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SESSION OVERVIEW

- Welcome & introductions
- Major research trends on short-term education abroad, notable gaps, and needed directions
- Global Engagement Measurement Scale (GEMS)
- Global Engagement Survey (GES)
- Discussion and application
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Over 63% of all students participate in programs of less than 8 weeks.
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What are the implications of this research for what we know and need to know about short-term education abroad?
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What we know and need to know about short-term education abroad:
A concise review of the literature.
HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF U.S. EDUCATION ABROAD RESEARCH

- **1950s**, Research began to emerge
- **1970s**, About 189 research studies
- **1990s**, 675 research studies
- **1990s**, Frontiers & JSIE launched
- **2001**, Forum on Education Abroad founded
- **2007**, Forum Guide to Outcomes Assessment published
- **2015**, Numerous Publications on EA Research
CATEGORIZATION OF RESEARCH TRENDS

Single Domain
(Second language acquisition, ICC, etc.)

Multiple Domains
(Identity development, attitude & behavioral change, disciplinary learning, etc.)

Longitudinal Studies
(Career impact, educational impact, language utilization, etc.)

Internal Variables
(Gender, language proficiency, previous experience, etc.)

Program/Enrollment Variables
(Duration, housing type, language of instruction, academic enrollment type, etc.)

Predictor Variables & Outcomes
(Retention & persistence, alumni development, workforce development, etc.)
## MAJOR RESEARCH TRENDS IN SHORT-TERM EDUCATION ABROAD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming &amp; Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Characteristics &amp; Demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Choice &amp; Decision Making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline Specific Programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTABLE GAPS AND NEEDED RESEARCH
NEEDED RESEARCH ON SHORT-TERM EDUCATION ABROAD

- Cohort Development
- Faculty & Student Interaction
- Curriculum Integration
- Healthcare Professions
- Embedded & Alternative Service Breaks
- Host Community Impact
- Interdisciplinary Teaching and Learning
RESEARCH LIMITATIONS

- Self-Selection
- Sample Size
- Experimental Design
- Generalizability
- Data Accessibility
- Terminology
THINGS TO KEEP IN MIND

- Be cautious when using self-reporting instruments.
- Correlation doesn’t mean causation.
- Avoid using the scale of most convenience.
- There is no one size fits all study.
- Differentiate evidence and anecdote.
- Avoid comparing institutional EA data with national datasets.
- Control accordingly and be mindful of confounding variables.
UNTESTED CLAIMS & CASUAL ASSUMPTIONS

- Longer is better!
- Some international education is better than none at all!
- One size fits all!
# ASSESSMENT & INSTRUMENTATION

## LANGUAGE LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT
- Language Strategies Survey  
  Cohen & Chi, 2001
- Oral Proficiency Interview & Simulated OPI  
  ACTFL, 1999
- Speech Act Measure  
  Cohen & Shively, 2003

## CULTURE LEARNING AND INTERCULTURAL DEVELOPMENT
- Beliefs, Events, and Values Inventory  
  Shealy, 2004
- Bicultural Involvement Questionnaire  
  Szapocznik, Kurintes & Fernandez, 1980
- Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory  
  Kelley & Myers, 1999
- Cross-Cultural World-Mindedness Scale  
  Der-Karabetian & Metzer, 1993
- Intercultural Adjustment Potential Scale  
  Matsumoto et al, 2001
- Intercultural Conflict Style Inventory  
  Hammer, 2002
- Intercultural Development Inventory  
  Hammer & Bennett, 1999, 2002
- Intercultural Effectiveness Scale  
  The Kozai Group, Inc.
- Sociocultural Adjustment Scale  
  Ward & Kennedy, 1999
- Strategies Inventory for Learning Culture  
  Page, Rong, Zhang, Kappler, Hoff, & Emert, 2003

## DISCIPLINARY LEARNING
- Disciplinary Learning Interview Protocol  
  Hammer, Malone, & Paige (in press)
- Academic Development Scale  
  Ogden, 2010

## GLOBAL KNOWLEDGE & AWARENESS
- Global Perspectives Inventory  
  Braskamp, Braskamp, and Merrill, 2009
- Global Awareness Profile  
  Corbitt, 1998
- Global Citizenship Scale  
  Morais & Ogden, 2011; Ogden, 2010
- Global Competencies Inventory  
  The Kozai Group, Inc.
- Global Competence Aptitude Assessment  
  Hunter, White, & Godbey, 2006
Global Engagement Measurement Scale (GEMS)
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85% on 65 short-term faculty-led programs
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Wide variety of countries and academic disciplines

Study abroad staff = 10

UD undergrads = 17,000
GLOBAL ENGAGEMENT MEASUREMENT SCALE

- home grown instrument*
- administered online pre and post to all students on UD global study programs
- 43 quantitative items (4-point Likert scale)
- one reflective short answer
- general enough to be applicable to all programs

*credit to UD psychology Ph.D. student Noel Shadowen
949 GEMS RESPONDENTS
JANUARY 2016

Gender
- male
- female

Class
- freshman
- sophomore
- junior
- senior

Program Type
- English-speaking
- lang. study
- non-Engl/no lang.
GEMS CONSTRUCTS

Knowledge of Host Site (KN)
Ambiguity Tolerance (AT)
Global Cultural Engagement (CE)
Diversity Tolerance (DTF and DTS*)
Resilience (RE)

*two scales related to friends (F) and siblings (S)
Same results as 2015 and preliminary analyses for 2017. Short-term programs can effect change!

Resilience hypothesis: Students over-estimate their ability to cope with challenges abroad.
ambiguity tolerance and diversity tolerance (friends):
- no difference among groups’ pre scores
- greatest change among “non-Engl./no lang. group” (p<.05)

Ambiguity & Diversity Tolerance hypothesis:

Students who don’t study the local language have to get by without any/little ability to communicate, hence more tolerance for ambiguity and understanding for “other”.
Host-site Knowledge:

- non-Engl/no lang = highest pre score
- no significant difference in change score (all groups reported equal increase in knowledge)

Host-site Knowledge hypothesis:
Uncertain – needs more study.

- Better preparation by faculty directors?
- Student demographic factors (major, class year)?
Cultural Engagement

- FL students = significantly higher pre scores
- no significant difference in change score (all groups reported equal increase in cultural engagement attitudes)

Cultural Engagement hypothesis:

Students pursuing language study may be initially more interested in theme of cultural engagement, perhaps due to content of on-campus language courses.
NOW WHAT?

- further groupwise comparison, for example:
  - traditional courses vs. internship
  - 5-week, 2-course model vs. 3-week, 1 course model
- compare short vs. semester program results
- qualitative analysis of short-answer responses
- GEMS results for Delaware Diplomats (ed. abroad scholarship program requiring pre-departure global engagement on campus)
Global Engagement Survey (GES)
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ASSESSING GLOBAL LEARNING

Considering critical thinking, intercultural capacities, and civic engagement through engaged global learning at home and abroad

GLOBAL ENGAGEMENT SURVEY
Summer 2016
AAC&U Global Learning

- Civic learning
- Critical thinking
- Intercultural learning
Mixed Methods

The Global Engagement Survey
globalsl.org

- **Global Learning**
  - Civic Engagement
  - Critical Thinking
  - Intercultural Competence

- **31 Likert Items, 4 Scales:** Efficacy, Political Voice, Advocacy and Activism, Conscious Consumption
- **8 Likert Items**
- **20 Likert Items, 2 Scales:** Self-Awareness, Intercultural Communication

- **6 Open-Ended Questions**
- **4 Open-Ended Questions**
- **6 Open-Ended Questions**
Multi-institutional assessment tool that employs quantitative and qualitative methods to better understand relationships among program variables and student learning, specifically in respect to global learning goals identified by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U, 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intercultural Competence – Communication</th>
<th>ICC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Competence – Self-awareness</td>
<td>ICSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Engagement – Efficacy</td>
<td>CEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Engagement – Political Voice</td>
<td>CEPV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Engagement – Conscious Consumption</td>
<td>CECC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Engagement – Values</td>
<td>CEV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Reflection</td>
<td>CR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Learning Outcome</td>
<td>Closed items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intercultural competence</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication (ICC)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-awareness (ICSA)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civic Engagement</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values (CEV)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy (CEE)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political voice (CEPV)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy &amp; activism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscious consumption (CECC)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical reflection (CR)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Completed pre-surveys: 241
Completed post-surveys: 200
Matched cases: 107

Scales: Pre - Post mean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Pre mean</th>
<th>Post mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICSA</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEE</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEPV</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CECC</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEV</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ICC
Intercultural competence - Communication

ICSA
Intercultural competence – Self-awareness

CEE
Civic Engagement - Efficacy

CECC
Civic Engagement – Conscious Consumption
Lower student scores on CEE & CEPV were more likely in programs where the program leader was visiting the host community for the first time.

The students who had experience where the entire experience was outside the US without pre or post coursework in the U.S. scored lower on ICC, CEPV, CEV, & CR.

Higher student scores on CEPV and CR scales when the program leader does not travel to the site with students*.

Summer course with pre and post coursework (vs. only summer course) was significantly higher on CEPV, CR, and ICC scales.

SL vs non-SL showed significant effect on CECC, CEPV, CEV, CR, and ICC. SL was higher on all five scales than non-SL.
QUALITATIVE FINDINGS

- Structural and systemic factors relating to cultural differences

- Frequency of comments on diversity focused on politics and religion

- Feelings of cynicism regarding political participation

- Adapting communication and behavior in different cultural settings...many examples about transitioning to the cultural context of their university.

- Current political context in the U.S.*
1. Applications to programming and pedagogy
2. Faculty development seminars
3. Curricular innovation and experimentation

So what?
- Increase #s, more institutional partners → statistical analyses
- Include programs during academic year → increase #s, partners, & program factors
- Data over multiple years → additional analyses now & future
- More partners → improve multi-institutional comparisons with attention to peer institutions
What are the implications of this research for what we know and need to know about short-term education abroad?
WHAT DOES THE FUTURE HOLD FOR U.S. EDUCATION ABROAD PROFESSIONALS?

Will education abroad professionals be seen as logistics experts (aka, a student travel agency) that handles risk management, health and safety, compliance, inbound/outbound travel, etc?

Will education abroad professionals be seen as educators with expertise on program design, student learning pedagogy, outcomes assessment, collaborating with faculty, curriculum integration, etc?
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