

Short-term faculty-led study abroad programs enhance cultural exchange and self-awareness

A. Celeste Gaia

Emory & Henry College: cgaia@ehc.edu

Though many experts argue that semester or year abroad study is the optimal path, short-term programs meet the needs of students who would not otherwise study abroad and can be effective at increasing intercultural competency. The present study describes one type of short-term program—the embedded faculty-led model—and provides evidence that programs of three weeks or less may be practical and affordable. Participants (N=136) in short-term faculty-led study abroad courses completed the Global Perspectives Inventory in a pre-post test format. Results indicated that these short-term programs enhanced participants’ understanding and awareness of other cultures and languages, appreciation of the impact of other cultures on the world, and awareness of their own identity. However, these programs may need to address more fully the value of living in complex situations, respect and acceptance of varying cultural perspectives, and a greater sense of responsibility to others. This model can be used with students from a variety of cultures.

Keywords: short-term study abroad; faculty-led programs; Global Perspectives Inventory; study abroad assessment.

INTRODUCTION

My experience abroad this summer has truly changed my life because I realized just how small we are in such a big world. This broadened my education by showing me just how much there still is to learn, and I brought back a new outlook that a classroom could never teach.

This quote from a student after completing a short-term faculty-led study abroad course program clearly expresses how transformative and educational short-term study abroad can be when well executed. It can be transformative because students view these experiences as life-changing, much as they do long-term ones—they begin to see themselves as part of a larger whole, and come to understand that the world extends beyond county, state, regional, and national boundaries. It is educational because not only do students benefit from the hands-on experiences and applied learning, but they also return to campus as ambassadors of international and cultural education; they teach other students and faculty members about the cultures they have come to know and also how their knowledge of their discipline fits within that context. There is no substitute for study abroad, as we have all heard students tell us. Having an academic experience abroad contributes to students’ personal and academic development by helping them to grow in global and cultural awareness, which is increasingly an institutional goal of particular importance in the 21st century. Studies show that study abroad of varying lengths is related to an increase in graduation rates, academic performance, disciplinary learning, sensitivity to cultural context, self-knowledge, appreciation for cultural differences, and practical travel skills (Sutton & Rubin, 2010; Sutton & Vande Berg, 2007). It also enhances job prospects because employers desire graduates who have experiences that reflect their ability to adapt to unfamiliar situations, interact with a variety of cultures, and exhibit intercultural understanding (AAC&U, 2013). Because of

these documented benefits, colleges and universities should strongly encourage students to participate in study abroad and provide affordable, academically rigorous study abroad experiences. Though many experts argue that semester or year abroad study is the optimal path (e.g., Dwyer, 2004; Medina-Lopez-Portillo, 2004; Ruhter McMillan & Opem, 2004; Zorn, 1996), short-term programs often meet the needs of students who would not otherwise study abroad and such programs can be effective at increasing intercultural competency and communication (e.g., Anderson, Lawton, Hubbard, & Rexeisen, 2005; Chieffo & Griffiths, 2004; Kehl & Morris, 2007-2008). Following is a description of one type of short-term program—the embedded faculty-led model—along with empirical evidence that programs three weeks or less may be a practical and affordable way for students to study abroad. Though this study focused on college students in the United States, this model can be applied with students of varying ages and cultures.

Recent studies have indicated that more than 50 percent of students who study abroad will do so in short-term programs, defined as one to eight weeks in duration (Institute for International Education, 2011). Many of these programs are faculty-directed, often sponsored by the home institution, and are offered during a special term, such as in January or May, or during summer break. More recently, short-term programs are embedded into a course that is offered during the regular semester and contains a study abroad component at the end of the term. Reasons for students choosing short-term programs vary from concerns about the cost of semester abroad programs to reluctance to participate because of involvement in extracurricular activities or athletics. Often students and their parents share concerns about the expense related to long-term study abroad, which is sometimes difficult to predict with currency exchange rates and lack of funding. Students who are completing multiple majors or who attend colleges and universities where required courses are not offered every semester also must carefully schedule semester abroad study. In addition, some students may be generally reticent to travel because they have rarely travelled internationally; it is not uncommon for first generation college students to have very limited experience outside of their home regions. Some students do not feel they can be away from campus for an entire semester due to academic or family obligations or the need for a part-time job to support their education. According to the 2010 National Center for Education Statistics (Snyder & Dillow, 2011), 35 percent of students enrolled in US colleges are over 25 years old, with 15 percent of these over the age of 35. Thirty-eight percent of these non-traditional students have full-time jobs and 27 percent must care for dependents. Therefore, it is particularly difficult for non-traditional students to participate in long-term study abroad programs.

In addition to helping students who may not be able to spend a semester abroad, short-term programs provide a safe and familiar initial exposure to another culture. They are an effective method to strike interest in international education, particularly with first- or second-year students who may later choose to spend a semester abroad. Though long-term study is ideal for foreign language majors, a short-term study course may be useful in helping non-language major students make sense of a general foreign language requirement. As mentioned, these short-term programs clearly meet a need for students who are hesitant and perhaps fearful about international travel, particularly because they involve fellow students and are led by a known faculty member. This is true for students in the US and is also applicable to students in other countries.

There are several models of short-term programs, and institutions must decide what approach will work best for their needs. Described here is the embedded model, involving topical, discipline-based courses with an embedded study abroad component, most often at the end of the semester, but also possible during mid-semester. Much academic and practical preparation is completed on the home campus and then the time abroad is spent highlighting cultural and historical sites, attending lectures, and interacting with the local culture. These types of programs are not new, but

have become increasingly common. For instance, in 2010-2011, over 61 percent of institutions indicated that they had developed new faculty-led programs (IIE/Forum on Education Abroad, 2011).

At a small, private liberal arts college, we have found the embedded model to be most beneficial to our students, faculty, and the institution as a whole. As mentioned above, short-term programs offer students an alternative to semester abroad study. These programs also allow faculty to provide students with an applied experience to help in their learning. Furthermore, because of professional and personal reasons, faculty members may be more likely to lead a two- to three-week study abroad program as compared to one that lasts six to eight weeks. For the institution, short-term programs can be more financially feasible than semester abroad study, particularly for small, private tuition-driven institutions that may suffer from the loss of tuition when a student is abroad for a semester. In addition, these programs are led by faculty members and are considered part of the student and faculty course load. This arrangement keeps program costs down for students, most of whom receive some kind of financial aid to attend the college or university. It also helps limit institutional costs because faculty are teaching the course as part of their regular semester load and do not need to be compensated for an extra course.

We currently have eleven of these courses, most of which meet during the spring semester and study abroad at the end of the spring term. The courses are in: *Tropical Biology* in Costa Rica; *Global Comparative Education* in Brazil; *The Social Psychology of the Holocaust* with study in the Czech Republic and Poland; *Cultural Christian Mission* in El Salvador; *The Emory Odyssey* in Greece; *International Perspectives on Student Leadership* in Guatemala; *Italian Art* in Rome, Florence, Pompeii, and Siena; *Media and Journalistic Practice* in Zambia; *The Wide World of Sport* in varying locations in Western Europe; *Spanish Language and Culture in Latin America/Spain* with study abroad to Peru/Spain; and *Environment and Sustainability* in Belize.

Short-term, faculty-led courses are effective when they include extensive preparatory study and prerequisite learning that helps students to apply their knowledge while abroad. According to Spencer and Tuma (2002), best practices for short-term programs include having clear academic content that is connected with the study abroad. We also believe it is important to focus not only on the topical knowledge base, but also on personal growth and cultural understanding. All of the courses mentioned above include an on-site journal component and time for group reflection, which is facilitated by the faculty leader. Cultural immersion and direct interaction with the individuals who live in the studied culture is essential. The goal of cross-cultural understanding is prominent—even in relation to the disciplinary knowledge base. We also require that faculty leaders make a clear link between the course content and the international experience, and encourage courses that derive from faculty interest and expertise, rather than simply a desire to travel abroad with students. These requirements all fit within Spencer and Tuma's (2002) best practices.

There is evidence that short-term study can be effective at increasing global awareness, as well as intellectual and personal growth (Chieffo & Griffiths, 2004; Gorka & Niesenbaum, 2001; Jurgens & McAuliffe, 2004; Lewis & Niesenbaum, 2005). However, much of this research has examined short-term programs that are four- to eight-weeks in duration. Studies that have examined two- to three-week programs are more limited. Of the studies that have examined shorter programs (three weeks or less), results suggest that such programs may offer needed exposure to other cultures and increase global mindedness (e.g., Festervand & Tillery, 2001; DeLoach, Saliba, Smith, & Tiemann, 2003). Other studies that surveyed alumni to assess long-term global engagement found that there was no difference in those who studied abroad long term and those who spent a few weeks abroad (Paige, Fry, Stallman, Josic, & Jon, 2009). Though some studies indicate that the

longer the study abroad program, the greater the benefits, other research suggests that there are clear positive outcomes of short-term study abroad, including increased global mindedness, cultural awareness, and appreciation for diversity. The goal of the present study was to explore pre-post changes that take place as a result of two- to three-week embedded short-term, faculty-led study abroad experiences.

METHOD

Participants

Participants were 136 college students (86 women, 48 men, 2 missing; Mean age = 21 years) attending a small, private liberal arts college in Southwest Virginia. Table 1 is a description of the participants by gender ethnicity, class status, and field of study. Over 50 percent of students at the college are from within a 100-mile radius, primarily from Southwest Virginia, East Tennessee, and Western North Carolina. The student body is mostly of European/White descent, with the next largest group being Hispanic/Latino. There are equal numbers of African/American and Asian/Pacific Islander students.

Table 1. A Description of Participants by Gender, Ethnicity, Class Status, and Field of Study

	Men %	Women %	Total %
African	0.0	2.3	1.5
African American/Black	6.3	1.2	2.9
Asian/Pacific Islander	0.0	4.7	2.9
European/White	89.6	84.9	85.3
Hispanic/Latino	2.1	0.0	5.1
Native American	0.0	2.3	.70
Other	2.1	4.7	5.1
Seniors	27.1	46.5	53.0
Juniors	43.8	25.6	45.0
Sophomores	25.0	23.3	32.0
First Year	0.0	3.5	3.0
Other	4.2	1.2	2.2
Agriculture/Natural Resources	4.2	3.5	3.7
Arts and Humanities	2.1	2.3	2.9
Business/Law	10.4	11.6	11.0
Education/Social work	0.0	5.8	3.7
Engineering	8.3	2.3	4.4
Health/Medicine	10.4	2.3	5.1
Physical/Biological Sciences/Math	12.5	12.8	12.5
Social/Behavioral Sciences	4.2	0.0	1.5
Other	6.3	7.0	7.4

Materials

The Global Perspectives Inventory. In an effort to determine the impact of the short-term study abroad experiences, we used the Global Perspectives Inventory (GPI) (Braskamp, Braskamp, Merrill, & Engberg, 2011), which we administered online in a pre-post format. The GPI is a 40-item measure that assesses three domains of holistic human development based on the work of Kegan (1994) and later refined in a social-cultural development context by King & Baxter Magolda (2005). The three domains are cognitive (i.e., How do I know?), intrapersonal (i.e., Who

am I?”), and interpersonal (i.e., How do I relate to others?). This theoretical framework considers how individuals grow, change, and develop as they think about the world, explore their identity, and interact with others. The GPI can be used to assess intercultural maturity and communication over a period of time, such as throughout the college years, or in response to a specific experience, such as study abroad. The GPI is appropriate for use with persons of all ages, but may be of particular interest in assessing the effectiveness of campus internationalization efforts with college students.

Within each of the three domains of the GPI are two subscales. In the cognitive domain, the GPI assesses: (a) knowing (i.e., How important is cultural context in judging the importance and value of knowledge?)—sample item: *When I notice cultural differences, my culture tends to have the better approach*; and (b) knowledge (i.e., How much understanding and awareness does a person have about other cultures and languages, as well as the impact of other cultures on the rest of the world?)—sample item: *I understand the reasons and causes of conflict among nations of different cultures*. In the Intrapersonal domain, there are the two subscales: (a) identity (i.e., How aware is a person of his or her own identity and the role that race, ethnicity, and gender play?)—sample item: *I have a definite purpose in my life*; and (b) affect (i.e., How much does a person respect and accept differing cultural perspectives and to what degree does he or she have confidence about living in complex situations?)—sample item: *I often get out of my comfort zone to better understand myself*. Finally, the Interpersonal domain subscales are: (a) social responsibility (i.e., To what extent does a person acknowledge interdependence and concern for others?)—sample item: *I think of my life in terms of giving back to society*; and (b) social interactions (i.e., How comfortable and culturally sensitive is a person when interacting with those who are different and how frequently does this happen?)—sample item: *I intentionally involve people from many cultural backgrounds in my life*. Participants respond using a 5-point Likert-type scale (Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree). Higher scores indicate greater cultural awareness and global perspective. The GPI also examines the extent to which students’ level of commitment to making a difference in the world, working for the concerns of others, and having a purpose in life, as well as a 1-item measure of Global Citizenship (i.e., “I see myself as a global citizen”).

Previous studies have reported test-retest reliability coefficients for the GPI subscales used for short-term study (e.g., 3 weeks or less) ranging from .49 to .81. Coefficient alpha for the individual subscales has ranged from .63 to .75 for previous studies, and .54 to .75 for the present data, indicating a range of weak to moderate internal consistency. According to Nunnally (1978), individual subscale α for previous research and the present study respectively were: cognitive knowing ($\alpha = .63, .61$); cognitive knowledge ($\alpha = .75, .73$); interpersonal identity ($\alpha = .72, .70$); interpersonal affect ($\alpha = .65, .75$); intrapersonal social responsibility ($\alpha = .70, .54$); intrapersonal social interactions ($\alpha = .70, .70$). Validity analyses are ongoing, and preliminary data suggests adequate face and construct validity (Braskamp, Braskamp, Merrill, & Engberg, 2012).

Procedure

Participants completed the pre-test GPI online in a pre-departure session for their course at the beginning of the semester, approximately three months before the study abroad experience. They completed the post-test GPI within two weeks of their return home. The courses and disciplines involved in the present research studied abroad in Australia/New Zealand (Mass Communications), Belize (Environmental Studies), Bulgaria (Theatre/Culture), China (Business), Costa Rica (Biology), Czech Republic/Poland/Hungary (Psychology), Germany (Business), Germany (German), Italy (Art), and Zambia (Mass Communications).

RESULTS

Braskamp, et al. (2011) suggested that an examination of the group mean difference scores between pre- and post-test administration may be more useful for interpreting the impact of study abroad programs on intercultural maturity and communication than are observations of statistically significant differences between means. We focused on group pre- and post-test mean difference scores of at least .10. This magnitude of change occurred on the subscales of cognitive knowing, cognitive knowledge, intrapersonal identity, interpersonal social interactions, and global citizenship (overall M increase = .16). Please see Table 2 for details.

Though we focused on group mean difference pre-post test scores of at least .10 rather than statistically significant differences, as can be seen above, we also wanted to note that one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) indicated statistically significant differences between pre and post means for cognitive knowledge ($p = .02$) and interpersonal identity ($p = .03$), confirming that the greatest pre-post change take place on these dimensions. Means and differences scores can be seen in Table 2.

Braskamp, et al. (2011) established pre-post data mean change norms for study abroad. A comparison of mean difference scores from the present study to the comparison sample revealed that the present findings are consistent with difference scores on five of the six subscales. See Table 3 for these results.

Table 2. Pre- and post-study abroad GPI subscale means and difference scores

Subscale	Pre M (SD)	Post M (SD)	Difference	F	p
Cognitive: Knowing	3.57 (.45)	3.72 (.44)	.15 [◇]	3.18	.08
Cognitive: Knowledge	3.39 (.60)	3.65 (.66)	.26 [◇]	5.43*	.02
Intrapersonal: Identity	3.85 (.50)	4.05 (.49)	.20 [◇]	4.77*	.03
Intrapersonal: Affect	3.80 (.46)	3.88 (.43)	.08	.83	.36
Interpersonal: Social Responsibility	3.71 (.45)	3.78 (.46)	.07	.642	.43
Interpersonal: Social Interactions	3.57 (.40)	3.70 (.45)	.13 [◇]	3.06	.08
Well-Being	3.79 (.44)	3.82 (.40)	.03	.06	.80
Global Citizenship	3.68 (.43)	3.78 (.43)	.10 [◇]	1.07	.30

[◇] = Post-mean increase \geq .10. * $p < .05$. $df = 1, 135$ for six subscales. $df = 1, 99$ for well-being and global citizenship.

Table 3. A Comparison of pre-post study mean change of E&H Students vs. national norms

Subscale	National	E&H
Cognitive: Knowing	.11 [◇]	.15 [◇]
Cognitive: Knowledge	.27 [◇]	.26 [◇]
Intrapersonal: Identity	.15 [◇]	.20 [◇]
Intrapersonal: Affect	.13 [◇]	.08
Interpersonal: Social Responsibility	.06	.07
Interpersonal: Social Interactions	.13 [◇]	.13 [◇]

[◇] = Post-mean increase \geq .10. National $N = 700$.

DISCUSSION

Results suggest that the embedded short-term, faculty-led study abroad programs examined here enhanced participants' understanding and awareness about other cultures and languages, as well

as the impact of other cultures on the rest of the world (i.e., cognitive knowledge). Furthermore, participants reported an increased awareness of their own identity and factors that may influence their self-perceptions, such as race, ethnicity, and gender (i.e., intrapersonal identity). Smaller, but notable change indicated that participation in these short-term programs was related to increasing the likelihood that students would consider the role of cultural context in judging the importance of knowledge (i.e., cognitive knowing) and being somewhat more culturally sensitive and willing to interact with those who are different (i.e., interpersonal social interactions). A more limited change occurred in participants being more likely to view themselves as global citizens after their study abroad experience. Findings are consistent with the changes in mean norms found in previous studies (e.g., Braskamp, et al. 2011).

Considering the demographic characteristics of the sample, with most students living in homogenous counties in southwest Virginia, it is not surprising that, after their study abroad experience, participants reported more understanding and awareness of other cultures and the role of these cultures in world events as compared to before. For some participants, the short-term study abroad program provided their first time to travel outside the region, fly on an airplane, and be immersed in a culture other than their own. Prior to their study abroad experience, students may have been limited in their understanding and awareness of diverse cultures and languages, as well as the impact of other cultures on the rest of the world because few had previously had the opportunity to experience another culture and be immersed in a foreign language.¹ It is possible that once they came to understand the powerful social and cultural factors in the lives of people in other cultures, they were able to explore their own sense of self and consider what factors shaped their own identity. Perhaps the short-term programs studied here enhanced participants' cultural awareness and understanding, as well awareness of their own diversity.

Another source of change was in participants' willingness to interact with persons from cultures other than their own. This finding is consistent with previous research that indicates that short-term programs can increase cultural sensitivity and desire for interaction (e.g., Anderson, et al., 2005; Chieffo & Griffiths, 2004; Kehl & Morris, 2007-2008). It makes sense that participants would grow in this area of interpersonal development because they may have limited face-to-face contact with individuals sharing a different cultural heritage from their own and few real opportunities to consider their own place in the world while spending time in another culture. Short-term programs should continue to promote an understanding of cultural diversity as part of the on-campus curriculum and then emphasize interactions with the local community while abroad. For these programs to be most effective, the focus on cultural understanding and awareness should hold as much importance as the disciplinary topic of the course.

Less movement from pre- to post-test was on the developmental domains of intrapersonal affect (i.e., participants' respect and acceptance of differing cultural perspectives and confidence about living in complex situations) and social responsibility (i.e., the extent to which they acknowledged interdependence and concern for others). Although previous studies using the GPI have indicated intrapersonal affect to be enhanced after study abroad (e.g., Braskamp et al., 2011), it was not the case in the present study. One explanation is that students may have already been at a high level of intrapersonal affect because they attended a college with a strong liberal arts tradition, which fosters an understanding of cultural context and how it plays a role in a culture's knowledge and values. However, students' mean score on intrapersonal affect was closer to the mid-point on the scale rather than at the highest level, suggesting that there was room for

¹ In a 2012 survey of all E&H students, approximately 50% reported they had not traveled outside North America.

movement. An alternative explanation is that the short-term programs studied here emphasized *contact* with other cultures more so than an *understanding of the complexity* of cultures and the *value of learning to adapt to unfamiliar situations* suggesting that the short-term programs studied here are less effective at helping students to increase on these dimensions. Overall, it appeared that though participants were more likely to grow in their *thinking* about the influence of other cultures and *willingness to interact* with those who are different after their experiences abroad, they did not experience great change in the degree to which they accepted cultural differences and their willingness to live in a complex setting. Whether students need less growth in these areas or the programs need to specifically address these two dimensions should be considered for subsequent program offerings.

The limited change on interpersonal social responsibility is consistent with previous studies using the GPI. This may be explained by recognizing that many colleges and universities today include service and social responsibility as part of their missions. This is particularly true of the college attended by participants in the present study. Service is clearly part of the college mission and many courses require service learning and students are encouraged to give back to the community. However, similar to interpersonal affect, mean scores on social responsibility were closer to the mid-point rather than to the highest possible score. If a college has a goal to increase international social responsibility, then it may be the case that these short-term programs need a stronger focus on serving others abroad. Perhaps the growing number and popularity of service-learning programs abroad address the goal of increasing students' international social responsibility. Future research could compare the sense of social responsibility reported by those who participate in traditional short-term study abroad programs versus those who take part in programs centred on service-learning.

Overall, participants *increased* in their *cognitive* consideration of cultural context and the realization of other cultures in the global scene. They also *increased* in the *intrapersonal* aspect of understanding the complexity of identity and the *interpersonal* aspect of desiring increased social interactions with others who are different; however, they learned less about accepting cultural differences and acknowledging interdependence with others. There was also some evidence that they came to see themselves more as global citizens, considering themselves as part of something beyond their state, region, and nation. Therefore, short-term experiences such as the ones described above may increase cultural awareness and engagement and the likelihood that participants will realize they are part of something beyond the local context, as well as encouraging students to examine their own cultural identity. However, these programs may need to address more fully the value of living in complex situations, respect and acceptance of varying cultural perspectives, and a greater sense of responsibility to others. Furthermore, the difference between the comparison sample and the responses of the participants in the present study may reflect geographical and/or regional differences that should be explored.

Though the GPI is widely used as a measure of the development of global perspective and is solidly grounded in theory, caution should be used in the interpretation of results because limited factor analytic work has been conducted with subscale items. Moreover, the internal consistency of the subscales in the present study ranged from somewhat weak to moderately reliable, suggesting again that the results must be interpreted keeping in mind the limitations of the existing psychometric properties. In addition, further validity studies could add to the confidence of conclusions derived from work with the GPI. Until this psychometric work has progressed, the current data should be considered primarily in light of previous norms established for mean change scores using larger samples. With this in mind, data from the present study are meaningful because they are largely consistent with pre-established norms. Furthermore, the present study

adds to previous research using this instrument and provides additional data to be used in considering the reliability and validity of the scale.

Due to the aforementioned documented benefits of study abroad, both personally and professionally (e.g., Sutton & Rubin, 2010; Sutton & Vande Berg, 2007), we strongly encourage colleges and universities to provide a variety of international opportunities to students. Future studies could examine learning outcomes associated with different types of programs, adding to previous work in this area. Furthermore, a more thorough understanding of the role of academic and practical pre-departure preparation for short-term programs in student learning is worthy of study, as is work in helping students to process their experience upon return. Future research also could explore how short-term programs such as those described here could be used with students in a variety of cultures and disciplines. Because these programs are more affordable, they may be more accessible to international students who could not study abroad otherwise. Using the GPI cross-culturally could add to the understanding of how students from other cultures may experience growth through international education and also establish a baseline of their knowledge and understanding of culture and self in comparison to students in the US.

CONCLUSIONS

Though the present study is limited in sample size and scope, we cannot discount the growth that occurred in students following a semester-long on-campus course with a two- to three-week embedded study abroad experience following. In addition, results are relatively consistent with findings from large-scale studies, suggesting that the change that occurred in the present sample is similar to the change that happens with other students. Findings of the present study demonstrated that short-term study abroad experiences might increase participants' hands-on knowledge of other cultures and languages, as well as their frequency of interaction with cultures outside their own: both are attributes that lead to higher levels of cultural understanding and global perspective, skills desired by future employers.

Though long-term programs remain a particularly valuable academic experience for which short-term programs will never be a substitute, if the goal is to increase cultural awareness and understanding, then short-term programs may be an effective and practical option. In fact, participation in short-term programs may provide students with the knowledge and confidence to pursue a long-term experience abroad. We recommend that colleges and universities continue to provide short-term study abroad experiences, particularly considering that many students and faculty may not have the time or financial means to participate in long-term programs. In order to develop greater cultural awareness and appreciation, these programs must include intentional pre-departure work in understanding the complexity of culture, and students must have real interactions with those from cultures other than their own when they are abroad (Spencer & Tuma, 2002).

These short-term programs, where students spend time abroad with familiar faculty and students, may serve certain student populations well, particularly if they have not had previous opportunities for international travel or are hesitant to travel on their own. It is also critical that colleges and universities identify goals and objectives for study abroad so that programs can specifically address expected outcomes. Short-term programs also could include applied experiences that will benefit graduates as they apply for graduate study or employment. Overall, short-term programs are a meaningful international study opportunity with clear benefits and should be seriously considered as students prepare for professional lives in the 21st century.

REFERENCES

- The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U; 2013). *It takes more than a major: Employer priorities for college learning and student success*. An online survey among employers conducted on behalf of: The Association of American Colleges and Universities by Hart Research Associates. Retrieved from https://www.aacu.org/sites/default/files/files/LEAP/2013_EmployerSurvey.pdf
- Anderson, P. H., Lawton, L., Rexeisen, R. J., & Hubbard, A. C. (2006). Short-term study abroad and intercultural sensitivity: A pilot study. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 30(4), 457-469.
- Braskamp, L. A., Braskamp, D. C., Merrill, K. C., & Engberg, M. E. (2011). *Interpretive guide and norms for Global Perspective Inventory (GPI)*. Retrieved from <https://gpi.central.edu/index.cfm?myAction=Guide>
- Braskamp, L. A., Braskamp, D. C., Merrill, K. C., & Engberg, M. E. (2012). *The Global Perspective Inventory (GPI): Its Purpose, Construction, Potential Uses and Psychometric Characteristic*. Retrieved from <http://gpi.central.edu/supportDocs/manual.pdf>
- Chieffo, L., & Griffiths, L. (2004). Large-scale assessment of student attitudes after a short-term study abroad program. *Journal of Study Abroad*, 10, 165-177.
- Deloach, S., Saliba, L., Smith, V., & Tiemann, T. (2003). Developing a global mindset through short-term study abroad. *Journal of Teaching International Business*, 15(1), 37-59. doi: 10.1300/J066v15n01_04
- Dwyer, M. M. (2004). More is better: The impact of study abroad duration. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 10, 151-163.
- Festervand, T. A., & Tillery, K. R. (2001). Short-term study abroad programs—A professional development tool for international business faculty. *Journal of Education for Business*, 77(2), 106-111. doi: 10.1080/08832320109599058
- Gorka, B., & Niesenbaum, R. (2001). Beyond the language requirement: Interdisciplinary short-term study-abroad. *Hispania*, 84(1), 100-109.
- Institute of International Education. (2011). Duration of U.S. Study Abroad, 2000/01-2009/10. *Open Doors Report on International Educational Exchange*. Retrieved from <http://www.iie.org/opendoors>
- Institute for International Education (IIE) and Forum on Education Abroad (2011, November). *Survey of study abroad enrollments during academic year 2010/11*. Retrieved from <http://www.iie.org/Who-We-Are/News-and-Events/Press-Center/Press-Releases/2011/2011-11-14-Open-Doors-Fall-Survey-Study-Abroad>
- Jones, L. (1994). *Appalachian values*. Ashland, KY: The Jesse Stuart Foundation.
- Jurgens, J. C., & McAuliffe, G. (2004). Short-term study-abroad experience in Ireland: An exercise in cross-cultural counseling. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, 26 (2), 147-161. doi:10.1023/B:ADCO.0000027427.76422.1f
- Kegan, R. (1994). *In Over Our Heads: The Mental Demands of Modern Life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Kehl, K., & Morris, J, (2007-2008). Differences in global-mindedness between short-term and semester-long study abroad participants at selected universities. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 15, 67–79.
- King, P. M. & Baxter Magolda, M. B. (2005). A developmental model of intercultural maturity. *Journal of College Students Development*, 46 (6), 571-592.
- Lewis R. L., & Billings D. B. (1997). Appalachian culture and economic development. *Journal of Appalachian Studies*, 3(1), 43–69.
- Medina-Lopez-Portillo, A. (2004). Intercultural learning assessment: The link between program duration and the development of intercultural sensitivity. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 10, 179–200.
- Niesenbaum, R. A. & Lewis, T. L. (2005). Extending the stay: Using community-based research and service learning to enhance short-term study abroad. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 9(3), 251-264.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Paige, R. M., Fry, G.W., Stallman, E., Josic, J., & Jon, J. (2009, February). *Study abroad for global engagement: Results that inform research and policy agendas*. Paper presented at the Forum on Education Abroad Conference, Portland, OR.
- Ruhter McMillan, A., & Opem, G. (2004). Study abroad: A lifetime of benefits. *Abroad View Magazine*, 6(2), 58, 60-61.
- Spencer, S.E. & Tuma, K. (Eds.). (2002). *The guide to successful short-term programs abroad*. Washington, DC: NAFSA: Association of International Educators.
- Snyder, T. D., & Dillow, S .A. (2011). *Digest of Education Statistics, 2010*. National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2011015>
- Sutton, R. C. & Rubin, D. L. (2010, February). *Documenting the impact of study abroad: A final report of the GLOSSARI project*. Presentation at the annual meeting of the Association of International Education Administrators, Washington, D.C.
- Sutton, R. C. & Vande Berg, M. (2007, May). *Changes that occur abroad: Measuring the impact of our programs*. Presentation at the annual meeting of NAFSA, Minneapolis, MN.
- Zorn, C. R. (1996). The long-term impact on nursing students of participating in international education. *Journal of Professional Nursing*, 12(2), 106–110.