A CASE STUDY OF GLOBAL PERSPECTIVE CHANGE FROM SELECTED STUDY ABROAD PROGRAM PARTICIPATION

A Thesis

by

LAUREN MICHELLE COCKERELL

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Approved by:

Co-Chairs of Committee, Gary Wingenbach
Tracy Rutherford
Committee Member, Clark Adams
Head of Department, John Elliot

December 2012

Major Subject: Agricultural Leadership, Education and Communications

Copyright 2012 Lauren Michelle Cockerell

ABSTRACT

This study examined selected components of faculty-led study abroad programs and determined students' changes in global perspectives after participating in faculty-led study abroad programs. A census of the population of interest (*N*=19), included undergraduate and graduate students enrolled in the *Texas A&M Namibia Technological Change and Agricultural Communications* and the *Texas A&M Guatemala Agricultural Leadership and Service Learning* study abroad programs. Participants were asked to complete a study abroad course evaluation upon return to the university during class time. The researcher-developed course evaluation included items to measure students' perspectives of orientation sessions, course delivery methods, program type, program staff, and individual development. The Global Perspective Inventory (GPI) was administered during pre-departure class meetings using the General Student Form. Post-experience administration class sessions were used to collect participants' global perspectives using the Study Abroad Post Test form. The GPI tests measured changes in global perspectives along three learning dimensions; cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal. Descriptive statistics (mean, frequencies, and standard deviation) were used to report the data.

The results showed that (1) the academic programs were intellectually stimulating; (2) student's individual development consisted of being more receptive to different ideas; and (3) student's improved their global perspective with regards to cognitive and intrapersonal development.

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this to my family especially my father. Without his patience and confidence I would have never found the joy in learning.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my committee chair, Dr. Wingenbach for pushing me out of my comfort zone and ensuring my success. Without his dedication to my research, I would not be where I am today. I would also like to thank my co-chair, Dr. Rutherford and committee member Dr. Adams, for their guidance and support throughout the course of this research.

A huge thank you must also go to my husband. He has been nothing but loving and supportive throughout the course of my degree.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	ii
DEDICATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	vii
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION	1
Literature Review	2
Purpose of Study	5
Methods …	6
CHAPTER II COURSE EVALUATION OF FACULTY-LED STUDY ABROAD PROGRAMS IN COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE & LIFE SCIENCES	11
Introduction	11
Literature Review	11
Purpose of Study	14
Methods……	14
Results……	16
Conclusions & Recommendations	22
CHAPTER III GLOBAL PERSPECTIVE CHANGE FROM FACULITY-LED STUDY ABROAD PROGRAMS IN THE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTRE AND LIFE SCIENCES	26
Introduction	26
Literature Review	27
Purpose of Study	28
Methods……	29
Results……	33
Conclusions & Recommendations	44
CHAPTER IV SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	47
Research Implications and Recommendations	47

Practical Implications and Recommendations 49

REFERENCES 51

APPENDIX A 58

APPENDIX B 63

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		Page
2.1	Demographics of Student Respondents	17
2.2	Descriptive Statistics for Orientation Sessions by Program Type	18
2.3	Course Delivery Methods	19
2.4	Descriptive Statistics for Academic Program by Program Type	20
2.5	Descriptive Statistics for Program Staff by Program Type	21
2.6	Descriptive Statistics for Individual Development by Program Type	22
3.1	Descriptive Statistics for Cultural Courses Taken in College	34
3.2	Descriptive Statistics for Student Participation in College	35
3.3	Descriptive Statistics for Students' College Experience	36
3.4	Significant Differences in Cognitive Development - Knowing	37
3.5	Significant Differences in Cognitive Development - Knowledge	38
3.6	Significant Differences in Intrapersonal Development - Identity	39
3.7	Significant Differences in Intrapersonal Development - Affect	40
3.8	Significant Differences in Interpersonal Development – Social Responsibility	41
3.9	Significant Differences in Interpersonal Development – Social Interaction	42
3.10	Overall Change for GPI Summed Scales	43

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Study abroad programs, defined as all educational programs that take place outside the geographical boundaries of the country of origin (Carlson, 1991), are prevalent in universities. These programs can include faculty-led programs, which blend an atmosphere of classroom learning with hands-on experience and extracurricular tours designed to increase global perspectives.

Most educators agree that students need to be equipped with the skills to interact and compete effectively in a global environment, along with gaining valuable exposure to different cultures to be competitive in the job market (Kehl & Morris, 2007). With a competitive job market, applicants set themselves apart by having extensive or unique experiences. An effective study abroad program not only exposes students to unique experiences, but also helps them use those experiences to change their perspectives and understanding (Barton, Bruck, & Nelson, 2009).

Rapid global development and growing demand for cross-cultural adaptability in employees puts pressure on study abroad programs to provide high quality outcomes for their growing participation (Kisantas, 2004). In today's pluralistic and global society, where multiple worldviews and salient cultural traditions have a lasting influence on how we think, feel, and relate to others, this developmental journey is increasingly complex (Braskamp & Engberg, 2011).

A global perspective recognizes differences across continents or countries, and helps us integrate all racial, cultural, and religious backgrounds (Braskamp, 2008). Global perspective-taking involves three critical, developmentally-based questions: How do I know? Who am I? How do I relate to others? (Braskamp & Engberg, 2011). This trio of questions serves as a framework to characterize student learning and development holistically (Braskamp, 2008).

This study measured selected university students' individual values of the contributing factors in each specific program and changes in global perspectives following faculty-led study abroad programs.

Literature Review

Several studies focused on the effectiveness of study abroad with regard to intercultural competence (Perry & Southwell, 2011), producing global citizens (Braskamp, 2008), and improving cross-cultural skills and global understanding (Kitsantas, 2004); all provided evidence of an increase of worldviews after participating in a study abroad program.

Theorists argue that cultural knowledge alone does not lead to intercultural competence (Perry & Southwell, 2011). Students must critically examine a culture, not just accumulate facts and knowledge about a culture, to develop intercultural competence (Perry & Southwell, 2011). As students examine cultures, they must also process critical introspection, or self-assessments, of their own changes toward other cultures to fully enhance their cultural knowledge.

Regular assessments, including both pre- and post-test situations, are needed to help measure and document participants' changes occurring as a result of their study

abroad experiences (Kehl & Morris, 2007). Not only is pre- and post-testing necessary, but Rodriguez and Roberts (2011) also suggested testing "during" the study abroad experience. To effectively teach intercultural competence, globalization, or cultural awareness in a study abroad program, Rodriguez and Roberts (2011) suggested that data collection should take place during the three stages (before, during, and after) of a study abroad program. Best practices were identified for each stage.

Before the study abroad program, planners should address concerns about safety, cultural considerations, travel preparation, identify preexisting knowledge, and conduct preflection exercises (Rodriguez & Roberts, 2011). In addition to preexisting knowledge, desire appears to be a contributing factor of success. Kitsantas (2004) concluded that moderate to strong correlations emerged between cross-cultural competence and subject competence goals; students' post-test scores on the Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory (CCAI); and global understanding. Correlations indicated that students who wanted to study abroad to improve their cross-cultural competence, because they had or were interested in developing competency in the subject matter, were more likely to report higher levels of cross-cultural skills and global understanding than those who did not want to study abroad (Kitsantas, 2004). These findings suggest that having students set goals within the pre-departure session helped promote cultural competence and global understanding.

During the study abroad program, planners should discuss course structure, community involvement, extracurricular activities, and reflection exercises (Rodriguez & Roberts, 2011). The most important best practice is to prepare the course structure to give students the most interactive experience possible (Rodriguez & Roberts, 2011).

Barton et al. (2009) also recommended focusing less on traditional lectures and more on discussion exercises and challenges that actively engage students.

After the study abroad program, planners need to have reflection sessions and motivate students to further their learning gained from the program (Rodriguez & Roberts, 2011). Student performance and student and faculty evaluations were used to analyze programs. Barton et al. (2009) focused on different instructional techniques such as student presentations, blog assignments, site visits, interaction with local contacts, observational exercises, reflection exercises, immediate feedback assignment tests (IFAT) and assessed each learning technique. Because of the variety of human learning styles, it is important to offer a range of educational activities so that all students have opportunities to respond favorably (Barton et al., 2009).

Undergraduate students in the Department of Agricultural Education at Texas A&M University had a gross lack of knowledge about international agricultural policies, products, peoples and cultures (Wingenbach, Boyd, Lindner, Dick, Arispe & Haba, 2003). Yet Briers et al., 2010 found that students at Texas A&M University revealed a strong interest in acquiring international educational experiences and hold positive perceptions of international experience and identified a wide array of countries in which to experience internationalization. To help increase the knowledge of international agriculture while also providing international educational experiences Zhai and Sheer (2002) found that agricultural college students' global perspective was enhanced by the study abroad program along with intercultural sensitivity, in which participants were more aware of and open to cultural diversity.

Previous research illustrates the effectiveness of study abroad programs when measuring globalization. However, minimal research exists for using the Global Perspective Inventory (GPI) as a measuring tool to assess students' changes in global perspectives as a result of participating in faculty-led study abroad programs.

This study helps expand the research of positive and negative characteristics of faculty-led study abroad programs and the potential change in students' global perspective. These results can help with making changes to these two faculty-led study abroad programs to make them more effective with regards to course content and globalization of students.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to explore selected components of faculty-led study abroad programs at Texas A&M University and to determine university students' changes in global perspectives after participating in selected faculty-led study abroad programs. The objectives of the research were to

1. Conduct a program evaluation of faculty-led study abroad agricultural programs in Guatemala and Namibia during summer 2012;
2. Describe students' perspectives of program orientation sessions, academics, program staff, and individual development;
3. Determine students' academic preparation for selected faculty-led study abroad programs;
4. Describe students' global perspectives in terms of
    a. Cognitive - Knowing
    b. Cognitive - Knowledge

c. Intrapersonal - Identity

d. Intrapersonal – Affect

e. Interpersonal - Social Responsibility

f. Interpersonal – Social Interaction

5. Determine if significant differences existed in students' global perspectives when analyzed by GPI test administration.

Methods

The research design was descriptive, survey methods (Jackson, 2009). Quantitative data was collected using Likert-type, five-point scales to measure students' attitudes toward faculty-led study abroad programs. This research was approved by the Institutional Review Board (2012-0268).

Population

The population of interest ($N = 19$) for this study included undergraduate and graduate students enrolled in the *Texas A&M Namibia Technological Change and Agricultural Communications* and the *Texas A&M Guatemala Agricultural Leadership and Service Learning* study abroad programs. Two participants did not complete the GPI post-test, resulting in an overall useable N=19. A census has been conducted with the population of interest because of limiting factors (financial cost, time, etc.) that prohibited additional research participants included in these unique international experiences.

Instrumentation

The 2012 study abroad summer program evaluation was a researcher-developed instrument using a combination of three previous study abroad evaluation surveys from Washington College (Office of International Programs, 2009), Ohio University (Office of Education Abroad, 2012) , and Duke University (Office of Study Abroad, 2012). The evaluation measured students' experiences using a Likert-type five point scale; s*trongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, or strongly agree.*

The survey measured effectiveness of orientation sessions given pre-departure, and on-site. The pre-departure sessions included general orientation prior to departure, program specific orientation prior to departure, and health and safety orientation prior to departure.

The assessment of program academics focused on different teaching methods used, usefulness of field trips, and fairness of academic program. The different teaching methods included lectures, individual or small group tutorials, class discussions, or field research. The fairness of the academic program focused on workload, grading, academic facilities, and intellectual stimulation.

Measuring the effectiveness of the program staff focused on the abilities and effectiveness of the instructor. The program staff was measured on accessibility, organization, intellectual stimulation, and contribution to overall experience.

Individual development focused on the potential gain or loss of personal characteristics. Students' were asked about self confidence, change in receptiveness, interest in social issues, career plans, and adaptability.

A second research instrument, "The Global Perspective Inventory (GPI)," contains questions about participants' academic preparation before participating in the study abroad experiences. Statements were asked about; (1) courses taken in college regarding culture, world history, or global issues, (2) participation in college activities such as leadership programs, interaction with differing cultures, and community service and (3) their perception of the university with regards to encouragement, supportiveness, and affiliation.

The GPI was used to measure students' three dimensions of the developmental process: cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal. The GPI had a Likert-type, five-point scale. Students indicated their level of agreement/disagreement (*strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree* or *strongly agree*) with 40 statements about global perspectives for both the General Student Form (pre-test) and the Study Abroad Post-Test Form.

Cognitive development is centered on one's knowledge and understanding of what is true and important to know (Braskamp et al., 2011). The two scales that measure cognitive development include knowing and knowledge. Intrapersonal development focuses on one becoming more aware of and integrating one's personal values and self-identity into one's personhood (Braskamp et al., 2011). The two scales that measure intrapersonal development are identity and affect. Interpersonal development is centered on one's willingness to interact with persons with different social norms and cultural backgrounds, acceptance of others, and being comfortable when relating to others (Braskamp et al., 2011). The two scales that measure interpersonal development are social responsibility and social interactions.

Data collection

Study abroad program evaluation data was collected on the last day of the study abroad program while in country during class time. The evaluation took 15 minutes to complete.

The GPI was administered during pre-departure class meetings using the General Student Form. Post-experience administration class sessions were used to collect participants' global perspectives using the Study Abroad Post Test form. Each administration required 15-20 minutes to complete. Students' received a GPI notice from the Texas A&M Study Abroad Program Office (SAPO). All data was housed on a secure server under the control of the SAPO.

Data analysis

Descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations) were utilized to analyze and report the data. Confidence intervals will be set *a priori* at $\alpha = 0.05$.

There are several limitations that must be taken into consideration when analyzing these results. The size of the population of interest is small in numbers. This can be changed in future research by adding other faculty-led short term study abroad programs from different colleges within Texas A&M University. Or a second option is to add faculty-led short term study abroad programs from different universities within the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences.

Timing of taking the post-test must also be considered, these results have the potential of being under or over exaggerated. Students' returning from a trip abroad can be overly excited, still adjusting from jet lag, and still processing the events that have occurred.

Access to the GPI information was limited since the SAPO was conducting the survey. Demographic characteristics were not available to the researcher and the data was received very late in the process giving a limited amount of time to process the results.

CHAPTER II

COURSE EVALUATION OF FACULTY-LED STUDY ABROAD PROGRAMS IN COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE & LIFE SCIENCES

Introduction

As international travel has become more commonplace and as the economies of the world have become more interdependent, both students and faculties recognize the need to prepare for this new, shrinking world (Anderson, Lawton, Rexeisen, & Hubbard, 2006). By offering a multitude of study abroad experiences, universities are able to provide an experience that promotes intellectual growth, personal growth, intercultural awareness, and professional development (Ingraham & Peterson, 2004).

Participation in study abroad programs by American students has risen dramatically in recent years, including a nearly 150% increase over the course of the last decade (Institute of International Education, 2008). With the increase in participation, studies that measure the impact of study abroad programs are essential to improving our understanding of the effectiveness of international education (Anderson et. al, 2006).

Literature Review

Program objectives, academic content, and student issues are of primary importance in offering an international educational experience (Festervand & Tillery, 2001). Faculty members, administration, and the university as a whole must accept and satisfy the responsibility for preparing students (Festervand & Tillery, 2001).

The program is termed study abroad for a reason, which involves certain expectations and responsibilities from both students and faculty members. Student responsibilities include representing their country and their university with respect and

dignity and completing all assignments related to their study abroad experience (Jackson & Nyoni, 2012).

According to Texas A&M University Study Abroad Programs Office (2012), a faculty-led study abroad program consists of a group of students led by a Texas A&M faculty member teaching Texas A&M courses abroad. Programs are designed to provide students with a culturally-relevant application to the host country while also enriching their experiences with tours of historical and cultural sites in addition to practical hands-on field-based study (Study Abroad Programs Office, 2012).

The *Texas A&M Guatemala Agricultural Leadership and Service Learning* study abroad program was designed to provide students with leadership development and education experiences that demonstrate the intersection between agriculture, leadership, and culture. Students participated in sustainable agriculture related service-learning projects, including the use of the Junior Master Gardener program, which directly benefitted rural communities in Guatemala. Field trips and Latin American cultural activities were included (Texas A&M University, 2012).

The *Texas A&M Namibia Technological Change and Agricultural Communication* study abroad program included competency building in change theory, critical thinking, and leading change effectively (personal, organizational, societal), as well as an emphasis in the principles and techniques of communicating scientific information relevant to Namibian agriculture. Students partnered with University of Namibia students and/or local Namibian agri-businesses to complete program assignments. Cultural field trips included Etosha National Park, the Cheetah Conservation Fund and other resources in Namibia (Texas A&M University, 2012).

Providing a course that is identical to the one that students would take stateside fails to take advantage of the international setting to deliver the distinctive study abroad experience that many students seek (Loroz, 2009). Cultural understanding is an important part of the educational process, but instructors must ensure that students attain the same level of core material mastery as those who remain at their home universities (Loroz, 2009).

In order for educators to provide an effective program, it is generally accepted that faculty development should center on activities that promote the creation and transfer of knowledge (Festervand & Tillery, 2001). In the case of educators, the international experience will provide the basis for developing new and richer teaching and learning materials gleaned from direct visits with representatives of industry, education, and government in another country and participation in its daily activities (Festervand & Tillery, 2001).

Students must travel, be immersed in, and develop cultural insight and related knowledge (Jackson & Nyoni, 2012). Anderson et al. (2006) showed that short-term programs can have a positive impact on participants' overall development of cross-cultural sensitivities. Intercultural growth; interest in other cultures, diminished ethnocentrism, language skills, cultural sensitivity, etc. (Anderson et al., 2006) occur from the in-country experiences.

Study abroad programs can play an important role by offering students' international experience and an increased global awareness, complement the classroom learning experience and provide firsthand insights into future careers (Nyaupane, Paris, & Teye, 2011). Developing an individual model for study abroad is somewhat a trial-and-

error process (Jackson & Nyoni, 2012). Study abroad is imperative as globalization increases the need for transnational professionals. Curriculum development must go global in preparation for an international workplace (Jackson & Nyoni, 2012).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to explore selected components of faculty-led study abroad programs at Texas A&M University. The objectives were to:

1. Conduct a program evaluation of faculty-led study abroad agricultural programs in Guatemala and Namibia during summer 2012; and
2. Describe students' perspectives of
    a. program orientation sessions,
    b. academics,
    c. program staff, and
    d. individual development.

Methods

The research design was descriptive, survey methods (Jackson, 2009). Quantitative data was collected using Likert-type, five-point scales to measure students' attitudes toward faculty-led study abroad programs. This research design allowed the description of specific situations occurring within the study abroad program. Using a Likert-type scale allowed for statistical analysis of the statements asked. This research was approved by the Institutional Review Board (2012-0268).

The population of interest ($N = 19$) for this study included undergraduate and graduate students enrolled in the *Texas A&M Namibia Technological Change and Agricultural Communications* and the *Texas A&M Guatemala Agricultural Leadership*

and Service Learning study abroad programs. A census was conducted with the population of interest because of limiting factors (financial cost, time, etc.) prohibiting additional research participants from being included in these unique international experiences.

The research instrument was developed based on three previous study abroad evaluation surveys from Washington College (Office of International Programs, 2009), Ohio University (Office of Education Abroad, 2012), and Duke University (Office of Study Abroad, 2012). The 2012 study abroad summer program evaluation measured students' experiences using Likert-type five-point scales. Students responded whether they s*trongly disagreed, disagreed, neutral, agreed, or strongly agreed.*

The survey measured effectiveness of orientation sessions given pre-departure, and on-site. The pre-departure sessions included a general orientation prior to departure focusing on payment schedule and necessary travel documents needed. The program specific orientation prior to departure focused on the specifics of the location; where the students were staying and traveling, what to expect at each location, and class registration. The health and safety orientation prior to departure focused on medications, shots needed, and campus rules of students' expected behavior.

Moghaddam, Peyvandi and Wang (2009) found that students were fairly satisfied with various components of the summer abroad courses while they see a need for improvement in extracurricular activities, such as company visits and plant tours. It is important to evaluate the program academics in order to enhance student learning.

The assessment of program academics focused on different teaching methods used, usefulness of field trips, and fairness of academic program. The different teaching

methods included lectures, individual or small group tutorials, class discussions, or field research. The fairness of the academic program focused on workload, grading, academic facilities, and intellectual stimulation.

Measuring the effectiveness of the program staff focused on the abilities and effectiveness of the instructor. This study focused on measuring the program staff on accessibility, organization, intellectual stimulation, and contribution to overall experience.

Individual development focused on the potential gain or loss of personal characteristics. Ingraham and Peterson (2004) found that the study abroad experience had a large impact on personal growth. Students' were asked about self confidence, change in receptiveness, interest in social issues, career plans, and adaptability in order to find out the potential change of personal growth.

Study abroad program evaluation data were collected upon return to the University during class time. The evaluation took 15 minutes to complete.

Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the data, including frequencies, means, and standard deviations.

Results

Participants (N = 19) included 14 undergraduates and 5 graduate students enrolled in the *Texas A&M Guatemala Agricultural Leadership and Service Learning* and the *Texas A&M Namibia Technological Change and Agricultural Communications* study abroad programs; included 15 females and 4 males (Table 2.1). Self reported ethnicities were 16 Caucasians, three Hispanics, and no other ethnicities. Approximately 74% of respondents were working toward a Bachelor's of Science degree and 26% were working

toward a graduate degree. Approximately 84% of students were in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences with majors including; Agricultural Leadership and Development, Agricultural Leadership, Education and Communication, Agricultural Communications and Journalism, Agricultural Economics, and Horticulture. The other 16% of students were in the College of Science. Only four students had participated in a study abroad program before the summer 2012 programs and 14 had not previously participated in a study abroad program (Table 2.1).

Table 2.1

Demographics of Student Respondents (N = 19)

		Guatemala (n = 10)		Namibia (n = 9)		Total	
Variables	Categories	f[a]	%	f[a]	%	f[a]	%
Gender	Female	8	80	7	77.77	15	78.95
	Male	2	20	2	22.22	4	21.05
Ethnicity	Caucasian	8	80	8	88.89	16	84.21
	Hispanic	2	20	1	11.11	3	15.79
Degree Level	Undergraduate	9	90	5	55.56	14	73.68
	Graduate	1	10	4	44.44	5	26.32
Undergraduate Classification	Sophomore	0	0	1	11.11	1	5.26
	Junior	5	50	2	22.22	7	36.84
	Senior	4	40	2	22.22	6	31.58
College of Major	Agriculture & Life Sciences	8	80	8	88.89	16	84.21
	Science	2	20	1	11.11	3	15.79
First Study Abroad Trip	No	0	0	4	44.44	4	21.05
	Yes	9	90	5	55.56	14	73.68

Note. [a]Frequencies may not total 21 because of missing data

Description of students' perspectives of program orientation sessions

Student's indicated their level of satisfaction (1 = Strongly Disagree…5 = Strongly Agree) about four orientations sessions. Respondents reported that *onsite orientation* (*M* = 4.29, *SD* = .59) and *health and safety orientation prior to departure* (*M* = 4.11, *SD* = .66) were the two most satisfying sessions (Table 2.2). *Program specific orientation prior to departure* (*M* = 4.00, *SD* = .46), and *general orientation prior to departure* (*M* = 4.00, *SD* = .65) were the two least satisfying sessions.

Table 2.2

Descriptive Statistics for Orientation Sessions by Program Type (N = 19)

	Guatemala (*n* = 10)		Namibia (*n* = 9)		Total	
Orientation Sessions	*M*[a]	*SD*	*M*[a]	*SD*	*M*[a]	*SD*
Onsite orientation	4.10	0.54	4.75	0.43	4.29	0.59
Health and safety orientation prior to departure	4.10	0.70	4.13	0.60	4.11	0.66
General orientation prior to departure	3.90	0.54	4.11	0.74	4.00	0.65
Program specific orientation prior to departure	3.80	0.40	4.22	0.42	4.00	0.46

Note. [a] Five-point Likert-type scale: 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree).

Description of students' perspectives of course delivery methods & program academics

Student's indicated their level of agreement (1 = Not at All…3 = Mostly) to each of the statements regarding course delivery methods. Courses taken during the *Texas A&M Guatemala Agricultural Leadership and Service Learning* included ALED 340 Survey of Leadership Theory, ALED 426 Methods in Adult Agricultural Education, and ALEC 685 Directed Studies. Courses taken during the *Texas A&M Namibia Technological Change and Agricultural Communications* included AGCJ 404 Communicating Agricultural Information to the Public, ALED 440Principles of

Technological Change, ALEC 604 Writing for Professional Publication, and ALEC 685 Directed Studies.

Respondents reported that courses included *Field Trips* (*M* = 2.72, *SD* = .56), *Field Research* (*M* = 2.63, *SD* = .48), and *Class Discussions* (*M* = 2.42, *SD* = .67) (Table 2.3).

Table 2.3

Course Delivery Methods (N = 19)

	Guatemala (*n* = 10)			Namibia (*n* = 9)				
	Not at All	Some	Mostly	Not at All	Some	Mostly	Total	
Methods	*f*	*f*	*f*	*f*	*f*	*f*	*M* [a]	*SD*
Field Trips	1	2	6	0	1	8	2.72	0.56
Field Research	0	4	6	0	3	6	2.63	0.48
Class Discussions	1	2	7	1	5	3	2.42	0.67
Lectures	1	3	6	0	8	1	2.32	0.57
Individual or Small Group Tutorials	1	7	2	1	5	3	2.16	0.59

Note. Frequencies may not total 19 because of missing data.
[a]Three-point Likert-type scale: 1 (Not at all) to 3 (Mostly).

Student's indicated their level of agreement (1 = Strongly Disagree…5 = Strongly Agree) about details of the academic program. Respondents reported that *the program was intellectually stimulating* (*M* = 4.53, *SD* = .60), *students were stimulating* (*M* = 4.42, *SD* = .82), and *the program was academically challenging* (*M* = 4.26, *SD* = .71) as the top three components of the study abroad academic programs (Table 2.4). *Grading was adequately explained up front* (*M* = 3.32, *SD* = 1.34), *the workload was reasonable* (*M* = 3.05, *SD* = 1.23), and *the academic facilities (classrooms, computer labs, libraries, etc.)*

were adequate for the amount and type of work expected of me (*M* = 2.79, *SD* = 1.20) were the bottom three components of the study abroad academic programs.

Table 2.4

Descriptive Statistics for Academic Program by Program Type (N = 19)

	Guatemala (*n* = 10)		Namibia (*n* = 9)		Total	
Academic Program	*M*[a]	*SD*	*M*[a]	*SD*	*M*[a]	*SD*
Program was intellectually stimulating.	4.50	0.67	4.56	0.50	4.53	0.60
Students were stimulating.	4.20	0.98	4.67	0.47	4.42	0.82
The program was academically challenging.	4.30	0.64	4.22	0.79	4.26	0.71
Creative work/ideas were recognized.	4.60	0.49	3.67	1.49	4.16	1.18
Instructors were stimulating.	4.40	0.49	3.78	1.40	4.11	1.07
Instructors were effective.	4.30	0.64	3.67	1.49	4.00	1.17
Criteria for student evaluation were fair.	4.20	0.75	3.78	0.79	4.00	0.79
The Program prerequisites, if any, were relevant.	3.78	1.23	4.00	0.82	3.87	1.09
The same subject matter is addressed at A&M.	4.11	0.74	3.00	0.82	3.56	0.96
Grading was adequately explained up front.	3.80	1.17	2.78	1.55	3.32	1.45
The workload was reasonable.	2.70	1.10	3.44	1.26	3.05	1.23
The academic facilities (classrooms, computer labs, libraries, etc.) were adequate for the amount and type of work expected of me.	3.50	0.92	2.00	0.94	2.79	1.20

Note. [a] Five-point Likert-type scale: 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree).

Description of students' perspectives of program staff

Student's indicated their level of agreement (1 = Strongly Disagree…5 = Strongly Agree) about details of the program staff. Respondents reported that the program staff *was/were responsive to student health/safety issues or concerns* (*M* = 4.47, *SD* = .88), *was/were accessible to students* (*M* = 4.42, *SD* = .82), and *offered an adequate number of activities that were intellectually stimulating* (*M* = 4.37, *SD* = .74) as the top three components of the program staff (Table 2.5). Program staff *was/were able to work effectively with diverse students in groups* (*M* = 3.95, *SD* = 1.32), *contributed in a*

positive, supportive fashion to my overall experience (*M* = 3.89, *SD* = 1.33), and *was/were organized* (*M* = 3.84, *SD* = 1.18) were the bottom three components of the study abroad program staff.

Table 2.5

Descriptive Statistics for Program Staff by Program Type (N = 19)

	Guatemala (*n* = 10)		Namibia (*n* = 9)		Total	
Program Staff	*M*[a]	*SD*	*M*[a]	*SD*	*M*[a]	*SD*
Was/were responsive to student health/safetyissues or concerns	4.60	0.66	4.33	1.05	4.47	0.88
Was/were accessible to students	4.60	0.49	4.22	1.03	4.42	0.82
Offered an adequate number of activities that were intellectually stimulating	4.50	0.67	4.22	0.79	4.37	0.74
Facilitated my interaction with the host culture	4.70	0.46	3.78	1.13	4.26	0.96
Was/were able to work effectively with diverse students in groups	4.70	0.46	3.11	1.45	3.95	1.32
Contributed in a positive, supportive fashion to my overall experience	4.60	0.49	3.11	1.52	3.89	1.33
Was/were organized	4.40	0.66	3.22	1.31	3.84	1.18

Note. [a] Five-point Likert-type scale: 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree).

Description of students' perspectives of individual development

Students indicated their level of agreement (1 = Strongly Disagree…5 = Strongly Agree) about details of their individual development. Participants reported that *study abroad has made me more receptive to different ideas* (*M* = 4.84, *SD* = .36), *I am more receptive to different ideas and ways of seeing the world* (*M* = 4.84, *SD* = .36), and *I've gained better insight into myself* (*M* = 4.79, *SD* = .52) as the top three components of their individual development (Table 2.6). *My tolerance of other people and customs has increased* (*M* = 4.53, *SD* = .60), *my interest in the arts has increased* (*M* = 3.63, *SD* =

1.18), and *my experience has changed my career plans* ($M = 3.42$, $SD = 1.18$) were the bottom three components of individual development.

Table 2.6

Descriptive Statistics for Individual Development by Program Type (N = 19)

	Guatemala ($n = 10$)		Namibia ($n = 9$)		Total	
Individual Development	M^a	*SD*	M^a	*SD*	M^a	*SD*
Study abroad has made me more receptive to different ideas.	5.00	0.00	4.67	0.47	4.84	0.36
I am more receptive to different ideas and ways of seeing the world.	5.00	0.00	4.67	0.47	4.84	0.36
I've gained better insight into myself.	5.00	0.00	4.56	0.68	4.79	0.52
My ability to adapt to new situations has increased.	4.90	0.30	4.44	0.50	4.68	0.46
I have a greater sense of self-confidence.	4.90	0.30	4.22	0.92	4.58	0.75
I have increased interest in social issues.	5.00	0.00	4.11	0.74	4.58	0.67
My interest in world events has increased.	4.80	0.40	4.33	0.67	4.58	0.59
My tolerance of other people and customs has increased.	4.90	0.30	4.11	0.57	4.53	0.60
My interest in the arts has increased.	4.20	0.75	3.00	1.25	3.63	1.18
My experience has changed my career plans.	3.80	1.17	3.00	1.05	3.42	1.18

Note. [a] Five-point Likert-type scale: 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree).

Conclusions and Recommendations

Study abroad programs must be evaluated to learn what was effective and what changes are needed for students to have a positive and productive international educational experience. Effective orientation sessions are imperative for students to start their study abroad experience with confidence. A student must feel comfortable before departure, Rodriguez and Roberts (2011) found that addressing concerns about safety, cultural considerations, travel preparation, identifying preexisting knowledge and preflection are necessary. This study found that all orientation sessions had an average

mean of four or greater, indicating students were satisfied with the information given during orientation sessions.

Because of the variety of learning styles, it is important to offer a range of education activities so that all students have an opportunity to respond favorably (Barton et al., 2009). This study found that the top three course delivery methods were field trips, field research, and class discussions. Loroz (2009) found that students generally found learning activities to be both useful for learning and enjoyable. With field trips and field research being the top course delivery methods this confirms previous findings.

The top three characteristics of the academic program were program was intellectually stimulating, students were stimulating, and the program was academically challenging. Sjoberg and Shabalina (2010) found that peer-to-peer student interaction provided for interaction that supports active learning and not passive observations during sight-seeing tours. This is important, as study abroad programs should not be viewed as taking vacation but an academically challenging experience.

It is also essential to recognize what characteristics were last in order to improve the study abroad programs. These characteristics include grading was adequately explained up front, the workload was reasonable, and the academic facilities were adequate for the amount and type of work expected of me. A minor change can be made for the explanation of grading, add this into the syllabus or one of the orientation sessions. As for the workload and academic facilities, these will be continuing issues. Loroz (2009) found that many students acknowledge that they spend less time on studying and assignments than they do in the states. Traveling to developing countries

will always promote a feeling of inadequate facilities especially when the United States is a leader of technology.

Many studies conclude that educators need to engage students (Sjoberg & Shabalina, 2010), use a variety of instructional techniques (Barton et al., 2009), and prepare the course structure to give the students the most interactive experience possible (Rodriguez & Roberts, 2011). Further research however needs to focus on the personal characteristics of the program staff. Program staff was responsive to student health/safety issues, was accessible to students, and offered adequate number of activities that were intellectually stimulating. With students ranking the academic programs high with regards to intellectual stimulation this shows a connection between the staff providing activities and the promotion of program stimulation.

The three characteristics of the program staff ranked the lowest; was/were able to work effectively with diverse students in groups, contributed in a positive, supportive fashion to my overall experience and was/were organized. The Namibia study abroad program rated the organization of program staff much lower than that of the Guatemala study abroad group. The large difference can potentially be explained by the Guatemala program having an in-country coordinator while the Namibia program did not.

Anderson et al. (2006) found that short-term programs can have a positive impact on the overall development of cross-cultural sensitivity. This study found that cross-cultural sensitivity was among the bottom of individual development, with tolerance of other people and customs being in the bottom three. However personal development was experienced during the study abroad programs. The top three individual development characteristics were study abroad has made me more receptive to different ideas, I am

more receptive to different ideas and ways of seeing the world, and I've gained better insight into myself.

This research should be expanded and continued to measure the effectiveness of faculty-led study abroad programs. Gathering a larger sample of respondents is recommended by using the same study abroad programs over multiple years. With a larger sample, data can be analyzed using different demographic characteristics. Further research can also be conducted using other faculty-led study abroad programs from other colleges within Texas A&M University giving a comparison between the two.

CHAPTER III

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVE CHANGE FROM FACULITY-LED STUDY ABROAD PROGRAMS IN COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES

Introduction

University administrators wonder if study abroad programs enhance students' global understanding. Rapid global development and a growing demand for employees with cross-cultural adaptability puts pressure on study abroad programs to provide high quality outcomes for their growing enrollment (Kitsantas, 2004). Because the global market wants students who have an understanding of the cultural, social, economic, and political systems throughout the world (Sjoberg & Shabalina, 2012), it is imperative that study abroad programs enhance students' global perspectives.

Sobania and Braskamp (2009) found that study abroad fostered the same general learning skills, self-identity formation, and interactions with others that all students should have acquired by the time of graduation. Chickering and Braskamp (2009) also found that education abroad does have an important influence on the holistic and global development of students.

The traditional-aged college student needs to develop and internalize a global perspective into their thinking, sense of identity, and relationships with others (Chickering & Braskamp, 2009). As the world becomes more interdependent, students need to prepare for the global challenges that lie ahead in their post college lives (Engberg & Fox, 2011).

Literature Review

The development of a global perspective is often cited as an education goal of academic programs possessing a global perspective is perceived as a critical determinant of success in life (McCabe, 2001). Higher education has always stressed the development of the "whole student" along several dimensions – intellectual, social, civic, physical, moral, and spiritual (Braskamp & Engberg, 2011). Because this generation, and future generations of students is and will be increasingly interacting with a larger, more globalized community, they need to become ever more competent in understanding, talking with, relating to, and working with persons who differ from them politically, socio-economically, and religiously (Sobania & Braskamp, 2009).

A global perspective is broadly defined to include both the acquisition of knowledge, attitudes, and skills important to intercultural communication and the development of more complex epistemological processes, identities, and interpersonal relations (Engberg & Fox, 2011). Kitsantas (2004) stated that global perspective involves the process of cross-cultural relativism, where one can view one's own culture in relation to other cultures, and suspend judgment and ethnocentrism.

Studies (Braskamp & Engberg, 2011; Chickering & Braskamp, 2009; Mapp, McFarland & Newell, 2007) have found that study abroad increases students' global perspectives. Kitsantas (2004) found that overall students' cross-cultural skills and global understanding improved; but students' goals to study abroad influenced the magnitude of these outcomes. Study abroad programs significantly contribute to the preparation of students to function in a multicultural world and promote international understanding (Kitsantas, 2004).

Bellamy and Weinberg (2006) suggested that study abroad programs could develop characteristics such as intercultural understanding, mindfulness, partnerships, pragmatic hope, and social entrepreneurship. Mapp et al., (2007) found that qualitative, not quantitative results indicated that participants expressed a change in their attitudes regarding global understanding and cross-cultural knowledge in short-term and long-term study abroad experiences. Jabbar (2012) also found that students benefited in all major categories: cultural awareness, knowledge of world affairs, career enhancements, and personal growth.

This strong evidence of positive outcomes from study abroad programs, especially improved global perspectives, makes it imperative that study abroad programs increase participation to provide more global-minded citizens for the workforce. As individuals develop global perspectives, they incorporate more complex ways of meaning-making that are grounded in intercultural knowledge, cultivate greater acceptance of cultural difference, and a more solidified sense of self, and develop more mature interpersonal relationships and a stronger commitment to social responsibility (Engberg & Fox, 2011).

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to determine university students' changes in global perspectives after participating in selected faculty-led study abroad programs. The objectives of the research were to

1. Determine students' academic preparation for selected faculty-led study abroad programs;
2. Describe students' global perspectives in terms of

a. Cognitive - Knowing
b. Cognitive - Knowledge
c. Intrapersonal - Identity
d. Intrapersonal – Affect
e. Interpersonal - Social Responsibility
f. Interpersonal – Social Interaction, and

3. Determine if significant differences existed in students' global perspectives when analyzed by GPI test administration.

Methods

The research design was descriptive, survey (Jackson, 2009). Quantitative data were collected using Likert-type, five-point scales to measure students' global perspectives. This design allowed for the description of attitudes about global perspectives. Using a Likert-type scale allowed for statistical analysis of the statements. This research was approved by the Institutional Review Board (2012-0268).

The Global Perspectives Inventory (GPI) has been determined valid for measuring college students' global perspectives. Validity forms included face validity (the extent to which the survey is considered fair and reasonable), concurrent validity (the degree of relationship and correlation with other instruments that are designed to measure similar characteristics and constructs), and construct validity (degree to which the survey results empirically support and reinforce the desired constructs and concepts under consideration) (Braskamp et al., 2011).

To determine face validity of the GPI, an initial item pool of several hundred items was asked to both college students and experts in study abroad and student

development to review items for clarity and credibility (Braskamp et al., 2011). After review, 69 items were chosen with additional feedback reducing the total items to 40. One study was conducted on the concurrent validity of the GPI, with another survey, the Intercultural Dimensions Inventory (IDI), with the researcher (Anderson, 2011) concluding that these two surveys did not measure similar characteristics (Braskamp et al., 2011). Construct validity was determined (Braskamp et al., 2011) through a number of studies that sought to empirically answer questions such as is group affiliation associated with differences on the GPI, do students changed over time, do seniors express a more global perspective than freshman, etc.

The population of interest ($N = 19$) for this study included undergraduate and graduate students enrolled in the *Texas A&M Namibia Technological Change and Agricultural Communications* and the *Texas A&M Guatemala Agricultural Leadership and Service Learning* study abroad programs. Two participants did not complete the post-test, resulting in an overall useable N=19. A census has been conducted with the population of interest because of limiting factors (financial cost, time, etc.) prohibiting additional research participants to be included in these unique international experiences.

The GPI contains questions about participants' academic preparation before participating in the study abroad experiences. Statements were asked about; (1) courses taken in college regarding culture, world history, or global issues, (2) participation in college activities such as leadership programs, interaction with differing cultures, and community service and (3) their perception of the university with regards to encouragement, supportiveness, and affiliation.

The GPI measured students' three dimensions of the developmental process: cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal, using Likert-type, five-point scales. Students responded whether they *strongly disagreed, disagreed, neutral, agreed,* or *strongly agreed* with 40 statements about global perspectives for both the General Student Form (pre-test) and the Study Abroad Form (post-test).

The three dimensions of student development defined by Braskamp et al. (2012) are cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal. Cognitive development is centered on one's knowledge and understanding of what is true and important to know (Braskamp & Engberg, 2011). This scale focuses on two aspects: *knowing*, how a student will focus on thinking and learning and *knowledge*, what the student knows and understands about the global world.

Intrapersonal development is focused on increasing awareness of one's own values and self-identity and integrating these into one's sense of personhood (Braskamp & Engberg, 2011). This scale focuses on two aspects: *identity*, how aware the student is of their uniqueness and their sense of purpose, and a*ffect*, the level of respect the student has for other cultures and the complexity of their emotional confidence.

Interpersonal development is centered on one's willingness to interact with persons with different social norms and cultural backgrounds, acceptance of others, and comfort when relating to others (Braskamp & Engberg, 2011). This scale focuses on two aspects: *social responsibility*, the students concern for others and level of interdependence and *social interaction*, the student's ability to engage with others from different cultures and the degree of cultural sensitivity.

The GPI was administered during pre-departure class meetings using the General Student Form. Post-experience administration class sessions were used to collect participants' global perspectives using the Study Abroad Post Test form. Each administration required 15-20 minutes to complete. Students' received a GPI notice from the Texas A&M Study Abroad Program Office (SAPO). All data were housed on a secure server under the control of the SAPO.

The GPI consists of 40 questions. Two questions were administered but not reported leaving 38 questions. Each domain has a unique number of statements. Cognitive development consists of 12 statements total, with seven statements regarding the knowing domain and five statements regarding the knowledge domain. Intrapersonal development consists of 14 statements total, with six statements regarding the identity domain and eight statements regarding the affect domain. Interpersonal development consists of 12 statements total, with five statements regarding responsibility and seven statement regarding social interaction. By summing these domains, significance can be tested for each of these domains.

Descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations) were utilized to report the data. Confidence intervals were set *a priori* at $\alpha = 0.05$.

Results

Participants (N = 19) included students enrolled in the *Texas A&M Guatemala Agricultural Leadership and Service Learning* and the *Texas A&M Namibia Technological Change and Agricultural Communications* study abroad programs. Any identifying demographic information was removed by SAPO. However, information about college courses taken, participation in activities and university characteristics were reported.

Description of students' academic preparation

Student's indicated how many courses were taken in different areas (0 to 5 or more). The total number of respondents reported that *multicultural courses addressing issues of race, ethnicity, gender, class, religion, or sexual orientation* (M = 1.86, SD = .80) and *world history* (M = 1.33, SD = 1.09) were the two courses taken most often (Table 3.1). While courses that included *opportunities for intensive dialog among students with different backgrounds and beliefs* (M = 1.19, SD = 1.28), and *foreign language* (M = .67, SD = 1.10) were the two courses taken least often (Table 3.1).

Table 3.1

Descriptive Statistics for Cultural Courses Taken in College (N = 21)

	Guatemala (*n = 10)*		Namibia (*n = 11)*		Total	
	M[a]	*SD*	*M*[a]	*SD*	*M*[a]	*SD*
Multicultural course addressing issues of race, ethnicity, gender, class, religion, or sexual orientation	1.70	.90	2.00	.74	1.86	.80
World history course	1.30	.90	1.36	1.43	1.33	1.09
Course focused on significant global/international issues and problems	.80	.75	1.82	1.27	1.33	1.07
Service-learning course	1.80	1.72	.64	.64	1.19	1.28
Course that includes opportunities for intensive dialog among students with different backgrounds and beliefs	.80	.87	1.18	.94	1.00	.83
Foreign language course	.60	1.02	.73	1.35	.67	1.10

Note. [a]Six-point Likert-type scale: 0 to 6 (5 or more)

Student's indicated how often they had participated in different activities since coming to college (1 = never…5 = very often). Respondents reported that they had participated in *leadership programs that stress collaboration and teamwork* (*M* = 2.86, *SD* = 1.02), *community service activities* (*M* = 2.62, *SD* = .97), and *interacted with students from a race/ethnic group different from your own* (*M* = 2.62, *SD* = .93) as the three activities most often participated (Table 3.2). While *interacted with students from a country different from your own* (*M* = 1.90, *SD* = .75), *attended a lecture/workshop/campus discussion on international/global issues* (*M* = 1.48, *SD* = 1.03), and *participated in events or activities sponsored by groups reflecting a cultural heritage different from your own* (*M* = 1.24, *SD* = .79) were the three activities with the least amount of participation (Table 3.2).

Table 3.2

Descriptive Statistics for Student Participation in College (N = 21)

	Guatemala (*n = 10)*		Namibia (*n = 11)*		Total	
	M[a]	*SD*	*M*[a]	*SD*	*M*[a]	*SD*
Participated in leadership programs that stress collaboration and team work	2.80	.98	2.91	1.00	2.86	1.02
Participated in community service activities	2.30	.90	2.91	.90	2.62	.97
Interacted with students from a race/ethnic group different from your own	2.50	.92	2.73	.86	2.62	.93
Read a newspaper or news magazine (online or print)	2.10	.94	2.91	1.00	2.52	1.04
Discussed current events with other students	2.20	1.08	2.73	.86	2.48	.99
Watched news programs on television or computer	2.00	.89	2.55	.99	2.29	.96
Participated in events or activities sponsored by groups reflecting your own cultural heritage	2.30	1.27	2.18	1.19	2.24	1.14
Participated in religious or spiritual activities	2.30	1.49	2.18	1.40	2.24	1.32
Followed an international event/crisis (e.g., through newspaper, social media, or other media source)	1.70	.64	2.64	1.15	2.19	1.02
Interacted with students from a country different from your own	1.70	.64	2.09	.79	1.90	.75
Attended a lecture/workshop/campus discussion on international/global issues	1.20	.87	1.73	1.29	1.48	1.03
Participated in events or activities sponsored by groups reflecting a cultural heritage different from your own	1.20	.75	1.27	.96	1.24	.79

Note. [a] Five-point Likert-type scale: 1 (Never) to 5 (Very Often)

Student's indicated their level of agreement about university characteristics (1 = strongly disagree…5 = strongly agree). Respondents reported that they *have been encouraged to develop my strengths and talents at my college/university* (*M* = 4.38, *SD* = 1.13) and *are both challenged and supported at my college/university* (*M* = 4.29, *SD* = 1.12) as the top two characteristics (Table 3.3). *I understand the mission of my college/university* (*M* = 4.14, *SD* = 1.08) and *I feel that my college/university community*

honors diversity and internationalism (*M* = 3.76, *SD* = 1.22) were the bottom two characteristics (Table 3.3).

Table 3.3

Descriptive Statistics for Students College Experience (N = 21)

	Guatemala (*n = 10)*		Namibia (*n = 11)*		Total	
	M[a]	*SD*	*M*[a]	*SD*	*M*[a]	*SD*
I have been encouraged to develop my strengths and talents at my college/university.	4.50	.50	4.27	.45	4.38	1.13
I am both challenged and supported at my college/university.	4.50	.50	4.09	.51	4.29	1.12
I feel I am a part of a close and supportive community of colleagues and friends.	4.40	.66	4.09	.67	4.24	1.13
I have a strong sense of affiliation with my college/university.	4.10	.70	4.27	.86	4.19	1.16
I understand the mission of my college/university	4.20	.60	4.09	.51	4.14	1.08
I feel that my college/university community honors diversity and internationalism.	4.20	.98	3.36	.98	3.76	1.22

Note. [a] Five-point Likert-type scale: 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree)

Description of students' cognitive development

Student's indicated their level of agreement (1 = Strongly Disagree…5 = Strongly Agree) about cognitive development (i.e., knowing). The respondents reported an increase when comparing pre-test and post-test means in all knowing statements except for *in different settings what is right and wrong is simple to determine* and *I rarely question what I have been taught about the world around me* (Table 3.4).

Table 3.4

Significant Differences in Cognitive Development - Knowing (N = 19)

	Pre-test (n = 21)		Post-test (n = 19)		Total	
Cognitive – Knowing Statements	M[a]	*SD*	M[a]	*SD*	M[a]	*SD*
Some people have a culture and others do not. [b]	4.38	.74	4.58	.61	4.48	.68
I take into account different perspectives before drawing conclusions about the world around me.	3.81	.87	4.42	.51	4.10	.78
I consider different cultural perspectives when evaluating global problems.	3.81	.75	4.37	.60	4.08	.73
I rely primarily on authorities to determine what is true in the world. [b]	3.62	.80	4.11	.94	3.85	.89
I rarely question what I have been taught about the world around me.[b]	3.57	1.03	3.47	1.17	3.53	1.09
In different settings what is right and wrong is simple to determine.[b]	3.48	.98	3.32	1.20	3.40	1.08
When I notice cultural differences, my culture tends to have the better approach. [b]	2.95	1.02	3.47	.77	3.20	.94

Note.[a]Five-point Likert-type scale: 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree).
[b] Items were reverse-coded for analysis.

Student's indicated their level of agreement (1 = Strongly Disagree…5 = Strongly Agree) about cognitive development for the knowledge scale. The respondents reported an increase when comparing pre-test and post-test means in all knowledge statements (Table 3.5).

Table 3.5

Significant Differences in Cognitive Development - Knowledge (N = 19)

	Pre-test (n = 21)		Post-test (n = 19)		Total	
Cognitive – Knowledge Statements	M[a]	*SD*	M[a]	*SD*	M[a]	*SD*
I can discuss cultural differences from an informed perspective.	3.52	.81	4.05	.41	3.78	.70
I understand how various cultures of this world interact socially.	3.43	.98	3.95	.52	3.68	.83
I know how to analyze the basic characteristics of a culture.	3.48	.68	3.89	.57	3.68	.66
I understand the reasons and causes of conflict among nations of different cultures.	3.24	.94	3.95	.52	3.58	.84
I am informed of current issues that impact international relations.	3.19	1.08	3.79	.79	3.48	.99

Note.[a]Five-point Likert-type scale: 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree).
[b] Items were reverse-coded for analysis.

Description of students' intrapersonal development

Student's indicated their level of agreement (1 = Strongly Disagree…5 = Strongly Agree) about intrapersonal development for the identity scale. The respondents reported an increase when comparing pre-test and post-test means in all statements on the identity scale (Table 3.6)

Table 3.6

Significant Differences in Intrapersonal Development - Identity (N = 19)

	Pre-test (n = 21)		Post-test (n = 19)		Total	
Intrapersonal – Identity Statements	M[a]	*SD*	M[a]	*SD*	M[a]	*SD*
I can explain my personal values to people who are different from me.	4.29	.46	4.32	.48	4.30	.46
I am confident that I can take care of myself in a completely new situation.	4.14	.48	4.47	.51	4.30	.52
I have a definite purpose in my life.	4.10	.89	4.37	.76	4.23	.83
I know who I am as a person.	4.05	.67	4.26	.56	4.15	.62
I am developing a meaningful philosophy of life.	3.90	.44	4.37	.50	4.13	.52
I put my beliefs into action by standing up for my principles.	3.81	.60	4.11	.46	3.95	.55

Note.[a]Five-point Likert-type scale: 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree).
[b] Items were reverse-coded for analysis.

Student's indicated their level of agreement (1 = Strongly Disagree…5 = Strongly Agree) about intrapersonal development for the affect scale. The respondents reported an increase when comparing pre-test and post-test means for all affect statements except for *I get offended often by people who do not understand my point-of-view* and *I do not feel threatened emotionally when presented with multiple perspectives* (Table 3.7).

Table 3.7

Significant Differences in Intrapersonal Development - Affect (N = 19)

	Pre-test (n = 21)		Post-test (n = 19)		Total	
Intrapersonal – Affect Statements	M[a]	*SD*	M[a]	*SD*	M[a]	*SD*
I am accepting of people with different religious and spiritual traditions.	4.05	.67	4.21	.54	4.13	.61
I am sensitive to those who are discriminated against.	4.10	.77	4.11	.74	4.10	.74
I do not feel threatened emotionally when presented with multiple perspectives.	4.14	.66	4.05	.62	4.10	.63
I feel threatened around people from backgrounds very different from my own. [b]	3.71	.90	4.37	.60	4.03	.83
I get offended often by people who do not understand my point-of-view. [b]	3.86	.73	3.84	.77	3.85	.74
I see myself as a global citizen.	3.52	.93	4.00	.58	3.75	.81
I often get out of my comfort zone to better understand myself.	3.29	.96	4.05	.71	3.65	.92
I constantly need affirmative confirmation about myself from others. [b]	3.33	.91	3.74	.93	3.53	.93

Note.[a]Five-point Likert-type scale: 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree).
[b] Items were reverse-coded for analysis.

Description of students' interpersonal development

Student's indicated their level of agreement (1 = Strongly Disagree…5 = Strongly Agree) about interpersonal development for the social responsibility scale. The respondents reported an increase when comparing pre-test and post-test means in all social responsibility statements (Table 3.8).

Table 3.8

Significant Differences in Interpersonal Development - Social Responsibility (N = 19)

Interpersonal – Social Responsibility Statements	Pre-test (n = 21)		Post-test (n = 19)		Total	
	M[a]	*SD*	M[a]	*SD*	M[a]	*SD*
I consciously behave in terms of making a difference.	3.81	.68	4.26	.65	4.03	.70
Volunteering is not an important priority in my life. [b]	3.95	1.20	4.00	1.05	3.98	1.12
I work for the rights of others.	3.76	.70	4.05	.62	3.90	.67
I think of my life in terms of giving back to society.	3.67	.86	4.05	.78	3.85	.83
I put the needs of others above my own personal wants.	3.48	.98	3.74	.87	3.60	.93

Note.[a]Five-point Likert-type scale: 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree).
[b] Items were reverse-coded for analysis.

Student's indicated their level of agreement (1 = Strongly Disagree…5 = Strongly Agree) about interpersonal development for the social interaction scale. The respondents reported an increase when comparing pre-test and post-test means in all social interaction statements except for *most of my friends are from my own ethnic background* (Table 3.9).

Table 3.9

Significant Differences in Interpersonal Development - Social Interaction (N = 19)

	Pre-test (n = 21)		Post-test (n = 19)		Total	
Interpersonal – Social Interaction Statements	*M*[a]	*SD*	*M*[a]	*SD*	*M*[a]	*SD*
I enjoy when my friends from other cultures teach me about our cultural differences.	4.38	.50	4.42	.51	4.40	.50
I am open to people who strive to live lives very different from my own life style.	4.10	.54	4.11	.66	4.10	.60
I am able to take on various roles as appropriate in different cultures and ethnic settings.	3.67	.73	4.26	.45	3.95	.68
People from other cultures tell me that I am successful at navigating their cultures.	3.38	.67	3.58	.77	3.48	.72
I intentionally involve people from many cultural backgrounds in my life.	3.33	1.07	3.63	.76	3.48	.93
I prefer to work with people who have different cultural values from me.	3.19	.93	3.37	.83	3.28	.88
Most of my friends are from my own ethnic background. [b]	2.24	.70	2.21	.86	2.23	.77

Note.[a]Five-point Likert-type scale: 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree).
[b] Items were reverse-coded for analysis.

Description of students' overall change for GPI summed scales

The summed scales indicate that the respondents reported an increase when comparing pre-test and post-test means had an increase along all six scales (Table 3.10). *Cognitive – Knowing* did not have practical difference while *Cognitive - Knowledge* did have a practical difference. *Intrapersonal – Identity*, *Intrapersonal – Affect*, *Interpersonal - Responsibility* and *Interpersonal - Social Interaction* did not have a practical difference.

Table 3.10

Overall Change for GPI Summed Scales (N = 19)

	Pre-test (n = 21)		Post-test (n = 19)		Total	
Scales	M[a]	*SD*	M[a]	*SD*	M[a]	*SD*
Cognitive Knowing [a]	25.62	2.89	27.74	2.68	26.63	2.96
Cognitive Knowledge [b]	16.86	2.69	19.63	1.46	18.18	2.58
Intrapersonal Identity [c]	24.29	1.79	25.89	1.82	25.05	1.96
Intrapersonal Affect [d]	30.00	4.02	32.37	2.97	31.13	3.72
Interpersonal Responsibility [b]	18.67	3.14	20.11	3.00	19.35	3.12
Interpersonal Social Interaction [a]	24.29	3.44	25.58	3.29	24.90	3.39

Note.[a] Seven items: Strongly Disagree = 7.00–10.50, Disagree = 10.51–17.50, Neutral = 17.51–24.50, Agree = 24.51–31.50, and Strongly Agree = 31.51–35.00.
[b] Five items: Strongly Disagree = 5.00–7.50, Disagree = 7.51–12.50, Neutral = 12.51–17.50, Agree = 17.51–22.50, and Strongly Agree = 22.51–25.00.
[c] Six items: Strongly Disagree = 6.00–9.00, Disagree = 9.01–15.00, Neutral = 15.01–21.00, Agree = 21.01–27.00, and Strongly Agree = 27.01–30.00.
[d] Eight items: Strongly Disagree = 8.00–12.00, Disagree = 12.01–20.00, Neutral = 20.01–28.00, Agree = 28.01–36.00, and Strongly Agree = 36.01–40.00.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Student's progressions among the domains differ, with cognitive knowledge, cognitive knowing, intrapersonal identity, and intrapersonal affect all showing a significant gain. Braskamp and Engberg (2011) and Chickering and Braskamp (2009) found students significantly increased their knowledge about different cultures, these changes are most apparent in the cognitive domain of knowledge.

The knowing domain of cognitive development focuses on student's thinking and learning with regards to their culture and other cultures. The total number of participants indicated severely low means for courses focusing on multicultural issues (M = 1.86, SD = .80), world history (M = 1.33, SD = .1.09), international issues (M = 1.33, SD = 1.07) and foreign language (M = .67, SD = 1.10). To help promote this concept of thinking and learning Andrews and Henze (2009) suggest conducting class sessions before the study abroad program to prepare students and to provide time to cover sufficient course content.

Many studies focus on study abroad shaping students into more globally-minded individuals (Clarke, Flaherty, Wright, & McMillen, 2009), focusing on students' global mindsets (Deloach, Saliba, Smith, & Tiemann, 2008), and development of cross-cultural skills (Anastasia, 2007). Further research is needed to help identify student identity development while participating in study abroad programs. The end of this journey on the intrapersonal dimension is a sense of self-direction and purpose in one's life, becoming more self aware of one's strengths, values, and personal characteristics and sense of self, and viewing one's development in terms of one's self-identity (Braskamp et al., 2011).

With interpersonal responsibility and interpersonal social interaction not showing a significant increase, Braskamp and Engberg (2011) found that after a semester abroad, students demonstrated considerable smaller increases in their social concern for others. In order for students to further increase interpersonal social responsibility, Engberg and Fox (2001) found the relationship between service participation and students' social responsibility to be the most significant finding. The minor gain in social responsibility can potentially be explained by the low mean of participants reporting participation in community service activities ($M = 2.62$, $SD = .97$). Although service learning has typically been used as a strategic device to build local community relationships, such opportunities, when placed in global contexts, have the potential to build the skills and dispositions students need to develop intercultural maturity (Engberg & Fox, 2011).

In order to promote a greater increase in global perspective, recommendations can be made for faculty leading the study abroad programs of goal setting, having awareness of differing personality traits among students participating, and pre-departure readiness. Correlations indicated that students who reported they wanted to study abroad in order to improve their cross-cultural competence and because they had or were interested in developing competency in the subject matter taught, were more likely to report higher levels of cross-cultural skills and global understand than those who did not Kitsantas (2004). Students who were more imaginative, intellectually curious, and tolerant of unconventional values were also goal oriented, in particular with respect to their learning goals (Moghaddam et al., 2009). Readiness for change may also be an important factor to consider, colleges should intentionally structure and sequence opportunities that take into account the developmental readiness of their students (Braskamp & Engberg, 2011).

This research should be expanded and continued to measure the change in global perspective after participating in study abroad programs. Gathering a larger sample of respondents is recommended by using the same study abroad programs over multiple years. Braskamp and Engberg (2011) found that students differ on their global perspective-taking depending on their gender, ethnicity, and age. Demographic characteristics are needed in order for the data to be analyzed, using these sub groups to learn more about the individuals participating and potential changes that can be made from these characteristics.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY & CONCLUSIONS

Education abroad does and can have an important influence on the holistic and global development of students (Chickering & Braskamp, 2009). By increasing students' intercultural sensitivity, it is reasonable to expect that they will be better prepared to address different cultures outside and within the United States (Anderson et al. 2005). Overall benefits of study abroad experiences are (1) personal growth, greater awareness, and appreciation of diversity and other aspects of social life; (2) development of personal and interpersonal skills; (3) career awareness and academic focus; and (4) critical-thinking skills, including the ability to apply academic concepts to an understanding of real-world situations (Jackson & Nyoni, 2012).

This study found that (1) the academic programs were intellectually stimulating; (2) student's individual development consisted of being more receptive to different ideas; and (3) student's increased their global perspective with regards to cognitive and intrapersonal development. These results mimic those of Jackson and Nyoni (2012), Jabbar (2012), Braskamp and Engberg (2011) and Chickering and Braskamp (2009).

Research Implications and Recommendations

In this study 79 % of the students were female and 21% were male; 84% were Caucasian and 16% were Hispanic. There is little diversity among student participation with white females being the majority of partipants; institution's efforts should be made to encourage students to study abroad and to expand their option (Christie & Ragans, 1999).

Limiting factors for student participation in study abroad programs can include financial constraints, time, and individual motivations. More financial assistance from universities, the federal government, and study abroad providers is needed (Bellamy & Weinberg, 2006) to continue the promotion and continuation of unique study abroad programs. Students are pressured by parents and legislators to get their degrees quickly without spending time and money on "frills" (Christie & Ragans, 1999). This mentality needs to change as this does not encourage students to participate in all the opportunities that universities have to offer. Individual motivations including location, safety, and social experiences (He & Chen, 2010) influence students' decision to take part in programs. By tailoring different study abroad programs to different students, university participation has the opportunity to increase.

Further expansion of the course evaluation and GPI can give a more in-depth assessment of the study abroad programs effectiveness. Use of researcher field notes, reflection sessions, and personal interviews (Rodriguez & Roberts, 2011) are encouraged for further review. By having these additional assessment tools, programs can be ever changing along with the students that are participating. In order to get a more holistic assessment of students change in global perspective, the GPI can be integrated with qualitative approaches such as in-depth interviews that allow individuals to express personal feelings more fully (Doyle, 2009).

This research should be expanded and continued to measure the effectiveness of faculty-led study abroad programs and the change in global perspective. Gathering a larger sample of respondents is recommended by using the same study abroad programs over multiple years. With a larger sample, data can be analyzed using different

demographic characteristics and inferential statistics. Further research can also be conducted using other faculty-led study abroad programs from other colleges within Texas A&M University giving a comparison between the two.

Longitudinal research (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009) using the two faculty-led study abroad programs in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences would be useful in analyzing the changes made to the programs year over year. Both the study abroad program evaluation and the GPI test could be administered to the students' participating in these programs.

Practical Implications and Recommendations

Providing a course that is identical to the one that students would take stateside fails to take advantage of the international setting to deliver the distinctive study abroad experience that many students seek (Loroz, 2009). It is the role of education to provide students with experiences that they can apply in a culturally diverse work place (Rodriguez & Roberts, 2011) and prepare students to function in a multicultural world and promote international understanding (Anastasia, 2004).

In order to promote the participation of study abroad programs faculty members and advisors of both the Study Abroad Programs Office and the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences should develop marketing plans to increase and diversify these study abroad programs. With an increase of participation, this will also give the opportunity of additional study abroad programs being added, further increasing the diversification of the university.

Cost constraints (Sobania & Braskamp, 2009; Toncar, Reid, & Anderson, 2006; Briers et al., 2010) hinder the opportunity of students having the chance to gain cultural

awareness and global perspective. To overcome these financial barriers universities can increase the diversity of the student bodies, become more serious about domestic program options (Sobania & Braskamp, 2009), and increase students participation in courses focusing on multicultural issues, world history, international issues and foreign language.

Texas A&M University must produce students that are competent in understanding, talking with, relating to, and working with persons who differ from them politically, socioeconomically, and religiously (Sobania & Braskamp, 2009). It is vital to take these results into consideration in order to make the necessary changes to help promote not only an effective course but also that of cultural awareness, individual development and global perspective.

REFERENCES

Anastasia, K. (2004). Studying abroad: The role of college students' goals on the development of cross-cultural skills and global understanding. *College Student Journal,* 38(3), 441-452.

Anderson, P., Lawton, L., Rexeisen, R., & Hubbard, A. (2005). Short-term study abroad and intercultural sensitivity: A pilot study. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations.* 30, 457-469.

Andrews, D. & Henze, B. (2009). Teaching technical communication to American students in a study abroad program. *Business Communication Quarterly,* 72, 5-20.

Barton, S., Bruck, J., & Nelson, C. (2009).Exploring ways to enhance student learning during study abroad: Landscape exploration of Brazil. *HortTechnology,* 19(2), 459 – 464.

Bellamy, C. & Weinberg, A. (2006). Creating global citizens through study abroad. *New England Board of Higher Education,* 21(2), 20-21.

Box, G., Hunter, W., & Hunter, J. (1978). *Statistics for experimenters: An introduction to design, data analysis, and model building.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Braskamp, L. (2008). Developing global citizens. *Journal of College & Character,* 10(1), 1-5.

Braskamp, L. & Engberg, M. (2011). How colleges can influence the development of a global perspective. *Liberal Education,* 97(3/4), 34-39.

Braskamp, L., Braskamp, D. & Merrill, K. (2009). Assessing progress in global learning and development of students with education abroad experiences. *The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad,* 18, 101-118.

Braskamp, L., Braskamp, D., Merrill, K., & Engberg, M. (2011).*Global Perspective Inventory (GPI): Its purpose, construction, potential uses and psychometric characteristics.* Chicago: Global Perspective Institute.

Briers, G., Shinn, G., & Nguyen, A. (2010). Through students' eyes: Perceptions and aspirations of college of agriculture and life science students regarding international educational experiences. *Journal of International Agricultural and Extension Education,* 17(2), 5-20.

Byrnes, H. (2009). Perspectives. *The Modern Language Journal,* 93, 607-627.

Carlson, J. (1991). Study abroad: The experience of American undergraduates in western Europe and the United States. Occasional papers on international educational exchange research series. New York: Publications Department, Council of International Exchange.

Chickering, A. & Braskamp, L. (2009). Developing a global perspective for personal and social responsibility. *Association of American Colleges and Universities,* 11(4), 27-30.

Chrisite, R. & Ragans, S. (1999). Beyond Borders: A model for student and staff development. *New Direction for Student Services,* 86, 79-87.

Clarke, I., Flaherty, T., Wright, N., & McMillen, R. (2009). Student intercultural proficiency from study abroad programs. *Journal of Marketing Education,* 31(2), 173 – 181.

Coolidge, F. (2006). *Statistics: A gentle introduction*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc.

Deloach, S., Saliba, L., Smith, V., & Tiemann, T. (2008). Developing a global mindset through short-term study abroad. *Journal of Teaching in International business,* 15(1), 37-59.

Dimitrov, D. & Rumrill, P. (2003). Pretest-posttest designs and measurement of change. *Speaking of Research,* 20(2), 159-165.

Doyle, D. (2009). Holistic assessment and the study abroad experience. *The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad,* 18, 143-155.

Engberg, M. & Fox, K. (2011). Exploring the relationship between undergraduate service-learning experiences and global perspective-taking. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice,* 48(1), 85-105.

Festervand, T. & Tillery, K. (2001). Short-term study abroad programs – A professional development tool for international business faculty. *Journal of Education for Business,* 106-111.

Fraenkel, J.R., & Wallen, N.E. (2009). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (7th ed). New York: The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.

He, N. & Chen, R. (2010). College Students' perceptions and attitudes toward the selection of study abroad programs. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration,* 11(4), 347-359.

Ingraham, E. & Peterson, D. (2004). Assessing the impact of study abroad on student learning at Michigan State University. *The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad,* 10, 83-100.

Institute of International Education (2008). *Open Doors 2008: Report on International Educational Exchange.* New York: Institute of International Education.

Institute of International Education. (2009). *Open Doors 2009: Report on International Educational Exchange.* New York: Institute of International Education.

Jabbar, S. (2012). International Education: A case study from the University of Jordan. *Education,* 133(1), 202-220.

Jackson, D., & Nyoni, F. (2012). Reflections on study abroad education: Guidelines on study abroad preparation and process. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment,* 22 (2), 201-212.

Kehl, K., & Morris, J. (2007). 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.

Kitsanta, A. (2004). Studying abroad: The role of college students' goals on the development of cross-cultural skills and global understanding.*College Student Journal,* 38(3), 441-452.

Loroz, P. (2009). Teaching Marketing in study abroad program: Learning and assessment in an internationalized principles of marketing course. *Marketing Education Review,* 19(3), 3-16.

Mapp, S., McFarland, P., & Newell, E. (2007). The effect of a short-term study abroad class on students' cross-cultural awareness. *The Journal of Baccalaureate Social Work,* 13(1), 39-51.

McCabe, L. (1994). The development of a global perspective during participation in semester at sea: A comparative global education program. *Educational Review,* 46(3), 275-286.

McCabe, L. (2001). Globalization and Internationalization: The impact of education abroad programs. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 5(2), 138-145.*

Moghaddam, J., Peyvandi, A. & Wang, J. (2009). The effect of personality traits on the perceived effectiveness of summer study abroad programs: An empirical study in the United States. *International Journal of Management,* 26(3), 426-435.

Nyaupane, G., Paris, C. & Teye, V. (2011). Study abroad motivations, destination selection and pre-trip attitude formation. *International Journal of Tourism Research,* 13, 205-217.

Office of Education Abroad. (2012). *Ohio University Study Abroad Program Evaluation.* Retrieved from https://www.ohio.edu/educationabroad/Pdf/EdAbroadProgramEval.doc

Office of International Programs. (2009). *Study abroad program evaluation survey.* Retrieved from http://oip.washcoll.edu/pdf/SAReturnEvaluation.pdf.

Office of Study Abroad. (2012). *Duke University study abroad summer program evaluation.* Retrieved from http://studyabroad.duke.edu/uploads/userfiles/file/summer%20program%20evaluation%20form.pdf

Perry, B. & Southwell, L. (2011).Developing intercultural understanding and skills: models and approaches, *International Education,* 22(6), 453 - 466.

Rexeisen, R. & Al-Khatib, J. (2009). Assurance of learning and study abroad: A case study. *Journal of Teaching in International Business,* 20(3), 192-207.

Rodriguez, M., & Roberts, G. (2011).Identifying best practices for a successful study abroad program. *Journal of International Agricultural and Extension Education,* 18(1), 19-31.

Sjoberg, S., & Shabalina, O. (2010). More than a sight-seeing trip: enhancing the value in short-term study abroad. *Business Education Innovation Journal,* 2(2), 46-58.

Sobania, N. & Braskamp, L. (2009). Study abroad or study away: It's not merely semanitcs. *Association of American Colleges and Universities,* 11(4), 23-26.

Texas A&M University (2009). *International Education Participation: College Distribution Executive Summary.* Retrieved from http://studyabroad.tamu.edu/_customtags/ct_FileRetrieve.cfm?File_ID=06007175704F70707004007673731C017C0903140F0975056E70760F717D710707057B010401737407

Texas A&M University (2010). *Diversity Report: Analysis of student participation in programs and activities abroad.* Retrieved from http://studyabroad.tamu.edu/_customtags/ct_FileRetrieve.cfm?File_ID=06007175734F707077700C7C0E051C750E7C7214750D75736E0504730700010A717501727A07037B05

Texas A&M University (2012). *Study Abroad Programs Office: Guatemala Agricultural Leadership & Service Learning.* Retrieved from http://studyabroad.tamu.edu/index.cfm?FuseAction=Programs.ViewProgram&Program_ID=12016.

Texas A&M University (2012). *Study Abroad Programs Office: Namibia Technological Change and Agricultural Communications.* Retrieved from

http://studyabroad.tamu.edu/index.cfm?FuseAction=Programs.ViewProgram&Program_ID=12010

Toncar, M., Reid, J., & Anderson, C. (2006). Perceptions and preferences of study abroad. *Teaching in International Business,* 17 (1-2), 61-80.

Wingenbach, G., Boyd, B., Lindner, J., Dick, S., Arispe, S., & Haba, S. (2003). Students' knowledge and attitudes about international agricultural issues. *Journal of International Agricultural and Extension Education,* 10(3), 25-35.

Zhai, L., & Scheer, S. (2002). Influence of international study abroad programs on agricultural college students. *Journal of International Agricultural and Extension Educations,* 9(3), 23-29.

APPENDIX A

STUDY ABROAD SUMMER PROGRAM EVALUATION

Texas A&M University
Agricultural Leadership, Education & Communications
600 John Kimbrough Boulevard
2116 TAMU
College Station, TX77843-2116

Age:
Sex: □ M □ F
Ethnicity: _____
Class standing while abroad: _____
Major: _____
Study Abroad Program: _____
Was this your first study abroad trip: □ Yes □ No
In no, please describe briefly your previous experience(s) abroad:
_____
_____

Orientation

Please indicate your level of satisfaction with your orientation program(s). If you were not able to attend one of these sessions please mark N/A (Not Applicable).

	Extremely Dissatisfied				Extremely Satisfied	N/A
Orientation Sessions	1	2	3	4	5	
General Orientation prior to departure						
Program Specific Orientation prior to departure						
Health and Safety Orientation prior to departure						
Onsite Orientation						

Please list any additional orientation sessions that may have been provided.

	Extremely Dissatisfied				Extremely Satisfied	N/A
Orientation Sessions	1	2	3	4	5	

Language Training/Skills
The language(s) of instruction was (were): _____

If the host country official language is English please skip this section and move on to the Program Academics section.

Before studying abroad I had completed ____ years in high school and ____ years in college of the host country language training.

Please indicate your level of agreement with each statement by checking the appropriate response.

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
My proficiency before the program				
Language training in the program				
My proficiency now				
My preparation for the language aspect of the program was adequate				

Please indicate your level of agreement with each statement by checking the appropriate response.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree
Statements	1	2	3	4	5
I plan to continue study of this language beyond the foreign language requirement of my degree program.					
My foreign language skills have enhanced my career opportunities.					
I would like to live, study or work in a foreign country at some point in the future.					

Program Academics
The course I took was (were): _____

Please indicate your level of agreement with each statement by checking the appropriate response.

The course(s) included:	Not at All	Some	Mostly
Lectures			
Individual or Small Group Tutorials			
Class Discussions			
Field Research			
Field Trips			
Other (describe):			

What advantages did you gain from taking classes in the host country rather than at Texas A&M? _____
_____

Were field trips offered as a part of your academic program? □ Yes □ No
How many were offered? _____
Were they required? _____
How many did you take? _____
Were they relevant? _____
Were they well organized? _____

Assessment of the Academic Program

Please indicate your level of agreement with each statement by checking the appropriate response.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree
Statements	1	2	3	4	5
The Program prerequisites, if any, were relevant.					
The workload was reasonable.					
Instructors were effective.					
Criteria for student evaluation were fair.					
The program was academically challenging.					
Program was intellectually stimulating.					
The same subject matter is addressed at A&M.					
Creative work/ideas were recognized.					
Instructors were stimulating.					
Students were stimulating.					
Grading was adequately explained up front.					
The academic facilities (classrooms, computer labs, libraries, etc.) were adequate for the amount and type of work expected of me.					

Assessment of Program Staff

Please indicate your level of agreement with each statement by checking the appropriate response.

Statements	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree
Please rate the degree to which the program staff:	1	2	3	4	5
Was/were accessible to students					
Was/were responsive to student health/safety issues or concerns					
Was/were able to work effectively with diverse students in groups					
Was/were organized					
Offered an adequate number of activities that were intellectually stimulating					
Facilitated my interaction with the host culture					
Contributed in a positive, supportive fashion to my overall experience					

Individual Development

Please indicate your level of agreement with each statement by checking the appropriate response.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree
Statements	1	2	3	4	5
Study abroad has made me more receptive to different ideas.					
I've gained better insight into myself.					
I have a greater sense of self-confidence.					
I have increased interest in social issues.					
I am more receptive to different ideas and ways of seeing the world.					
My interest in world events has increased.					
My interest in the arts has increased.					
My experience has changed my career plans.					
My tolerance of other people and customs has increased.					
My ability to adapt to new situations has increased.					

Overall Satisfaction

Describe your overall satisfaction with your study abroad experience?

What was the greatest challenge/obstacle you faced on your study abroad trip?

What was your greatest learning experience?

What are the most desirable aspects of the program?

What are the least desirable aspects of the program?

What changes would you make to the program?

How do you plan on using your study abroad experience to help with your career planning?

Before studying abroad, what didn't you know that you wish you had known?

APPENDIX B

Three Forms of the GPI
2011 – 2012

General Student Form
New Student Form
Study Abroad Post Test Form

General Student Form. Students who are undergraduates (or graduate students) would take this form. Students who are taking a pretest as part of their study abroad program would also take this form (e.g., students taking the GPI in December/January just before or during the first week of their semester abroad). This form includes items about their coursework and co-curricular activities during college.

New Student Form. This form is only for students who are taking the GPI as part of their Orientation program during the summer or the first month on campus. This form includes items about their coursework and co-curricular activities during high school.

Study Abroad Post Test Form. Students who are completing a study abroad program or just completed one would take this form. Items about their experiences abroad are included.

Global Perspective Inventory

General Student Form 2011 - 2012

You have been invited to respond to the Global Perspective Inventory. You should be able to complete the survey in 15-20 minutes.

Participation is voluntary. There are no foreseeable risks involved in responding to this survey beyond those experienced in everyday life. By completing the GPI, you are agreeing to participate in research. You are free to stop responding at any time. Confidentiality will be maintained to the degree permitted by the technology used and to the extent allowed by law. No absolute guarantees can be made regarding the confidentiality of electronic data. You will not be identified in anything written about this study.

If you have questions about this survey, please contact us through our website address, gpi.central.edu. If you have questions about your rights as a participant, please contact Central College, Institutional Review Board, Dr. Keith Jones, Campus Mailbox 0109, 812 University, Pella, IA 50219; phone: (641)628-5182.

Please enter the four-digit Access Code provided to you ___ ___ ___ ___ (If applicable)

INSTRUCTIONS: There is no time limit, but try to respond to each statement as quickly as possible. There are no right or wrong answers, only responses that are right for you. You must complete every item for your responses to count. Thank you for your cooperation.

Copyright © 2011 Global Perspective Institute Inc.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. When I notice cultural differences, my culture tends to have the better approach.	SA	A	N	D	SD
2. I have a definite purpose in my life.	SA	A	N	D	SD
3. I can explain my personal values to people who are different from me.	SA	A	N	D	SD
4. Most of my friends are from my own ethnic background.	SA	A	N	D	SD
5. I think of my life in terms of giving back to society.	SA	A	N	D	SD
6. Some people have a culture and others do not.	SA	A	N	D	SD
7. In different settings what is right and wrong is simple to determine.	SA	A	N	D	SD
8. I am informed of current issues that impact international relations.	SA	A	N	D	SD
9. I know who I am as a person.	SA	A	N	D	SD
10. I feel threatened around people from backgrounds very different from my own.	SA	A	N	D	SD
11. I often get out of my comfort zone to better understand myself.	SA	A	N	D	SD
12. I am willing to defend my own views when they differ from others	SA	A	N	D	SD
13. I understand the reasons and causes of conflict among nations of different cultures.	SA	A	N	D	SD
14. I am confident that I can take care of myself in a completely new situation.	SA	A	N	D	SD
15. People from other cultures tell me that I am successful at navigating their cultures.	SA	A	N	D	SD
16. I work for the rights of others.	SA	A	N	D	SD
17. I see myself as a global citizen.	SA	A	N	D	SD
18. I take into account different perspectives before drawing conclusions about the world around me.	SA	A	N	D	SD
19. I understand how various cultures of this world interact socially.	SA	A	N	D	SD
20. I get offended often by people who do not understand my point-of-view.	SA	A	N	D	SD
21. I am able to take on various roles as appropriate in different cultural and ethnic settings.	SA	A	N	D	SD
22. I put my beliefs into action by standing up for my principles.	SA	A	N	D	SD
23. I consider different cultural perspectives when evaluating global problems.	SA	A	N	D	SD
24. I rely primarily on authorities to determine what is true in the world	SA	A	N	D	SD
25. I know how to analyze the basic characteristics of a culture.	SA	A	N	D	SD
26. I am sensitive to those who are discriminated against.	SA	A	N	D	SD
27. I do not feel threatened emotionally when presented with multiple perspectives.	SA	A	N	D	SD
28. I prefer to work with people who have different cultural values from me.	SA	A	N	D	SD
29. I am accepting of people with different religious and spiritual traditions.	SA	A	N	D	SD
30. Cultural differences make me question what is really true.	SA	A	N	D	SD
31. I put the needs of others above my own personal wants.	SA	A	N	D	SD
32. I can discuss cultural differences from an informed perspective.	SA	A	N	D	SD
33. I am developing a meaningful philosophy of life.	SA	A	N	D	SD
34. I intentionally involve people from many cultural backgrounds in my life.	SA	A	N	D	SD
35. I rarely question what I have been taught about the world around me	SA	A	N	D	SD
36. I constantly need affirmative confirmation about myself from others.	SA	A	N	D	SD
37. I enjoy when my friends from other cultures teach me about our cultural differences.	SA	A	N	D	SD
38. I consciously behave in terms of making a difference.	SA	A	N	D	SD
39. I am open to people who strive to live lives very different from my own life style.	SA	A	N	D	SD
40. Volunteering is not an important priority in my life.	SA	A	N	D	SD

41. My age in years, (e.g., 21) __ __

42. My gender is
    a. Female
    b. Male
    c. Other

43. Select the one that best describes your current status.
    a. American student at an American college/university
    b. Non American student at an American college/university
    c. Other

    If answered "b" to item 43, also respond to 43a and 43b.

    43a. How long have you lived in the United States? _____ years [fill-in-the-blank numeric]

    43b. What is your country of origin? _____ [fill-in-the-blank alpha}

    ---

44. Select the one ethnic identity that best describes you:
    a. Multiple Ethnicities
    b. African/African American/Black
    c. Asian/Pacific Islander
    d. European/White
    e. Hispanic/Latino
    f. Native American
    g. I prefer not to respond

45. My status at the college/university in which I am enrolled.

    a. Freshman
    b. Sophomore
    c. Junior
    d. Senior
    e. Graduate student
    f. Faculty
    g. Administration/staff
    h. Other

46. My major field of study is (mark only one)
    a. Agriculture and natural resources
    b. Arts and humanities
    c. Business and Law
    d. Communications and Journalism
    e. Education and Social Work
    f. Engineering
    g. Health and Medical Professions
    h. Physical and Biological Sciences and Math
    i. Social and Behavioral Sciences
    j. Other

47. What was the highest level of formal education for either of your parents?
    a. Less than high school _____
    b. High school graduate _____
    c. Some college, but less than a BA, BS degree ____
    d. College degree_____
    e. Some Graduate school ____
    f. Graduate degree (Masters, Doctorate, MD, etc)___

48. Are you a transfer student at the college or university where you are enrolled?
    a. Yes
    b. No
    c. Not applicable

49. What is your average grade earned in college?

    A or A+___ A-- ___ B+___ B___ C___ D____

Since coming to college, how many courses have you taken in the areas listed below.

50. Multicultural course addressing issues of race, ethnicity, gender, class, religion, or sexual orientation	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more
51. Foreign language course	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more
52. World history course	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more
53. Service-learning course	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more
54. Course focused on significant global/international issues and problems	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more
55. Course that includes opportunities for intensive dialogue among students with different backgrounds and beliefs	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more

Since coming to college, how often have you participated in the following.

56. Participated in events or activities sponsored by groups reflecting your own cultural heritage	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
57. Participated in events or activities sponsored by groups reflecting a cultural heritage different from your own	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
58. Participated in religious or spiritual activities	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
59. Participated in leadership programs that stress collaboration and team work	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
60. Participated in community service activities	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
61. Attended a lecture/workshop/campus discussion on international/global issues	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
62. Read a newspaper or news magazine (online or in print)	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
63. Watched news programs on television or computer	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
64. Followed an international event/crisis (e.g., through newspaper, social media, or other media source)	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
65. Discussed current events with other students	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
66. Interacted with students from a country different from your own	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
67. Interacted with students from a race/ethnic group different from your own	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often

68. Have you ever participated in a living-learning program with a global/international theme?

a. Yes
b. No

69. **Prior to this semester or quarter**, how many quarters/ semesters have you studied abroad?

a. None
b. Short term --summer session, January term
c. One term
d. Two terms
e. More than two terms

70. I have a strong sense of affiliation with my college/university.	SA	A	N	D	SD
71. I feel that my college/university community honors diversity and internationalism.	SA	A	N	D	SD
72. I understand the mission of my college/university.	SA	A	N	D	SD
73. I am both challenged and supported at my college/university.	SA	A	N	D	SD
74. I have been encouraged to develop my strengths and talents at my college/university.	SA	A	N	D	SD
75. I feel I am a part of a close and supportive community of colleagues and friends.	SA	A	N	D	SD

76. Provide your ID number here _____

Global Perspective Inventory
New Student Form 2011 - 2012

You have been invited to respond to the Global Perspective Inventory. You should be able to complete the survey in 15-20 minutes.

Participation is voluntary. There are no foreseeable risks involved in responding to this survey beyond those experienced in everyday life. By completing the GPI, you are agreeing to participate in research. You are free to stop responding at any time. Confidentiality will be maintained to the degree permitted by the technology used and to the extent allowed by law. No absolute guarantees can be made regarding the confidentiality of electronic data. You will not be identified in anything written about this study.

If you have questions about this survey, please contact us through our website address, gpi.central.edu. If you have questions about your rights as a participant, please contact Central College, Institutional Review Board, Dr. Keith Jones, Campus Mailbox 0109, 812 University, Pella, IA 50219; phone: (641)628-5182.

Please enter the four-digit Access Code provided to you ___ ___ ___ ___ (If applicable)

INSTRUCTIONS: There is no time limit, but try to respond to each statement as quickly as possible. There are no right or wrong answers, only responses that are right for you. You must complete every item for your responses to count. Thank you for your cooperation.

Copyright © 2011 Global Perspective Institute Inc.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. When I notice cultural differences, my culture tends to have the better approach.	SA	A	N	D	SD
2. I have a definite purpose in my life.	SA	A	N	D	SD
3. I can explain my personal values to people who are different from me.	SA	A	N	D	SD
4. Most of my friends are from my own ethnic background.	SA	A	N	D	SD
5. I think of my life in terms of giving back to society.	SA	A	N	D	SD
6. Some people have a culture and others do not.	SA	A	N	D	SD
7. In different settings what is right and wrong is simple to determine.	SA	A	N	D	SD
8. I am informed of current issues that impact international relations.	SA	A	N	D	SD
9. I know who I am as a person.	SA	A	N	D	SD
10. I feel threatened around people from backgrounds very different from my own.	SA	A	N	D	SD
11. I often get out of my comfort zone to better understand myself.	SA	A	N	D	SD
12. I am willing to defend my own views when they differ from others	SA	A	N	D	SD
13. I understand the reasons and causes of conflict among nations of different cultures.	SA	A	N	D	SD
14. I am confident that I can take care of myself in a completely new situation.	SA	A	N	D	SD
15. People from other cultures tell me that I am successful at navigating their cultures.	SA	A	N	D	SD
16. I work for the rights of others.	SA	A	N	D	SD
17. I see myself as a global citizen.	SA	A	N	D	SD
18. I take into account different perspectives before drawing conclusions about the world around me.	SA	A	N	D	SD
19. I understand how various cultures of this world interact socially.	SA	A	N	D	SD
20. I get offended often by people who do not understand my point-of-view.	SA	A	N	D	SD
21. I am able to take on various roles as appropriate in different cultural and ethnic settings.	SA	A	N	D	SD
22. I put my beliefs into action by standing up for my principles.	SA	A	N	D	SD
23. I consider different cultural perspectives when evaluating global problems.	SA	A	N	D	SD
24. I rely primarily on authorities to determine what is true in the world	SA	A	N	D	SD
25. I know how to analyze the basic characteristics of a culture.	SA	A	N	D	SD
26. I am sensitive to those who are discriminated against.	SA	A	N	D	SD
27. I do not feel threatened emotionally when presented with multiple perspectives.	SA	A	N	D	SD
28. I prefer to work with people who have different cultural values from me.	SA	A	N	D	SD
29. I am accepting of people with different religious and spiritual traditions.	SA	A	N	D	SD
30. Cultural differences make me question what is really true.	SA	A	N	D	SD
31. I put the needs of others above my own personal wants.	SA	A	N	D	SD
32. I can discuss cultural differences from an informed perspective.	SA	A	N	D	SD
33. I am developing a meaningful philosophy of life.	SA	A	N	D	SD
34. I intentionally involve people from many cultural backgrounds in my life.	SA	A	N	D	SD
35. I rarely question what I have been taught about the world around me	SA	A	N	D	SD
36. I constantly need affirmative confirmation about myself from others.	SA	A	N	D	SD
37. I enjoy when my friends from other cultures teach me about our cultural differences.	SA	A	N	D	SD
38. I consciously behave in terms of making a difference.	SA	A	N	D	SD
39. I am open to people who strive to live lives very different from my own life style.	SA	A	N	D	SD
40. Volunteering is not an important priority in my life.	SA	A	N	D	SD

41. My age in years, (e.g., 21) __ __

42. My gender is
    a. Female
    b. Male
    c. Other

43. Select the one that best describes your current status.
    a. American student at an American college/university
    b. Non-American student at an American college/university
    c. Other

If answered "b" to item 43, also respond to 43a and 43b.

43a. How long have you lived in the United States? _____ years [fill-in-the-blank numeric]

43b. What is your country of origin? _____ [fill-in-the-blank alpha}

44. Select the one ethnic identity that best describes you:
    a. Multiple Ethnicities
    b. African/African American/Black
    c. Asian/Pacific Islander
    d. European/White
    e. Hispanic/Latino
    f. Native American
    g. I prefer not to respond

45. My status at the college/university in which I am enrolled.

    a. Freshman
    b. Sophomore
    c. Junior
    d. Senior
    e. Graduate student
    f. Faculty
    g. Administration/staff
    h. Other

46. My major field of study is (mark only one)
    a. Agriculture and natural resources
    b. Arts and humanities
    c. Business and Law
    d. Communications and Journalism
    e. Education and Social Work
    f. Engineering
    g. Health and Medical Professions
    h. Physical and Biological Sciences and Math
    i. Social and Behavioral Sciences
    j. Other

47. What was the highest level of formal education for either of your parents?
    a. Less than high school _____
    b. High school graduate _____
    c. Some college, but less than a BA, BS degree ____
    d. College degree_____
    e. Some Graduate school ____
    f. Graduate degree (Masters, Doctorate, MD, etc)___

48. Are you a transfer student at the college or university where you are enrolled?
    a. Yes
    b. No
    c. Not applicable

49. What is your average grade earned in high school?

    A or A+___ A-- ___ B+___ B___ C___ D____

In high school, how many courses did you complete in the areas listed below.

50. Multicultural course addressing issues of race, ethnicity, gender, class, religion, or sexual orientation	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more
51. Foreign language course	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more
52. World history course	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more
53. Service-learning course	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more
54. Course focused on significant global/international issues and problems	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more
55. Course that includes opportunities for intensive dialogue among students with different backgrounds and beliefs	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more

In high school, how often have you participated in the following?

56. Participated in events or activities sponsored by groups reflecting your own cultural heritage	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
57. Participated in events or activities sponsored by groups reflecting a cultural heritage different from your own	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
58. Participated in religious or spiritual activities	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
59. Participated in leadership programs that stress collaboration and team work	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
60. Participated in community service activities	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
61. Attended a lecture/workshop/campus discussion on international/global issues	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
62. Read a newspaper or news magazine (online or in print)	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
63. Watched news programs on television or computer	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
64. Followed an international event/crisis (e.g., through newspaper, social media, or other media source)	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
65. Discussed current events with other students	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
66. Interacted with students from a country different from your own	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
67. Interacted with students from a race/ethnic group different from your own	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often

68. Provide your ID number here _____(if requested)

Global Perspective Inventory
Study Abroad Post Test Form 2011 - 2012

You have been invited to respond to the Global Perspective Inventory. You should be able to complete the survey in 15-20 minutes.

Participation is voluntary. There are no foreseeable risks involved in responding to this survey beyond those experienced in everyday life. By completing the GPI, you are agreeing to participate in research. You are free to stop responding at any time. Confidentiality will be maintained to the degree permitted by the technology used and to the extent allowed by law. No absolute guarantees can be made regarding the confidentiality of electronic data. You will not be identified in anything written about this study.

If you have questions about this survey, please contact us through our website address, gpi.central.edu. If you have questions about your rights as a participant, please contact Central College, Institutional Review Board, Dr. Keith Jones, Campus Mailbox 0109, 812 University, Pella, IA 50219; phone: (641)628-5182.

Please enter the four-digit Access Code provided to you ___ ___ ___ ___ (If applicable)

INSTRUCTIONS: There is no time limit, but try to respond to each statement as quickly as possible. There are no right or wrong answers, only responses that are right for you. You must complete every item for your responses to count. Thank you for your cooperation.

Copyright © 2011 Global Perspective Institute Inc.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. When I notice cultural differences, my culture tends to have the better approach.	SA	A	N	D	SD
2. I have a definite purpose in my life.	SA	A	N	D	SD
3. I can explain my personal values to people who are different from me.	SA	A	N	D	SD
4. Most of my friends are from my own ethnic background.	SA	A	N	D	SD
5. I think of my life in terms of giving back to society.	SA	A	N	D	SD
6. Some people have a culture and others do not.	SA	A	N	D	SD
7. In different settings what is right and wrong is simple to determine.	SA	A	N	D	SD
8. I am informed of current issues that impact international relations.	SA	A	N	D	SD
9. I know who I am as a person.	SA	A	N	D	SD
10. I feel threatened around people from backgrounds very different from my own.	SA	A	N	D	SD
11. I often get out of my comfort zone to better understand myself.	SA	A	N	D	SD
12. I am willing to defend my own views when they differ from others	SA	A	N	D	SD
13. I understand the reasons and causes of conflict among nations of different cultures.	SA	A	N	D	SD
14. I am confident that I can take care of myself in a completely new situation.	SA	A	N	D	SD
15. People from other cultures tell me that I am successful at navigating their cultures.	SA	A	N	D	SD
16. I work for the rights of others.	SA	A	N	D	SD
17. I see myself as a global citizen.	SA	A	N	D	SD
18. I take into account different perspectives before drawing conclusions about the world around me.	SA	A	N	D	SD
19. I understand how various cultures of this world interact socially.	SA	A	N	D	SD
20. I get offended often by people who do not understand my point-of-view.	SA	A	N	D	SD
21. I am able to take on various roles as appropriate in different cultural and ethnic settings.	SA	A	N	D	SD
22. I put my beliefs into action by standing up for my principles.	SA	A	N	D	SD
23. I consider different cultural perspectives when evaluating global problems.	SA	A	N	D	SD
24. I rely primarily on authorities to determine what is true in the world	SA	A	N	D	SD
25. I know how to analyze the basic characteristics of a culture.	SA	A	N	D	SD
26. I am sensitive to those who are discriminated against.	SA	A	N	D	SD
27. I do not feel threatened emotionally when presented with multiple perspectives.	SA	A	N	D	SD
28. I prefer to work with people who have different cultural values from me.	SA	A	N	D	SD
29. I am accepting of people with different religious and spiritual traditions.	SA	A	N	D	SD
30. Cultural differences make me question what is really true.	SA	A	N	D	SD
31. I put the needs of others above my own personal wants.	SA	A	N	D	SD
32. I can discuss cultural differences from an informed perspective.	SA	A	N	D	SD
33. I am developing a meaningful philosophy of life.	SA	A	N	D	SD
34. I intentionally involve people from many cultural backgrounds in my life.	SA	A	N	D	SD
35. I rarely question what I have been taught about the world around me	SA	A	N	D	SD
36. I constantly need affirmative confirmation about myself from others.	SA	A	N	D	SD
37. I enjoy when my friends from other cultures teach me about our cultural differences.	SA	A	N	D	SD
38. I consciously behave in terms of making a difference.	SA	A	N	D	SD
39. I am open to people who strive to live lives very different from my own life style.	SA	A	N	D	SD
40. Volunteering is not an important priority in my life.	SA	A	N	D	SD

41. My age in years, (e.g., 21) __ __

42. My gender is
    a. Female
    b. Male
    c. Other

43. Select the one that best describes your current status.
    a. American student at an American college/university
    b. Non-American student at an American college/university
    c. Other

    If answered "b" to item 43, also respond to 43a and 43b.

    43a. How long have you lived in the United States? _____ years [fill-in-the-blank numeric]

    43b. What is your country of origin? _____ [fill-in-the-blank alpha}

    ---

44. Select the one ethnic identity that best describes you:
    a. Multiple Ethnicities
    b. African/African American/Black
    c. Asian/Pacific Islander
    d. European/White
    e. Hispanic/Latino
    f. Native American
    g. I prefer not to respond

45. My status at the college/university in which I am enrolled.

    a. Freshman
    b. Sophomore
    c. Junior
    d. Senior
    e. Graduate student
    f. Faculty
    g. Administration/staff
    h. Other

46. My major field of study is (mark only one)
    a. Agriculture and natural resources
    b. Arts and humanities
    c. Business and Law
    d. Communications and Journalism
    e. Education and Social Work
    f. Engineering
    g. Health and Medical Professions
    h. Physical and Biological Sciences and Math
    i. Social and Behavioral Sciences
    j. Other

47. What was the highest level of formal education for either of your parents?
    a. Less than high school _____
    b. High school graduate _____
    c. Some college, but less than a BA, BS degree ____
    d. College degree_____
    e. Some Graduate school ____
    f. Graduate degree (Masters, Doctorate, MD, etc)___

48. Are you a transfer student at the college or university where you are enrolled?
    a. Yes
    b. No
    c. Not applicable

49. What is your average grade earned in college?

    A or A+___ A-- ___ B+___ B___ C___ D____

50. Have you ever participated in a living-learning program with a global/international theme?
    a. Yes
    b. No

51. **Prior to this semester or quarter**, how many quarters/ semesters have you studied abroad?
    a. None
    b. Short term -- summer session, January term
    c. One semester/quarter
    d. Two semesters/quarters
    e. More than two semesters/quarters

52. How long was your most recent study abroad experience (the one you are just completing or just completed)?
    a. Short term -- summer session, January term
    b. One semester/quarter
    c. Two semesters/quarters

53. Was English the primary language spoken in the country you studied abroad?
    a. Yes
    b. No

54. How often did you speak in the host country's language in the non-language courses?	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
55. How often did you speak in the host country's language outside of the classroom?	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
56. How often did you interact with individuals from the host country outside of the classroom?	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
57. How often did you reflect upon your experiences abroad through writing/journaling as a part of course requirements?	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
58. How often have you shared/discussed with others your experiences abroad?	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
59. How often did you feel immersed in the culture of the host country?	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often

60. Did you stay with a host family while studying abroad?
    a. Yes
    b. No

61. Provide your ID number here _____ (If requested)