). Washington, DC: NAFSA: Association of International Educators.

Knight, J. (1999a). Internationalization of higher education. In J. Knight & H. de Wit (Eds.), *Quality and internationalization in higher education*, (pp. 13-23). Paris: OECD.

Knight, J. (2003). Updated internationalization definition. *International Higher Education, 33*, 2-3.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1987). *The leadership challenge: How to get extraordinary things done in organizations.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2002). *The leadership challenge* (3rd Ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Krueger, R. A., & Casey M. A. (2015). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research* (5th Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Leask, B., Jones, E., & de Wit, H. (2018, December 7). Towards inclusive intercultural learning for all. *University World News*. Retrieved from https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20181205093157690

Lemke-Westcott, T., & Johnson, B. (2013). When culture and learning styles matter: A Canadian university with Middle Eastern students. *Journal of Research in International Education, 12*(1), 66-84.

Lempert, L. B. (2007). Asking questions of the data: Memo writing in the grounded theory tradition. In A. Bryant & K. Charmaz (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of grounded theory* (pp. 245-264). Thousand Oak, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

McLean, G. (2005). *Organization Development: Principles, processes, performance*. San-Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Miller, T. (2019). "Diversity and Inclusion in Global Education." State University of New York, Albany, NY. 9 April 2019.

Mitra, D. L. (2006). Student voice from the inside and outside: The positioning of challengers. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 9*(4), 315-328.

Maxwell, J. A. (2013). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (3rd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Nichols, E. (2013). *A case study: Exploring cultural competency in faculty at an institution of higher education* (Order No. 3630492). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses A&I. (1564033311). Retrieved from http://login.ezproxy.lib.umn.edu/login?url=http://search.proquest.com.ezp3.lib.umn.edu/docview/1564033311?accountid=14586

Otten, M. (2003). Intercultural learning and diversity in higher education. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 7*, 12-26.

Paige, R. M., & Goode, M. L. (2009). Intercultural competence in international education administration: Cultural mentoring. *The SAGE handbook of intercultural competence.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Paige, R. M., Harvey, T. A., & McCleary, K. S. (2012). The maximizing study abroad project: Toward a pedagogy for culture and language learning. In M. Vande Berg, R. M. Paige, & K. H. Lou (Eds.), *Student learning abroad: What our students are learning, what they're not, and what we can do about it* (pp. 308-334). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Paige, R. M., & Vande Berg, M. (2012). Intervening in student learning abroad: Recent research. In M. Vande Berg, R. M. Paige, & K. H. Lou (Eds.), *Student learning abroad: What our students are learning, what they're not, and what we can do about it* (pp. 29-58). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Rizvi, F. (2005). International education and the production of cosmopolitan identities. *Seminar Series, 9*(1996), 77–92.

Sanderson, G. (2008). A foundation for the internationalization of the academic self. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 12*(3), 276-307.

Savicki, V. (Ed.). (2008). Developing intercultural competence and transformation: Theory, research, and application in international education. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Savicki, V., & Cooley, E. (2011, May-June). American identity in study abroad students: Contrasts, changes, correlates. *Journal of College Student Development, 52* (3), pp. 339-349. https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2011.0035

Savicki, V., & Selby, R. (2008). Synthesis and conclusions. In V. Savicki (Ed.), *Developing intercultural competence and transformation: Theory, research, and application in international education* (p. 349). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing LLC.

Shaw, M. A., Chapman, D. W., & Rumyantseva, N. L. (2011). The impact of the Bologna Process on academic staff in Ukraine. *Higher Education Management and Policy. 23*(3), 71-91. http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/hemp-23-5kg0vswcsfvf

Stebleton, M. J., Soria, K. M., & Cherney, B. (2013). The high impact of education abroad : College students' engagement in international experiences and the development of intercultural competencies. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, *22*, 1–24.

Stohl, M. (2007). We have met the enemy and he is us: The role of the faculty in the internationalization of higher education in the coming decade. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *11*(3-4), 359-372.

Stone, N. (2006). Conceptualising intercultural effectiveness for university teaching. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 10*(4), 334-356.

Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques* (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Tervalon, M., & Murray-García, J. (1998). Cultural humility versus cultural competence: A critical distinction in defining physician training outcomes in multicultural education. *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved, 9*(2), 117–125. doi:10.1353/hpu.2010.0233

Vande Berg, M., Connor-Linton, J., & Paige, R. M. (2009). The Georgetown Consortium Project: Interventions for student learning abroad. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 18,* 1-75.

Vande Berg, M., Paige, R. M., & Lou, K. H. (Eds.). (2012a). *Student learning abroad: What our students are learning, what they're not, and what we can do about it.* Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Vande Berg, M., Paige, R. M., & Lou K. H. (2012b). Student learning abroad: Paradigms and assumptions. In M. Vande Berg, R. M. Paige, & K. H. Lou. (Eds.), *Student learning abroad: What our students are learning, what they're not, and what we can do about it* (pp. 3-28). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

West, C. (2012). Toward globally competent pedagogy. Washington, DC: NAFSA: Association of International Educators. Retrieved from http://www.nafsa.org/uploadedFiles/Chez_NAFSA/Find_Resources/Publications/Periodicals/Epublications/epub_toward_globally.pdf

Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods* (5th Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Appendix 1: Focus Group and Interview Questioning Route (Students)

Study Purpose: The purpose of this study is to determine stakeholder views of factors influencing student learning in faculty-led study abroad programs.

Participants: 3-8 recently returned faculty-led study abroad students at one public four-year college

Time: 90-120 minutes

			Minutes
Opening	1.	Tell us your name, your major, and which study abroad course(s) you participated in.	2
Introduction	2.	Tell us briefly about the study abroad course(s) you have joined. Where did it take place and what was the main topic?	10
	3.	How did you feel about this program?	3
Transition	4.	Think back to before you began your study abroad course. What were your goals at that time? Write down what you wanted to accomplish. You may have one or more items. [Go around the room and have each person cite their goals and list them on a flipchart.]	10
Key	5.	Now that you have completed the study abroad experience, what was your most important accomplishment? It could the same as you stated earlier, or it could be something different. (Or what is the most important thing you have gained?). [Again, ask them to list these and then record them on another flipchart.]	5
	6.	Look at the second flipchart (things gained after completing). What patterns do you see? How would you categorize these accomplishments? What labels would you give to these categories? [Note: For this question, allow for a variety of ways of categorizing. After one person suggests a framework, you might ask other to comment. Then	5

		ask, “Are there other ways to categorize?”] [If the participants do not mention intercultural learning, ask:] Do you feel you also achieved some intercultural learning?	
	7.	How are the goals from before the experience similar or different from the accomplishments identified after the experience?	5
	8.	If there is a change from before to after, what caused these changes?	5
	9.	What types of activities or assignments do you remember as being particularly helpful to you in making these accomplishments?	5
	10.	Which activities or assignments were less helpful?	5
	11.	Now think back to your faculty leader or leaders. Were there particular ways in which they helped you accomplish these goals?	5
	12.	What knowledge or competencies have you developed through this course?	10
	13.	How are you different as a result of this study abroad experience? Can you give me an example?”	5
	14.	Imagine you are designing your own study abroad course. How would you design it? Consider the type of format and activities you would use.	10
	15.	What were the most important points about leading a study abroad course we made today?	5
Ending	16.	Now I’ll briefly summarize the major themes we discussed today. Is this an adequate summary? What did I miss? Is there anything else you would like to add?	5
		Total	95

Appendix 2: Focus Group and Interview Questioning Route (Faculty)

Study Purpose: The purpose of this study is to determine stakeholder views of factors influencing student learning in faculty-led study abroad programs.

Participants: 4-5 faculty study abroad course leaders at one public college
Time: 90-120 minutes

			Minutes
Opening	1.	Tell us your name, your academic department, and which study abroad course(s) you have led.	5
Introduction	2.	Tell us briefly about the study abroad course or courses you have led. Where did it take place, what was the main topic, and how many times have you led it?	5
Transition	4.	On a piece of paper, write down two to three reasons that prompted you to develop and lead this course.	5
	5.	Based on your observations, what have students gained from the study abroad experience? [If needed, use probes such as: knowledge, skills, attitudes, aspirations; or perhaps social, psychological, physical, mental, etc.] [If the participants do not mention intercultural learning, ask:] Did you observe students engaged in intercultural learning?	10
Key	6.	Make a list of what students gained and indicate your hunch as to the percentage of students that have gained it. [After listing on flip chart (including intercultural learning, if participants believed it occurred), ask:] Which one would you consider to be the most important accomplishment?	5

		[Then circle those items on the flip chart.]	
	7.	What types of activities or assignments do you remember as being particularly helpful to students in making these accomplishments?	10
	8.	Which activities or assignments were less helpful?	5
	9.	How are students different as a result of this study abroad experience? Can you give me an example?	10
	10.	How are you as a faculty leader different as a result of this study abroad experience?	10
	11.	What do you see as your role or roles as a study abroad leader? What factors helped prepare you to lead a study abroad course and serve in these roles?	10
	12.	What were the most important points about leading a study abroad course we made today?	5
Ending	13.	Now I'll briefly summarize the major themes we discussed today. Is this an adequate summary? What did I miss?	5
		Total	85