

Program Design and the Development of Students' Global Perspectives in Faculty-Led Short-Term Study Abroad

Journal of Studies in International Education
2021, Vol. 25(3) 301–318
© 2020 European Association for
International Education
Article reuse guidelines:
sagepub.com/journals-permissions
DOI: 10.1177/1028315320906156
journals.sagepub.com/home/jsi



Melissa Whatley¹ , Adam C. Landon²,
Michael A. Tarrant², and Donald Rubin²

Abstract

This study explores connections between design features of faculty-led short-term study abroad programs and resulting changes in students' global perspectives. Over 2,000 students provided data for this study, completing the Global Perspective Inventory (GPI) before and after studying abroad. Results indicated that program features such as participation in an internship and opportunities for reflection are positively associated with global perspective development while abroad, whereas features such as number of students traveling together and coursework in English are negatively associated with such development. Given the increasing numbers of students who participate in faculty-led short-term abroad programs, research that provides evidence-based recommendations concerning program design is essential to enhancing global perspectives through study abroad.

Keywords

study abroad, cross-border delivery of education, international exchange programs, mobility of students and academic staff, strategic institutional management of internationalization

¹North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC, USA

²University of Georgia, Athens, GA, USA

Corresponding Author:

Melissa Whatley, North Carolina State University, Belk Center for Community College Leadership and Research, 706 Hillsborough Street, Raleigh, NC 27603, USA.

Email: mewhatle@ncsu.edu

Over 300,000 U.S. students studied abroad in 2016–2017, representing a 2% increase over the prior year (Institute of International Education [IIE], 2018b). Growth in study abroad at U.S. colleges and universities derives mostly from short-term programs, accounting for 65% of U.S. study abroad during the 2016–2017 academic year (IIE, 2018b). A number of factors, such as burdensome costs of participation, prescriptive degree program requirements, demands on limited free time for work and internship experiences, and family responsibilities have drawn students to these shorter options (Ogden, 2015). Although some question the ability of shorter programs to influence student development, such as the cultivation of a global perspective (Kehl & Morris, 2008; Tarrant & Lyons, 2011), researchers have generally found that short-term programs can provide at least some of the same benefits as long-term programs (Anderson et al., 2006; Chieffo & Griffiths, 2004; Mapp, 2012). In contrast to more traditional semester-long exchange programs, short-term programs tend to be led by faculty from students' home institutions in the United States (Anderson et al., 2006; Chieffo & Griffiths, 2003).

Keese and O'Brien (2011) point out a critical need to establish best practices in faculty-led study abroad programs, which tend to be more complex and demanding to administer than traditional exchange programs and certainly require students' home institutions to take on more responsibility. Although it is important that all study abroad programs be designed to optimize student development, focusing on these faculty-led programs ensures that best practices touch the most students.

The question remains as to what faculty-led program design features best facilitate students' development during short-term study abroad. What, for instance, are the relative advantages, if any, of instruction by host-nation educators versus home-campus instructors; or, of housing in the community versus dormitories; or, of residential (also known as island) campuses versus traveling programs? Although some work has identified key design features of study abroad programs (e.g., Engle & Engle, 2004) and examined the relationship between program characteristics and selected student outcomes (e.g., Dwyer, 2004; Engberg et al., 2015; Jessup-Anger, 2008; Knight & Schmidt-Rinehart, 2010; Norris & Dwyer, 2005; Paige et al., 2004), few studies have taken a comprehensive look at the influence of program design on student development specifically (Ogden, 2015). Before recommendations for best practices in faculty-led study abroad programming can be made, effects of program design features on aspects of student development must first be understood.

This study focuses on development of students' global perspectives while abroad (Braskamp & Engberg, 2011). The study abroad environment is particularly efficacious in fostering global perspectives, as it likely affords experiences not possible at home. Although other experiences, such as interaction with diverse students and participation in international-focused coursework at home, likely also foster global perspective development, our focus on study abroad stems from its increasing popularity among college students, administrators, and policy-makers. National initiatives, such as the IIE's Generation Study Abroad, which aims "to mobilize resources and commitments to the goal of doubling and diversifying the number of U.S. students studying abroad by the end of the decade," are but one example of recent pushes to increase

study abroad participation among U.S. university students (IIE, 2018a). Although the disciplinary content of study abroad programs is extremely diverse, the simple act of traveling outside one's own culture likely derives certain developmental benefits, especially as it relates to the development of a global perspective (McKeown, 2009). For example, while a student might undertake study abroad to explore horticulture in southern France, this student potentially returns home not only with increased disciplinary knowledge but also an altered sense of obligation to the global community. In this study, interest lies in the programmatic attributes that facilitate this development, regardless of disciplinary focus of the study abroad program.

Program Characteristics and Student Development in Study Abroad

Engle and Engle (2004) hypothesized that several core characteristics differentiate study abroad program types, potentially influencing student development. These include duration of sojourn, characteristics of academic content and instructional methods, exposure to reflection activity, student preparation, and accommodations. We draw on this typology to conceptualize program characteristics, but also consider program characteristics that have yet to be explored in the literature. Although some of the studies highlighted in this section examined data from students participating in faculty-led programs (e.g., Landon et al., 2017), the faculty-led nature of study abroad programs and their characteristics were not the focus of this prior research.

Sojourn Duration

Length of study, and its influence on student development, is one of the most contentious topics surrounding study abroad design. Conventional wisdom suggests that a longer duration of study abroad yields greater development. However, scholars have challenged the proposition that long-term experiences are required for students to make meaningful gains in global perspectives (Tarrant & Lyons, 2011). Empirical results examining the influence of program duration on learning outcomes in education abroad are mixed. Dwyer (2004) documented gains in academic attainment, intercultural development, personal growth, and career outcomes for students completing full year, semester, and summer study abroad programs, although these programs were not faculty-led. Dwyer's results support the proposition that longer programs generate greater outcomes, but programs of all durations examined generated benefits for students. However, Medina-Lopez-Portillo (2004) concluded that longer programs led to greater growth in intercultural sensitivity than did short-term programs. Similarly, Zorn (1996) found that nursing students who studied abroad for a period of 16 weeks or longer scored higher on a measure of global perspectives than did students abroad for a shorter term. Kehl and Morris (2008) found evidence for an influence of program length on students' global mindedness *ex post facto*. Engle and Engle (2004) suggested that diminishing returns exist for increased length of study and foreign language learning.

Generally, this literature indicates that much of the benefit that can be realized through study abroad may be obtained during the first semester or less. Although there is some evidence for a positive relationship between program length and student outcomes, much still stands to be known. For instance, scholars examining student learning and development in short-term study abroad continue to amass evidence for substantial gains, even at shorter intervals (Landon et al., 2017). Determining optimal length of study abroad sojourn, in terms of student learning and development, is critical for short-term faculty-led study abroad practice.

Language

Some past work has demonstrated that teaching in a foreign language can have a positive relationship with global perspective development during study abroad. Engberg and Jourian (2015), for instance, document a relationship between language and a measure of *intercultural wonderment*. Students who spoke a foreign language inside and outside the classroom during study abroad scored higher on a measure of their immersion, interaction, and willingness to navigate the host culture. Similarly, Vande Berg et al. (2009) suggested that students' foreign language learning is augmented by pervasive exposure during instruction. Although there appears to be a link between instruction in a foreign language and speaking a foreign language while abroad, and level of cultural immersion and foreign language fluency, the relationship between foreign language use and other areas of student development, such as global perspectives, remains less understood.

Student–Faculty Interaction

Interactions with faculty have been generally shown to relate to student development, although previous work has not accounted specifically for study abroad. Kuh (2008) suggested that faculty interaction is a critical component of high-engaging instruction, which is linked in turn to student learning and development (Carini et al., 2006; Miller et al., 2018). In thinking about study abroad in particular, certain program designs may create space to enhance these student–faculty interactions, especially in the context of faculty-led study abroad. For instance, travel-based programs where faculty travel with students for extended periods likely increase opportunities for interaction, whereas traditional, classroom-based formats replicate the campus teaching model and likely provide less student–faculty interaction. In addition, student outcomes may differ depending on whether the faculty members leading the program also teach the courses that students take or if instructors are residents of the host country.

Reflection

Reflection is a critical component of experiential learning (Kolb, 1984). Such activity is a common component of study abroad pedagogy (Ash & Clayton, 2009) and

potentially relates to the acquisition of global perspective (Engberg, 2013). Indeed, Perry et al. (2012) suggest, referencing study abroad, that “the critical moment where learners have engaged with something novel, whether it is physical or psychological, is when reflection and critical reflection become imperative to the learning process” (p. 682). Study abroad affords students opportunity for encountering something “novel.” However, the extent to which those experiences are transformed into meaningful development is in part dependent on aspects of instruction and program design (Engle & Engle, 2004).

Several different types of reflection activities have been explored in the literature. Daily journals are one way that teachers have sought to incorporate reflection in study abroad curriculum. Glass (2014), for instance, expounds the value of personal journals as a tool for students to reflect on and make meaning of experiences. These findings are echoed by Dummer et al. (2008). Others have found that structured writing exercises and storytelling (Rodriguez, 2010) are effective reflection activities with relevance to study abroad. Regardless of the medium, mechanisms for *meaning-making* are critical for students to process experiences during and after study abroad (Kortegast & Boisfontaine, 2015).

Housing

Another characteristic of study abroad programs that may influence student development, especially concerning global perspectives, is housing. Although travel-based programs likely increase faculty interaction, at the same time they may reduce opportunities for host culture interaction. It may be that students who live with host families demonstrate especially high levels of growth in metrics of global perspectives. That is, opportunities for (dis)equilibration to the home culture abound when immersed in the day-to-day life of a foreign household. Although previous work has not explored the relationship between student housing and global perspectives development specifically, previous work has examined other outcomes, sometimes with surprising results. Rivers (1998) studied the relationship between student housing and gains in foreign language ability, finding that students living with host families made less progress in speaking and listening while abroad compared with those living in dormitories, but more progress in reading comprehension. Similarly, Allen et al. (2007) found that students living in homestays scored lower on measures related to identification with native culture perspectives and cultural practices after study abroad compared with the beginning, while students not living in homestays made gains in both areas.

Conceptual Model

This study adopts Engberg and Fox’s (2011) definition of global perspective, “the acquisition of knowledge, attitudes, and skills important to intercultural communication, as well as the development of more complex epistemological processes, identities, and interpersonal relations” (pp. 86–87), and employs King and Baxter-Magolda’s

(2005) developmental model of intercultural maturity (Perez et al., 2015). This model stems from a holistic approach to human development (Kegan, 1994) and conceptualizes the intercultural maturity development within a three-dimensional framework: cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal. As development occurs, students' intercultural maturity is thought to transition from an initial to a mature level, passing through several intermediate stages (Perez et al., 2015).

King and Baxter-Magolda (2005) define these three dimensions. The cognitive dimension captures intercultural maturity development as it transitions from assumptions that knowledge is certain, naïve understandings of different cultural practices and values, and resistance to differing beliefs and views to the ability to consciously shift perspectives and behaviors to accommodate multiple cultural worldviews. Perez et al. (2015) add that along this dimension, students transition from an initial understanding of culture in simplistic terms to a more complex view, wherein they make explicit attempts to understand similarities and differences. The intrapersonal dimension refers to a transition from lack of understanding of other cultures and unawareness of one's own cultural values to the ability to challenge those values and beliefs using a multicultural lens (King & Baxter-Magolda, 2005). This development involves moving from a lack of awareness of one's own privilege and conformance to dominant norms toward a capacity for the creation of an internal self that challenges one's own views and beliefs (Perez et al., 2015). Finally, the interpersonal dimension illustrates a shift from depending on others for identity and fostering an egocentric worldview to the "capacity to engage in meaningful, interdependent relationships with diverse others that are grounded in an understanding and appreciation for human differences" (King & Baxter-Magolda, 2005, p. 576). Perez et al. (2015) add that this evolution leads one to develop negative feelings toward others that seem to be culturally insensitive.

To understand how faculty-led study abroad program characteristics relate to these three developmental dimensions, the following research questions are addressed in this study:

Research Question 1: How are faculty-led study abroad program design characteristics associated with advances in students' cognitive development and their intercultural knowledge and awareness?

Research Question 2: How are these characteristics associated with advances in students' personal values and sensitivity toward difference?

Research Question 3: How are these characteristics associated with advances in students' preferences for intercultural relationships and their commitment to making a difference in society?

Method

The students who provided data for this study ($N = 2,280$) participated in faculty-led short-term summer study abroad programs ($N = 59$) between 2012 and 2015. These programs were based out of a large research university in the Southeast United States,

Table 1. Mean GPI Scores and Maximum Value for Each Subscale.

Scale	Subscale	N items	Maximum score	Prescore		Postscore	
				N	M	N	M
Cognitive	Knowing	7	35	2,253	26.16	2,238	26.66
	Knowledge	5	25	2,280	17.70	2,269	18.71
Intrapersonal	Identity	6	30	2,263	24.73	2,252	25.30
	Affect	8	40	2,263	31.22	2,248	31.72
Interpersonal	Social interaction	7	35	2,254	24.06	2,235	24.58
	Social responsibility	5	25	2,268	18.54	2,259	18.70

Note. GPI = Global Perspective Inventory.

ranging in length from 2 to 7 weeks. Programs took place in a variety of locations, including Europe, Latin America, and Asia. All students completed the Global Perspective Inventory (GPI; Braskamp et al., 2009) at the beginning and end of study abroad. This instrument aims to capture King and Baxter-Magolda’s (2005) three developmental dimensions. Although student development along dimensions not accounted for in the GPI is certainly possible, the GPI has been used widely at a variety of higher education institutions to explore students’ global perspective development (Braskamp et al., 2009; Tarrant et al., 2015). This instrument consists of 38 Likert-type items corresponding to cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal dimensions. Participants rated items on a scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Each dimension contains two subcategories: knowing and knowledge (cognitive), identity and affect (intrapersonal), and social responsibility and social interactions (interpersonal; see <http://www.gpi.hs.iastate.edu/dimensions.php> for additional information; number of items; and maximum numerical values for each subscale are given in Table 1). These subscales were designed to correspond to intercultural communication theory and theory of cultural development, respectively; for example, the cognitive knowing scale focuses on complexity of thinking, whereas the cognitive knowledge scale reflects knowledge of multicultural issues (Braskamp et al., 2013).

In examining study abroad specifically, Braskamp et al. (2009) compared students’ GPI scores before and after a semester-long study abroad, finding evidence of development along five subscales (all except cognitive knowing). More recently, Tarrant et al. (2015) explored development along GPI subscales among students participating in short-term study abroad programs compared with students who enrolled in home-campus courses for the same amount of time. Results of this study indicated higher levels development along the cognitive knowing, intrapersonal identity, intrapersonal affect, and social responsibility subscales among the students studying abroad. Although these studies provide evidence of student development along GPI subscales over the course of study abroad, they do not address specific characteristics of study abroad programs themselves that may encourage or inhibit such development.

Based on previous work on the construct validity of this instrument (Braskamp, 2008; Braskamp et al., 2009, 2013), this study employs six first-order factors

Table 2. Program Characteristics.

Characteristic	M
Duration	3.79
No. of Students	25.78
Dorm/hotel	0.81
Host family	0.14
Classes in English	0.91
English-speaking country	0.63
Home institution faculty	0.93
Reflection	0.79
Internship	0.10
Volunteer work	0.11
Travel	0.57
Island campus	0.26
Host institution campus	0.14

corresponding to the GPI's six subscales as main outcomes. Individual items for the six subscales were aggregated to obtain pre- and post-study abroad scores for each student, following prior GPI research. Cronbach's alpha for the cognitive knowing and knowledge subscales were, respectively, .58 and .74 before study abroad and .63 and .75 after. Alpha levels for items on the intrapersonal identity and affect subscales were, respectively, .68 and .61 pre-study abroad and .73 and .67 after. Reliability coefficients on the interpersonal scale were .72 and .71 for the social interaction and responsibility subscales prior to study abroad and .72 and .75 after. These alpha levels are similar to those that Braskamp et al. (2013) report for this instrument and are close to the .7 cut-off criteria commonly referenced in psychometric studies (Vaske et al., 2017).

The program-level characteristics employed to predict student outcomes for each of the six GPI subscales (see Table 2) included program length (in weeks); number of program participants; binary indicators for living with a host family (1 = *yes*, 0 = *no*); English as the language of instruction and the language of the host country; whether home-institution faculty taught students' classes; where the study abroad program was hosted (an island campus, a host-institution campus, or neither); and the presence of structured opportunities for reflection, extracurricular travel, internships, or volunteer work. Important to note is that the latter two opportunities were attributes of a broader study abroad program and were not opportunities that students sought out beyond their study abroad program. Information about program characteristics was obtained through structured interviews with the faculty directors of each program.

Analysis

Separate ordinary least squares (OLS) regression models were estimated using the six GPI subscales as dependent variables and program characteristics as independent variables. Pretest scores were entered into models to account for nonrandom variation in

outcomes prior to study abroad and clustered standard errors accounted for the grouping of students into study abroad programs (Cameron & Miller, 2015). All models included a fixed effect for cohort.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

Tables 1 and 2 contain pre–post mean scores on each of the six GPI subscales and summary statistics for study abroad program characteristics, respectively. On each GPI subscale (Table 1), prescores were already higher than the midpoint value (e.g., the midpoint value on the cognitive knowing subscale was 17.5, and students' prescores averaged 26.16), but considerably lower than the maximum value in all cases (e.g., the maximum value on the cognitive knowing subscale was 35). Posttest GPI scores were consistently higher than pretest scores, but did not reach the maximum value on any scale. In all cases, although gains were small (less than a point in some cases), a paired samples *t*-test indicated that posttest scores were higher than pretest scores at a level well beyond that likely due to chance ($p < .001$).

The average study abroad program was 3.79 weeks long and had 26 participants. Most students (81%) were housed in a dorm or hotel, whereas 14% lived with host families. Most courses were taught in English (91%) by faculty from students' home institution (93%). Sixty-three percent took place in Anglophone countries. Most programs had a reflection component (79%), but considerably fewer provided students with an opportunity to participate in either internships (10%) or volunteer work (11%). In addition, 57% of programs incorporated in-country travel. Twenty-six percent were island campus programs and 14% took place primarily on a host-institution campus.

Regression Results

Regression results are found in Table 3. Students' pretest GPI scores were positively related to posttest scores for all subscales. Duration of study abroad program was not a significant predictor of GPI scores in any model. In what follows, the statistically significant relationships between each program design element and the six GPI subscales are summarized.

Program size and campus operation. Results indicated that the number of students participating in a study abroad program was negatively related to cognitive knowing, intrapersonal affect, and interpersonal social interaction. When an additional student participated in a program, students' scores on these subscales decreased by approximately 0.02 points. Where a program was hosted—on an island campus or on a host-institution campus—also related to several of the GPI subscales. Specifically, an island campus was associated with an approximate 1-point decrease in cognitive knowing, and a host-institution campus was associated with an approximate 1-point decrease in both intrapersonal identity and interpersonal social interaction.

Table 3. Regression Models.

Independent variables	Cognitive		Intrapersonal		Interpersonal	
	Knowing	Knowledge	Identity	Affect	Social interaction	Social responsibility
Duration	0.176 (0.187)	0.045 (0.126)	0.109 (0.166)	-0.237 (0.149)	0.159 (0.124)	-0.137 (0.110)
No. of students	-0.018** (0.007)	-0.016 ⁺ (0.008)	-0.008 (0.006)	-0.020* (0.007)	-0.023*** (0.006)	-0.000 (0.007)
Host family	-0.510 (0.447)	-0.917** (0.334)	-0.771 ⁺ (0.423)	-0.692 (0.628)	-2.125*** (0.361)	-0.789* (0.308)
Classes in English	-0.870 ⁺ (0.445)	-1.666*** (0.322)	-1.011** (0.334)	-1.658** (0.532)	-2.364*** (0.263)	-0.631* (0.280)
English-speaking country	-0.492 (0.313)	-0.529** (0.197)	-0.477 ⁺ (0.271)	0.123 (0.361)	-0.875** (0.310)	-0.314 (0.254)
Home institution faculty	1.212* (0.508)	0.435 (0.337)	-0.646 ⁺ (0.363)	0.201 (0.454)	-0.081 (0.309)	0.370 ⁺ (0.219)
Reflection	0.411 (0.315)	-0.047 (0.354)	0.320 (0.304)	0.617* (0.287)	0.438 ⁺ (0.243)	0.076 (0.267)
Internship	0.771 ⁺ (0.410)	-0.449 (0.283)	0.727* (0.330)	0.220 (0.383)	2.130*** (0.260)	1.287*** (0.284)
Volunteer work	-0.597 (0.624)	-0.449 (0.412)	-0.661 (0.644)	-0.385 (0.517)	-1.379*** (0.385)	0.155 (0.350)
Travel	0.622 ⁺ (0.316)	0.622* (0.263)	0.508 (0.314)	0.268 (0.330)	0.455 ⁺ (0.242)	0.555* (0.256)
Island campus	-1.166*** (0.300)	-0.592 ⁺ (0.325)	-0.456 ⁺ (0.244)	-0.077 (0.267)	-0.336 (0.248)	-0.151 (0.205)
Host institution campus	-0.486 (0.367)	-0.154 (0.336)	-0.749* (0.320)	-0.225 (0.400)	-1.330*** (0.270)	-0.035 (0.300)
Summer 2013 ^a	0.266 (0.220)	-0.804*** (0.227)	-0.472 ⁺ (0.239)	-0.381 (0.318)	-0.156 (0.224)	-0.159 (0.282)
Summer 2014 ^a	1.821*** (0.359)	0.475 (0.344)	-0.056 (0.298)	0.259 (0.332)	0.399 (0.303)	0.192 (0.320)
Summer 2015 ^a	0.388 (0.261)	-0.330 (0.226)	-0.509 ⁺ (0.261)	0.142 (0.225)	0.287 (0.173)	-0.121 (0.263)
Cognitive knowing	0.639*** (0.020)	0.521*** (0.034)				
Cognitive knowledge			0.630*** (0.022)	0.674*** (0.022)	0.712*** (0.022)	0.732*** (0.021)
Intrapersonal identity						1.223
Intrapersonal affect						.53
Interpersonal social interaction						1.215
Interpersonal social responsibility						.54
N	1,206	1,235	1,221	1,224	1,215	1,223
R ²	.42	.34	.45	.46	.54	.53

Note. Clustered standard errors in parentheses. + corresponds to $p < .10$.

^aReference year is Summer 2012.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Living arrangements and language. Living with a host family negatively related to cognitive knowledge and both interpersonal subscales (decreases of 0.92, 2.13, and 0.79, respectively). Taking courses taught in English negatively related to student postscores on all the GPI subscales except for cognitive knowing, whereas English as the language of the host country negatively related to both cognitive knowledge and interpersonal social interaction. Mean decreases in GPI subscale measures due to coursework in English ranged from 2.36 for the interpersonal social interaction subscale to 0.63 for the interpersonal social responsibility subscale, whereas studying in an English-speaking host country was associated with average 0.53 and 0.88 decreases along the cognitive knowledge and interpersonal social interaction subscales, respectively.

Program activities. Traveling with faculty from the students' home institutions was positively associated with the cognitive knowing subscale, resulting in an average increase of 1.21 GPI points. The inclusion of reflection in a study abroad program's design positively related to the intrapersonal affect subscale, resulting in an average increase of 0.62. The opportunity to participate in an internship while abroad showed a positive relationship to postscores in intrapersonal identity ($\beta = 0.73$), interpersonal social interaction ($\beta = 2.13$), and interpersonal social responsibility ($\beta = 1.29$), but opportunities for volunteer work negatively related to global perspectives development along the interpersonal social interaction subscale ($\beta = -1.38$). In-country travel positively related to both the cognitive knowledge and interpersonal social responsibility subscales, mean increases of 0.62 and 0.56, respectively.

Limitations

Several limitations to this study are worth noting. First, our data set lacks information about students' demographic characteristics, thus precluding a consideration of, for example, student race/ethnicity in analyses. It may be that students from under-represented groups experience study abroad differently compared with their majority counterparts, thus influencing their study abroad outcomes. This lack of demographic information is especially limiting when considering the salience of characteristics such as race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, sexual orientation, and religion in relation to student development. That is, students who participate in study abroad programs with a more homogeneous group of peers may experience global perspectives development to a lesser extent than those who study abroad with a group of peers that is more diverse. Second, some of the program characteristics were obtained several years after the collection of student-level data. As such, its accuracy depends on program directors' record-keeping and recall. Third, this study focuses on faculty-led study abroad programs at a single institution. The results are not necessarily generalizable to other institutions or to other types of short-term study abroad programs. Finally, we note that the gains along the GPI subscales reported in this study are relatively small and as a consequence may not have the same practical significance that they have statistically. However, we note that the

gains along the GPI subscales that we found are similar to gains found in previous literature (Tarrant et al., 2015). Given that very few studies in the education abroad literature adopt a pre–post research design such as ours, any effect is notable and makes this study an important contribution to the field.

Discussion

This study focused specifically on characteristics of faculty-led, short-term study abroad programs with the goal of examining the relationship between program characteristics and students' global perspectives development. Generally, the number of students participating in a program was negatively related to global perspective development. This finding is possibly explained by student "cocooning" in social activities within their study abroad cohort rather than being immersed in disequilibrating experiences while abroad. Moreover, the more students participating in a cohort, the less opportunity for each to interact intensely with instructors, as recommended by student engagement research (Kuh, 2008). Additional research is needed to further explore the dynamics of study abroad student groups of different sizes and how these differing dynamics might relate to student outcomes, such as global perspectives development. "Cocooning" might also account for the negative relationship between programs that happen on a home-institution-owned campus and global perspectives development. That is, students studying on campuses owned by their home institutions may be quick to form friendship groups with other students from their home institution rather than venturing outside of their comfort zones for social interaction. Additional factors negatively related to global perspective development included living with a host family, taking classes in English, studying in a host country where English was the primary language, completing volunteer work, and attending classes on a host-institution campus.

Other program characteristics exhibited positive associations with global perspectives development, namely, studying with home-institution faculty, reflection activity, internships, and in-country travel. The positive relationship between studying with home-institution faculty and global perspectives development is not at all surprising, especially because it was the cognitive knowing subscale where this programmatic feature was significant. This finding likely reflects a situation wherein home-institution faculty who teach on study abroad programs are subject-matter experts in areas related to the host country. For example, a faculty member leading a political science study abroad program to the United Kingdom is very likely to be an expert in U.K. politics. This expertise may cultivate a classroom environment that fosters students' complexity of thinking within the abroad context. The finding concerning reflection is especially in line with the thinking of other researchers, who suggest that reflection positively relates to student development while abroad (Glass, 2014; Perry et al., 2012). These program components, reflection, internships, and educational travel, whether curricular or extracurricular, are already included in many faculty-led abroad programs, and these findings suggest that their inclusion provides students with opportunities to develop global perspectives.

Three negative associations, namely, living with a host family, volunteer work participation, and taking courses taught on a host-institution campus, at first glance are counterintuitive and require further explanation. Concerning host families, it may be that short-term programs are simply not long enough for students to process the initial shock of living in a foreign household. It is worth noting that this study is not the first to find a negative relationship between host family living arrangements and study abroad outcomes (e.g., Allen et al., 2007). More research is needed to understand the relationship between study abroad living options and student development over various time scales. Indeed, the effects of different housing options are likely closely related to students' baseline foreign language proficiency and predeparture knowledge of their host culture.

This study is the first to investigate the role of volunteer work specifically in global perspectives development while abroad. It is possible that the volunteer work students in this study completed while abroad challenged them to confront their own privilege in unexpected ways. Given the short time frame of many of these study abroad programs, students may simply have not had enough time to confront this challenge in any meaningful way. An additional explanation for this finding is that the faculty-led programs represented in this study failed to provide students with sufficient and consistent training and opportunity to reflect on volunteer experiences. Previous research on service learning suggests that these components are needed for the successful implementation of volunteer activities (Jacoby, 1996; Mitchell, 2007). Additional work is needed to reach a better understanding of volunteer work opportunities in study abroad programming and their related student outcomes.

Prior research is also silent on the potential influence of location of coursework on student development while abroad. Given that many faculty-led short-term abroad programs take place during the summer (as did all the programs included here), taking courses on the campus of a host-country institution may not provide much contact with host-country students. This experience may be counter to students' expectations about interactions while abroad, resulting in the negative association observed. Additional investigation, especially work that examines students' expectations of study abroad and whether these expectations are fulfilled, might shed light on this issue.

Implications and Conclusion

This study's results have important implications for international educators and faculty who design study abroad programs. Specifically, results indicated that the number of students involved in a program matters and suggest that practitioners are warranted in limiting the sizes of their study abroad groups, especially when considering students' cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal development. Conversely, it is important to consider that, in addition to the size of the student group, the group's composition of individuals may also matter in education abroad. The data set employed in this study did not contain the information needed to

explore this possibility, but this topic represents a necessary direction for future research.

Incorporating reflection and internship opportunities positively related to global perspectives development during study abroad. Opportunities for reflection appeared to increase students' ability to respect and accept cultural differences, while internship participation was positively related to their ability to engage and build relationships with diverse others. In contrast, volunteer work may not make as positive a contribution to global perspectives development as practitioners believe. The same is true of living with a host family. Homestays do not always foster acculturation (Wilkinson, 1998). Practitioners may need to consider that short-term study abroad is simply not long enough for students to process the initial shock of living in a foreign household.

Results also suggested that students benefit from experiencing an environment where English is not the primary language. Although practitioners may be tempted to build programs in English-speaking locations, these programs are likely not as beneficial to students. Practitioners will need to consider how they balance the goal of providing study abroad opportunities to more students with that of designing high-quality experiences. Equally likely is that results reflect that students who chose to study abroad in non-English-speaking locales already had more positive predispositions, such as openness to change, to the acquisition of a global perspective, compared with students who chose to study abroad in English-speaking environments. Additional research is needed to explore this proposition.

Practically speaking, this study has two important implications for future research on study abroad outcomes. First, it highlights the importance of accurate and accessible record-keeping. This study was possible because directors and coordinators that organized each program were able to provide information about program characteristics. The validity of the results presented here rests on the accuracy of this information. In addition, this study underscores the importance of collecting data on study abroad outcomes across programs and over time, thus augmenting and improving on single-shot case studies that are typical of study abroad research (Rubin & Tarrant, 2017). Second, this study underscores the importance of collecting detailed information on student demographics when survey instruments such as the GPI are used. This study's primary limitation is its inability to control for factors such as gender, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and spiritual orientation in models, all of which likely influence students' development along the GPI scales. Future research that overcomes this limitation is needed to enhance and provide nuance to our findings.

Research of this nature is especially warranted given the ever-increasing popularity of faculty-led study abroad programs. Given the appeal that these programs hold, particularly for students who might not feel comfortable venturing abroad on their own, it is important to identify program characteristics that contribute best to student development while abroad. While this study examined global perspective development, other outcomes represent fruitful areas for future research. For example, researchers might address other skills, such as intercultural communication, that students develop through study abroad participation. Such studies would

greatly contribute to the development of faculty-led study abroad programs that enable students to derive the most from their international experiences.

Authors' Note

Adam C. Landon is now affiliated with Minnesota Department of Natural Resources and University of Minnesota, St. Paul, MN, USA and Michael A. Tarrant is also affiliated with University of the Sunshine Coast, Queensland, Australia and University of Newcastle, NSW, Australia.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

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

Funding

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

ORCID iD

Melissa Whatley  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7073-6772>

References

- Allen, H. W., Dristas, V., & Mills, N. (2007). Cultural learning outcomes and summer study abroad. In M. Mantero (Ed.), *Identity and second language learning: Culture, inquiry, and dialogic activity in educational contexts* (pp. 189–215). Information Age Publishing.
- 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*(4), 457–469.
- Ash, S. L., & Clayton, P. H. (2009). Generating, deepening, and documenting learning: The power of critical reflection in applied learning. *Journal of Applied Learning in Higher Education, 1*, 25–48.
- Braskamp, L. A. (2008). Developing global citizens. *Journal of College and Character, 10*, 1–5.
- Braskamp, L. A., Braskamp, D. C., & Engberg, M. E. (2013, August). *Global Perspective Inventory (GPI): Its purpose, construction, potential uses, and psychometric characteristics*. <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.584.9216&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Braskamp, L. A., Braskamp, D. C., & Merrill, K. C. (2009). Assessing progress in global learning and development in students with education abroad experiences. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 18*, 101–118.
- Braskamp, L. A., & Engberg, M. E. (2011). How colleges can influence the development of a global perspective. *Liberal Education, 97*(3–4), 34–39.
- Cameron, A. C., & Miller, D. L. (2015). A practitioner's guide to cluster-robust inference. *The Journal of Human Resources, 50*(2), 317–372.
- Carini, R. M., Kuh, G. D., & Klein, S. P. (2006). Student engagement and student learning: Testing the linkages. *Research in Higher Education, 47*, 1–32.

- Chieffo, L., & Griffiths, L. (2003). What's a month worth? Student perceptions of what they learned abroad. *International Educator*, 12(4), 26–31.
- Chieffo, L., & Griffiths, L. (2004). Large-scale assessment of student attitudes after a short-term study abroad program. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 10, 165–177.
- Dummer, T. J., Cook, I. G., Parker, S. L., Barrett, G. A., & Hull, A. P. (2008). Promoting and assessing “deep learning” in geography fieldwork: An evaluation of reflective field diaries. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 32, 459–479.
- Dwyer, M. M. (2004). More is better: The impact of study abroad program duration. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 10, 151–163.
- Engberg, M. E. (2013). The influence of study away experiences on global perspective-taking. *Journal of College Student Development*, 54(5), 466–480.
- Engberg, M. E., & Fox, K. (2011). Exploring the relationship between undergraduate service-learning experiences and global perspective-taking. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 48, 83–103.
- Engberg, M. E., & Jourian, T. J. (2015). Intercultural wonderment and study abroad. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 25, 1–19.
- Engberg, M. E., Jourian, T. J., & Davidson, L. M. (2015). The mediating role of intercultural wonderment: Connecting programmatic components to global outcomes in study abroad. *Higher Education*, 71, 21–37.
- Engle, L., & Engle, J. (2004). Assessing language acquisition and intercultural sensitivity development in relation to study abroad program design. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 10, 219–236.
- Glass, M. (2014). Encouraging reflexivity in urban geography fieldwork: Study abroad experiences in Singapore and Malaysia. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 38(1), 69–85.
- Institute of International Education. (2018a). *Generation study abroad*. <https://www.iie.org/Programs/Generation-Study-Abroad>
- Institute of International Education. (2018b). *Open doors 2018: Report on international educational exchange*. <http://www.iie.org/Research-and-Publications/Open-Doors>
- Jacoby, B. (1996). *Service-learning in higher education: Concepts and practices*. Jossey-Bass.
- Jessup-Anger, J. E. (2008). Gender observations and study abroad: How students reconcile cross-cultural differences related to gender. *Journal of College Student Development*, 49, 360–373.
- Keese, J. R., & O'Brien, J. (2011). Learn by going: Critical issues for faculty-led study-abroad programs. *The California Geographer*, 51, 3–24.
- Kegan, R. (1994). *In over our heads: The mental demands of modern life*. Harvard University Press.
- Kehl, K., & Morris, J. (2008). Differences in global-mindedness between short-term and semester-long study abroad participants at selected private universities. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 15, 67–79.
- King, P. M., & Baxter-Magolda, M. B. (2005). A developmental model of intercultural maturity. *Journal of College Student Development*, 46, 571–592.
- Knight, S. M., & Schmidt-Rinehart, B. C. (2010). Exploring conditions to enhance student/host family interaction abroad. *Foreign Language Annals*, 43, 64–71.
- Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Prentice Hall.

- Kortegast, C. A., & Boisfontaine, M. T. (2015). Beyond “it was good”: Students’ post-study abroad practices for negotiating meaning. *Journal of College Student Development, 56*(8), 812–828.
- Kuh, G. D. (2008). *High impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter*. American Association of Colleges and Universities.
- Landon, A. C., Tarrant, M. A., Rubin, D. L., & Stoner, L. (2017). Beyond “just do-it”: Fostering higher-order learning outcomes in short-term study abroad. *AERA Open, 3*(1), 1–7.
- Mapp, S. C. (2012). Effect of short-term study abroad programs on students’ cultural adaptability. *Journal of Social Work Education, 48*(4), 727–737.
- McKeown, J. S. (2009). *The first time effect: The impact of study abroad on college student intellectual development*. State University of New York Press.
- Medina-Lopez-Portillo, A. (2004). Intercultural learning assessment: The link between program duration and the development of intercultural sensitivity. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 10*, 179–199.
- Miller, A. L., Rocconi, L. M., & Dumford, A. D. (2018). Focus on the finish line: Does high-impact practice participation influence career plans and early job attainment? *Higher Education, 75*, 489–506. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-017-0151-z>
- Mitchell, T. D. (2007). Critical service-learning as social justice education: A case study of the citizen scholars program. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 40*(2), 101–112.
- Norris, E. M., & Dwyer, M. M. (2005). Testing assumptions: The impact of two study abroad program models. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 11*, 121–142.
- Ogden, A. C. (2015, December). *Toward a research agenda for US education abroad* [AIEA Research Agendas for the Internationalization of Higher Education]. Association of International Education Administrators.
- Paige, R. M., Cohen, A. D., & Shively, R. L. (2004). Assessing the impact of a strategies-based curriculum on language and culture learning abroad. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 10*, 253–276.
- Perez, R. J., Shim, W., King, P. M., & Baxter-Magolda, M. B. (2015). Refining King and Baxter Magolda’s model of intercultural maturity. *Journal of College Student Development, 56*(8), 759–776.
- Perry, L., Stoner, L., & Tarrant, M. A. (2012). More than a vacation: Short-term study abroad as a critically reflective, transformative learning experience. *Creative Education, 3*(5), 679–683.
- Rivers, W. P. (1998). Is being there enough? The effects of homestay placements on language gain during study abroad. *Foreign Language Annals, 31*(4), 492–500.
- Rodriguez, K. (2010). Digital storytelling in study abroad: Toward a counter-catalogic experience. *Seminar.net—International Journal of Media Technology and Lifelong Learning, 6*(2), 219–233.
- Rubin, D. L., & Tarrant, M. A. (2017). “It changed my life”: Strategies for assessing student learning. In L. Chieffo & C. Spaeth (Eds.), *The guide to successful short-term programs abroad* (3rd ed., pp. 171–182). NAFSA: Association of International Educators.
- Tarrant, M. A., & Lyons, K. (2011). The effect of short-term educational travel programs on environmental citizenship. *Environmental Education Research, 18*, 403–416.
- Tarrant, M. A., Rubin, D. L., & Stoner, L. (2015). The effects of studying abroad and studying sustainability on students’ global perspectives. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 26*, 68–82.

- 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.
- Vaske, J., Beaman, J., & Sporanski, C. C. (2017). Rethinking internal consistency in Cronbach's alpha. *Leisure Sciences*, 39(2), 163–173.
- Wilkinson, S. (1998). Study abroad from the participants' perspective: A challenge to common beliefs. *Foreign Language Annals*, 31, 23–39.
- Zorn, C. R. (1996). The long-term impact on nursing students of participating in international education. *Journal of Professional Nursing*, 12(2), 106–110.

Author Biographies

Melissa Whatley, PhD, is a postdoctoral research scholar in the Belk Center for Community College Leadership and Research at North Carolina State University. Her research focuses on underrepresented student populations in U.S. study abroad, especially low-income and community college students.

Adam C. Landon, PhD, is a research scientist in the Division of Fish and Wildlife at the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, and Adjunct Assistant Professor in the Department of Fisheries, Wildlife and Conservation Biology at the University of Minnesota. His research is related to the human dimensions of natural resources, especially environmental and conservation psychology.

Michael A. Tarrant, PhD, is Josiah Meigs Distinguished Teaching Professor in the Warnell School of Forestry and Natural Resources at the University of Georgia in the USA and Adjunct Professor with the Faculty of Arts, Business and Law at the University of the Sunshine Coast in Queensland, Australia. His research interests include the learning outcomes of study abroad, global citizenship, the human dimensions of natural resources, and international protected area and wilderness management.

Donald Rubin, PhD, is emeritus professor of Communication Studies and Language and Literacy Education at the University of Georgia. One thread of his research activity inquires about student learning outcomes accruing from international education.