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This study focuses on the experiences and perceptions of faculty members who develop and lead study abroad programs for students enrolled in higher education institutions. Through qualitative case study inquiry, four questions are answered. First this study explores what motivates faculty members to become involved in the development and implementation of short-term study-abroad programs. Second, faculty identify what was involved in creating and leading the short-term, faculty-led program including what obstacles they encountered and what helped overcome them. Third, these faculty shared their perceptions of what students gained from participating in the program. Finally, this study investigates what institutions could do to better support faculty in the development and implementation of short-term study-abroad programs. Kolb’s Experiential Learning Theory serves as the theoretical framework for this constructivist research design and provides a lens for data analysis and interpretation throughout this study. Interviews were held with ten participants, and interview transcripts were analyzed using in vivo and values coding. The results of this study give voice to faculty members and inform institutions on how to use policy and practice in a way that further supports faculty in developing educational exchanges abroad for students.
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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

International education continues to transform universities and the academic profession as institutions strive to become active participants and leaders to keep up with a new globalized industry. Informed by diverse disciplines, internationalization is now high on the priority list for universities around the world (Hudzik, 2015). Knowledge production has moved from being a national enterprise to a global enterprise, which motivates institutions to cultivate an international perspective among students and the workforce. Developed and developing nations are investing in their national systems of higher education as key instruments of human resource development and their future economic competitiveness (Finkelstein, Huang, & Rostan, 2014). In doing this, institutions are incorporating an international dimension to strategic planning (Hudzik, 2015).

In this increasingly globalized economy, higher education institutions have a responsibility to provide students with transformative learning experiences that will help them gain global perspectives and prepare them for a global marketplace (Hulstrand, 2016). Employers seek students who are able to work effectively with diverse teams and networks that span international borders. For students to make themselves more competitive in a global workforce, they seek ways to engage in cultural exchanges and take part in study abroad experiences as they pursue their field of study in higher education. Students believe that studying abroad increases their ability to secure job interviews, receive job offers, and enhance career progression (Anderson, Hubbard, & Lawton, 2015).

In addition, there is a growing awareness that intercultural competence is necessary for living and working in today’s diverse population (Hudzik, 2015). The rising demand for graduates who have international and intercultural experiences, coinciding with the need for a
workforce with global perspectives, has been a key driver underlying the efforts of college and university leaders to develop an internationalization agenda (Hudzik, 2015). With this rising momentum for internationalization in higher education, it is important for university leaders to learn how to implement programs that promote cultural exchanges to facilitate international learning opportunities for all students. Study abroad programs are central to this effort.

Among the many forms of study abroad opportunities, faculty-led programs have become increasingly prevalent. Keese and O’Brien (2011) define faculty-led programs as a special type of study abroad opportunity in which faculty develop a safe, cost effective, structured, and academically rigorous international experience for students while accompanying them as trip leaders and teachers. This type of program provides faculty the opportunity to engage students in critical learning and life-changing experiences as they learn about the world firsthand. According to Hulstrand (2016), creating faculty-led programs abroad is a way to encourage students to engage in international experiences who might not have otherwise had the opportunity to do so. These programs are relatively short (eight weeks or less) and take the form of a course in the student’s major. Hence, they constitute a lower-cost study-abroad opportunity while allowing faculty and students to apply disciplinary content in international settings. They are short but intensive and contribute to the broader internationalization of college campuses.

**Problem Statement**

Over the past decade, a growing number of qualitative and quantitative studies have provided insights on faculty-led study abroad, including an investigation of experiential and transformative learning in study-abroad programs (Strange and Gibson, 2017), a study analyzing transformative experiences of instructor-led engagement and immersion programs (Graham and Crawford, 2012), and an examination of cultural identification within faculty-led study abroad
(Lee and Negrelli, 2018). However, these studies do not thoroughly investigate the experiences of those who develop and lead international exchanges for students. Specifically, researchers have yet to thoroughly investigate how faculty members perceive their work developing study-abroad programs for students. A qualitative study is essential to examine what motivates faculty to develop and lead study-abroad programs and to understand the challenges they face along the way.

**Purpose and Significance of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to examine faculty perceptions of their work leading short-term study-abroad programs, investigating what motivates faculty members to do this work, the challenges they face, and their understanding of how these programs can be made more meaningful for students. This research addresses gaps in empirical and practitioner literature on faculty-led study-abroad programs. This study is significant because it adds to the body of scholarship on this topic by allowing faculty members to share their experiences so that institutions can better support them in implementing these important programs. Institutions that strive to increase study abroad options for students can use this research to implement strategies for motivating faculty to develop these learning experiences, ultimately increasing the number of options available to students. Administrators can learn what type of support faculty members need so they can implement policy that supports these practices.

In addition, this research is significant for faculty who are new to developing study abroad programs. The results can be used as a tool for deciding what type of program to create and to discover what resources are helpful to faculty who have been through the experience. New faculty leaders can also gain insight into the critical steps necessary for developing a study-
abroad program and can use this research to foresee possible challenges they may encounter and how to overcome them.

Furthermore, this study has implications for informing stakeholders what students gain from faculty-led study-abroad programs and what modifications can be made to existing programs based on faculty perceptions and reflections. Finally, this study is significant to my own professional development. Since I would like to develop and lead study-abroad programs for students in the future, this research will give me insight into the steps that are necessary for engaging in this type of work so that I can develop successful programs in the future.

**Theoretical Framework**

Experiential Learning Theory is a holistic theory that defines learning as “the major process of human adaptation involving the whole person” (Kolb & Kolb, 2009). This theory views learning as a process linking cycles of action, reflection, experience, and abstraction. The Experiential Learning Theory incorporates six propositions which include: 1. learning is best conceived as a process, not in terms of outcomes, 2. all learning is re-learning, 3. learning requires the resolution of conflicts between dialectically opposed modes of adaptation to the world, 4. learning is a holistic process of adaptation, 5. learning results from synergetic transactions between the person and the environment, and 6. learning is the process of creating knowledge (Kolb & Kolb, 2009). This theory serves as a framework that orients the ways in which many different types of learning can work together. It is an ongoing cycle of how a learner engages in concrete experiences, grasps new ideas, and ultimately how knowledge diverges through reflection and conceptualization. This theory provides a lens for this study as faculty describe how they navigate the process of developing and leading a study-abroad program for students.
Definition of Key Terms

The follow list of terms and descriptions were used throughout this research study to offer context specific to this study.

- **Globalization:** Steger (2009) determines that globalization refers to “the expansion and intensification of social relations and consciousness across world time and world space” (p. 37). Globalization describes the growing interdependence of the world's economies, cultures, and populations, brought about by cross-border trade in goods and services, which ultimately impact higher education institutions.

- **Internationalization of Higher Education:** For the purposes of this study, de Wit et. al. (2015) definition of internationalization is used. They define internationalization as "the intentional process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions and delivery of post-secondary education, in order to enhance the quality of education and research for all students and staff and to make a meaningful contribution to society” (p. 29).

- **Faculty-Led Study-Abroad Programs:** The specific focus of this study is faculty designed study-abroad programs. In the context studied, these programs are typically shorter in duration than traditional, semester-long study-abroad programs, taking place over the course of about two weeks to six weeks. In these courses, faculty guide students as they study specific course content and often participate in applied learning practicums.

Limitations of the Study

Due to the nature of this research, limitations should be considered when reading the results and conclusions of this study. One of the limitations is that this research was conducted at one institution in the central states of the United States. This means the results may not
necessarily be transferable to other institutions unless the context is within a similar academic environment. In addition, only ten faculty participated in the interviews. Had the sample size been larger, the results may have been different. Also, the interpretation of the results needs to be taken within the limits of my research objectives.

Summary

As more students continue to study abroad through faculty-led programs each year, it is essential to understand the role of the faculty who develop these programs. This qualitative study was designed to inform practice and to help institutions understand the challenges faculty face when developing and leading these programs so they can best equip them in this role. Chapter two, the literature review, highlights empirical and practitioner literature on faculty-led study abroad. Chapter three outlines the methodology for this study. Chapter 4 presents the findings of this study including a narrative of each participant and the study-abroad program they developed as well as the themes that emerged from the data analysis process. Chapter 5 incorporates the conclusions drawn from this research study and provides recommendations for university administrators, faculty members, and future scholars who are interested and involved in faculty-led study abroad.
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter provides a review of relevant literature beginning with the internationalization of higher education and then moving on to writings of study abroad and faculty-led study abroad specifically. The chapter also provides a review of prior research on faculty-led study-abroad programs.

How Globalization Drives Internationalization of Higher Education

The internationalization of higher education is part of the complex phenomenon of globalization and how it impacts the world. Foskett and Maringe (2010) describe globalization as “the opening up and coming together of business, trade, and economic activities between nations” (p. 1). Arabkeradmad et. al. (2015) explain that globalization happens naturally around us with the development of new inventions as the world changes. These new inventions such as cell phones, the internet, and advanced technology, transform social interactions and cultural zones. The world becomes more interconnected. Drawing on several definitions, Steger (2009) determined that “globalization refers to the expansion and intensification of social relations and consciousness across world time and world space” (p. 37). This relates directly to this study of faculty-led programs, which expand social relationships and intensify cultural exchanges by bringing about a consciousness of how others live around the world.

Globalization increases communication in the world and influences how we learn, bringing about changes in higher education institutions. For example, Turner and Robson (2008) explain that globalization is often thought to be the catalyst for institutional efforts to increase academic mobility and international exchanges. As the world becomes more globalized, institutions must realign their goals to ensure they are providing quality experiences that prepare students to live and work in a more globally interconnected world. It is important that
universities respond to globalization by integrating international or intercultural dimensions into the mission of teaching, research, and service (Foskett & Maringe, 2010). University responses to globalization are the key drivers of internationalization within higher education. Ultimately, globalization refers to how the world interacts among nations. More specifically, internationalization describes how higher education responds to the world as it changes and how institutions incorporate these global aspects into their mission.

**Defining Internationalization of Higher Education**

Institutions understand internationalization in different ways due to varying missions and perspectives on globalization. It is important to investigate how scholars (in this case faculty members leading study-abroad programs) define internationalization and how this process determines the strategies they use to create transformative study-abroad opportunities for students. Internationalization of higher education has multiple interpretations, and scholars have developed definitions from different perspectives (Arabkheradmand et. al., 2015; Hudzik, 2015; Proctor & Rumbley, 2018). Educators at each institution should determine what internationalization means for them and how it will impact the institutional mission and influence stakeholders. As Arabkheradmand et. al. (2015) notes, “each institution bases its definition of internationalization on its own needs, capabilities, and purposes” (p. 5).

Given these variations, I examined several definitions in the literature to determine the core characteristics of internationalization within higher education. de Wit et. al. (2015) define internationalization as

- the intentional process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions and delivery of post-secondary education, in order to enhance the
quality of education and research for all students and staff and to make a meaningful contribution to society (p. 29).

This definition, adapted from the work of Knight (2008), reflects how internationalization is becoming more inclusive rather than only focusing on the mobile minority—the few students who are able to study abroad. Emphasis is placed on incorporating a global dimension to education and highlights the importance of students and staff using these learning opportunities to make meaningful contributions to society.

Hudzik (2015) describes internationalization as a multifaceted phenomenon that plays out differently in practice across institutions and regions. Goals for addressing differing value systems may be prioritized differently in higher education systems across the world based on each country’s experiences with the internationalization process. Countries that have experienced instability and conflict may have different goals than countries not currently in that situation. Through these global differences, the rising demand for graduates with intercultural experiences in the workforce serves as motivation for university leaders to adopt an integrated approach to internationalization (Hudzik, 2015). This integrated approach incorporates global perspectives throughout the teaching, research, and service missions of higher education.

Finally, Ennew and Greenaway (2012) contend that internationalization is a management philosophy and an organizational function. For example, when policymakers, administrators, and stakeholders lead with a mindset that internationalization is an educational philosophy, the organization will move forward, providing global mobility and classroom learning opportunities as the world changes. They will develop new pedagogic approaches built on a teaching and learning philosophy that incorporates cultural traditions and prepares students for a world of global interconnectivity and mobility (de Wit et. al., 2017). Analyzing internationalization as a
continuum rather than as a static phenomenon helps understand the challenges institutions face and how organizations navigate through this complex process of internationalization.

In examining these definitions, internationalization is viewed as a philosophy influencing all of campus life as well as institutional frames of reference, partnerships, and relations. Institutions that view internationalization as a process and philosophy are more likely to adopt a theoretical foundation of internationalization that can be “justified on educational, economic, political, ideological, and cultural bases” (Arabkheradmand et al., 2015). When this happens, internationalized communities including faculty, students, and staff develop an awareness and respect for cultures, beliefs, and values of others (Hudzik, 2015). An integrated approach to internationalization cultivates these values as it is incorporated throughout the campus as a whole.

In conclusion, internationalization has become more complex over the years as institutions continue to focus on mobility, knowledge transfer, and international education (Finkelstein, Huang, & Rostan, 2014). Some of the literature focuses on how globalization influences the international education agenda while other authors focus on student and staff mobility and the development of cross-border partnerships. Knight (2008) argues that even though there will most likely never be a true universal definition of internationalization, it is important that common understandings guide discussions and analyses. These definitions of internationalization in higher education shape policy and practices and will help facilitate mutual understanding among nations through cultural exchange.

**Implementing Internationalization**

Equipping students with global competence in a multi-dimensional world is becoming increasingly important for the future of education worldwide. Institutional internationalization
allows students, faculty and staff to experience a broadened worldview, develop skills to function in an intercultural context, become less judgmental of differing behaviors and opinions, and form positive attitudes towards other cultures (Abrakheradmand et al., 2015). Knight (2008) explains having clear and articulated rationales are important when implementing internationalization because “they are reflected in policies and programs that are eventually implemented” (p. 32). It is crucial that clear rationales and objectives are used when developing a plan of action for internationalization, so that campuses are more likely to experience positive outcomes (Knight, 2008).

Institutions have developed specific strategies for implementing internationalization depending on their interpretation of how globalization impacts our society. There is no one definite approach to internationalization; rather, each institution develops a strategic plan specific to its mission statement to decide how the organization will move forward with the process. Therefore, each institution’s implementation plan may vary depending on its priorities, culture, history, politics, and resources (Knight, 2008). Foskett and Maringe (2010) explain that some universities will place an emphasis on teaching and research as a way of contributing to a global society. Other institutions will focus on the ideals of world peace and mutual understanding. Other strategies institutions consider when moving toward internationalization include international student recruitment, curriculum development, the exchange of research and knowledge, support services for international students, and language skills development. Institutions that prioritize the implementation of program activities, focus more on specific curricular and co-curricular activities and the integration of an international dimension within them. Whereas institutions that prioritize organizational strategies focus on governance,
operations, support services, and human resource development that help institutionalize the international activities (de Wit et al., 2015). Ultimately, both are needed.

Student and faculty mobility is not always an option for some campus communities; therefore, policymakers and stakeholders look for new options for encouraging faculty, students, and staff to engage in transformative international experiences (Abrakheradmand et al., 2015). The concept of internationalization of high education aims to “incorporate an international dimension into all aspects of teaching, learning, research and curriculum to provide equal opportunities for non-mobile students to acquire international competence” (p. 27). Whether through faculty and staff mobility or by incorporating diversity in the curriculum, it is crucial that higher education institutions determine how the internationalization process will be implemented in ways that will best equip students for success in a globalized world.

Hudzik (2015) describes a popular approach for implementing internationalization known as comprehensive internationalization, which is defined as “a commitment confirmed through action to infuse international and comparative perspectives throughout the teaching, research, and service missions of higher education” (p. 218). This process is a journey that depends on continuing leadership and commitment. If implemented effectively, the process can achieve greater cultural self-awareness among educators and students, as well as foster meaningful international and intercultural engagement on campus. Ultimately, when using a comprehensive approach, institutions generally integrate three strategies: recruiting international students to their home campus, internationalizing the curriculum, and sending students to study abroad. All are part of comprehensive efforts to internationalize the campus.
Internationalization of Home Campus

The literature often explores how institutions internationalize their campuses as a key strategy for pursuing comprehensive internationalization. The term *Internationalization at home* is used to describe these campus-based efforts. Knight (2008) explains that an important part of internationalization at home is the integration of foreign students and scholars into campus life and activities. One aspect of this strategy includes integrating an intercultural and international dimension within the teaching-learning process. Another facet focuses on research, extracurricular activities, and relationships with local cultural and ethnic community groups (Knight, 2008). Finally, recruiting international students to enroll in the institution also contributes to the internationalization of home campuses (Knight, 2008).

The literature explores several rationales as to why institutions internationalize their home campuses and use this approach to fulfill their campus mission (Knight, 2008; Turner & Robson, 2008; Abrakheradmand et al., 2015). In this line of discourse, authors discuss strategic and operational challenges as well as pathways to achieving international goals. Institutions strive to internationalize their home campuses in order to cultivate global experiences for students through the implementation of new educational practices that replace those that have not been sufficiently diverse to nurture a global mindset among domestic students, most of whom may not be able to pursue global exchanges abroad. Indeed, in a survey of several institutions worldwide, Ennew and Greenaway (2012) determined that student mobility rates were low in almost all regions of the world. Only 48% of institutions said they offer the opportunity for their students to study abroad, and less than 1% of their undergraduate students participate. These figures are relatively low, which makes it especially important to expand efforts in internationalizing the home campus.
In their survey, Ennew and Greenaway (2012) also collected data on international students attending U.S. colleges and universities. Institutions were asked to indicate the percentage of total enrollment in 2009-2010 made up of students from other countries. Of the responding institutions, 33% indicated that foreign students represented less than 1% of their student body, suggesting that international students are only a small minority at many colleges. Therefore, institutions are working to change these statistics by investing in internationalization and recruiting international students. Increasing the number of faculty and students from around the world will diversify the campus community and promote more opportunities for local students to develop relationships with individuals from different backgrounds and cultures.

**Internationalizing the Curriculum**

Another strategy institutions use to fulfill their mission for internationalization is diversifying the curriculum. Increasing student diversity on college campuses provides opportunities to develop intercultural skills; however, simply placing diverse groups of learners together does not guarantee that intercultural learning will take place (Turner & Robson, 2008). Therefore, internationalizing the curriculum is a topic of concern among institutions and requires the development of relevant curricula and pedagogies, as well as the professional development of educators who can nurture an appreciation of diversity, social justice, and equal opportunities (Shaklee & Baily, 2012). Diversifying the curriculum is necessary so students can learn different perspectives and develop global competence.

Leask (2015) explains that while it is true that international students bring new perspectives to classroom experiences, a common misconception is that recruitment of international students will result in an internationalized curriculum. Instead, attention must be given to learning outcomes, content, teaching and learning activities, and assessment tasks.
Teaching practices that sporadically include international case studies across a program of study rather than the systematic integration of internationalization in all courses, will not sufficiently diversify the curriculum. Instead, Turner and Robson (2008) explain that academic development needs to address the foundational philosophies of different disciplines and explore the hidden cultural assumptions at play within these disciplines.

Efforts to diversify the curriculum are crucial because the curriculum is linked to broader issues of social power (Turner & Robson, 2008). Higher education institutions have a responsibility to empower students through education that enhances their development as global citizens and practitioners. For example, “curricula with defined objectives to integrate intercultural learning can promote recognition of the ways in which cultural factors and practices influence diverse understandings as individuals seek relevance and meaning in their world” (Turner & Robson, 2008, p. 50). Exposure to this type of learning through an internationalized curriculum will prepare students for life in today’s globalized society. Internationalizing the curriculum is a critical part in “helping students to navigate the demands and challenges associated with the global world” (Engel & Olden, 2012, p. 87).

**Internationalization Through Study Abroad**

Another strategy institutions use to provide diverse learning experiences for students is through study abroad, which can be defined as an experiential approach to global learning that has the power to broaden educational experiences and transform lives (Smith & Mrozek 2015). Study abroad programs give students the ability to experience culture, language, customs, and traditions that are different from their own through exchanges in other countries while still enrolled in a higher education institution in their home country. Students and their parents believe studying abroad enhances opportunities to secure job offers because these programs
prepare students to live and work in an interdependent global environment (Anderson, Hubbard & Lawton, 2015).

**Who participates?**

One of the objectives of study abroad is for students to gain global perspectives through authentic experiences so they can become global citizens. Institutions continue to work toward improving the development and facilitation of study abroad programs; however, many students do not take part in them despite the various benefits they offer. To increase study abroad enrollment, researchers have investigated factors that predict who is most likely to participate in these programs. For example, Luo and Jamieson-Drake (2014) investigated specific student characteristics that can be indicators of who is likely to pursue a study abroad experience. Their findings indicate that women, white students, and those in humanities fields are more likely than their counterparts to demonstrate a strong interest in study abroad. Another study conducted by Deviney et al. (2014) investigated student behavioral characteristics as indicators of which students are motivated to pursue study abroad options. The authors found that students who elected to go abroad tended to be people-oriented as opposed to task-oriented and have a relatively high tolerance for ambiguity.

In addition to personal and behavioral characteristics of students, other factors such as credit hours, campus support, cost, and level of language proficiency are factors that influence a student’s decision to study abroad. For example, Deviney et al. (2014) explain that students may choose not to study abroad if credits seem difficult to transfer, if the campus lacks support for study-abroad students, or if the program costs are too high. Sometimes these factors outweigh benefits that study abroad offers, such as the ability to develop new perspectives on real-world issues, experience personal growth, achieve proficiency in a foreign language, and develop
career skills. Lörz, Netz and Quast (2016) also agree that a student’s decision to study abroad is influenced by financial and social costs, the benefits they will gain, performance-related factors, and previous international experiences. For example, their research findings indicate that socio-economically disadvantaged students may be less willing to take the risk of studying abroad if they worry that their courses may not transfer, their grade averages might decline, or that their transition to another language or culture will be difficult and thus lead to the loss of course credits. These students, then, may rationally weigh the benefits and disadvantages of studying abroad and decide not to go.

Study abroad has many benefits, yet high program costs often limit the number of students who are able to participate. Foskett & Maringe (2010) explain that there are different tiers of mobile students. The top tier consists of the elite, most able, affluent students who have the confidence and resources to travel to desirable destinations. These students are not affected by tuition fees, distance, culture, language, or living costs. Below the elite are students who are motivated by employment benefits and who seek a direct return on their investment in study abroad. These students require significant funds to finance study abroad, and they are sensitive to trade-offs between the key factors that influence their decision to study abroad and where they go. Institutions seeking to improve their programming should recognize that factors such as length of program, cost, course transfer, and student preference often prevent students from studying abroad. Colleges and universities should consider these factors and inequities when developing new study-abroad programs to provide diverse learning experiences and equal opportunities for students.
Types of study-abroad programs

Currently there are several types of study-abroad options available for students. The length of time students live and study in another country is what determines if the program is considered long-term or short-term. The Institute of International Education (2019) defines long-term study abroad as any program longer than eight weeks. Any program eight weeks or less is considered short-term. Programs are also categorized by the type of exchange that takes place. For example, island programs, direct enrollment, third-party, and immersion programs all provide opportunities for students to travel abroad, yet these exchanges are structured differently, giving students opportunities to choose a program that best fit their needs. Since this study focuses on the perspectives of faculty who developed a study-abroad program for students enrolled in an institution in the United States, the types of study-abroad programs described below are specific to those that are popular in the US.

Island programs

Island programs are structured so that American students relocate to a different country where they travel with other American students and attend classes that are taught by American professors. These programs can be long-term or short-term. One benefit of island programs is that they ensure the content of the courses meets the expectation of the institution. This appeals to students because it is easier for courses to transfer back to the full degree academic program (Scally, 2015).

Direct enrollment programs

Another type of study abroad program is direct enrollment. This program structure allows students to enroll directly into the host institution and participate in the same courses as local students (Norris & Dwyer, 2005). Direct enrollment opportunities are generally long-term
programs in which students complete a semester or year of study at the host institution. In direct enrollment programs, American institutions generally develop an exchange relationship with institutions abroad so they can send a certain number of students overseas and receive the same number of students in return.

**Third-party programs**

In addition, *third-party programs* are a combination of island programs and direct enrollment programs. In third-party programs, students take some of their courses at the local university and the rest of their coursework at a study center with other American students. The courses at the study center usually include lessons on the culture, history, and language of the host country (Norris & Dwyer, 2005). Third-party programs are usually a semester or year in length and are most commonly located in countries where English is not the native language.

**Immersion programs**

Island programs, direct enrollment, and third-party programs can also be considered *immersion programs*. In order for a study abroad program to be categorized as an immersion program, the student learning objectives must focus on developing fluency in another language. Students generally have the opportunity to live with a host family, take courses in the target language, and immerse themselves in the culture and language of the host country. Immersion programs can be long-term or short-term.

**Faculty-Led Study-Abroad Programs**

In an effort to internationalize college campuses, higher education institutions invest in opportunities for students to engage in cultural exchanges that foster new global perspectives and enhance the learning environment. Faculty-led study-abroad is one type of program that can provide these opportunities for students. As higher education institutions strive to increase study
abroad enrollment and provide global experiences for students, faculty-led study abroad can support institutions in meeting these goals. This section of the literature review draws on writings and studies of faculty-led short-term study abroad programs, highlighting four conversations in the literature: the purpose of these programs, best practices, expectations of faculty, and program outcomes. It is important to note that short-term programs and faculty-led programs are two different types of study abroad; however, since this study focuses specifically on faculty-led programs that are short-term, this section in the literature review refers to these programs as they relate hand-in-hand throughout the four conversations.

**Purpose**

As globalization continues to impact educational practices, higher education institutions consider new ways to improve study-abroad experiences that help students gain a multicultural education. Historically, study abroad required students to spend a semester or longer studying and living in the host country (Jutte, 2011). More recently, colleges and universities have begun offering short-term programs, usually eight weeks or less, that are developed and led by faculty members. These less-time-consuming and relatively affordable programs provide students an opportunity to study abroad while at the same time earning credits in their particular majors. Faculty members leading these programs have academic freedom to tailor them toward a specific topic, providing students with authentic experiences in a specific field of study (Jutte, 2011). *The Open Doors Report* (Institute for International Education, 2019) indicates that 65% of students who studied abroad in 2019, participated in short-term programs, many of which were faculty-led. It is evident that these types of study-abroad programs are becoming increasingly popular in higher education because they expand opportunities for students to participate and they can be customized to meet students’ needs. In fact, Pasquarelli, Cole, & Tyson, (2018)
argue that the “development and implementation of faculty-led short-term study abroad programs are the trend in the field of international education” (p. 1).

According to Hulstrand (2016), offering faculty-led programs is one way to encourage students to engage in international experiences who otherwise might not have the opportunity to do so. For example, students who have demanding degree requirements such as those in athletic training, nursing, or teacher-preparation programs, could participate in a short-term program but would not have otherwise been permitted to be away for a semester or longer (Jutte, 2011). These short-term programs can be customized by the faculty who lead them to create lower-cost study-abroad opportunities while allowing faculty and students to apply disciplinary content in hands-on applications. They are more affordable because students are not away from home as long, and faculty who develop the programs can consider cost when customizing the itinerary.

Simply developing and offering a variety of short-term, cost-effective study abroad programs to increase participation is not enough; it is also crucial for these programs to challenge the way students think and encourage them to step beyond their comfort zones in ways that will help them thrive in a global economy. Faculty-led study-abroad programs allow faculty to design a course of study in which students apply content to real-life situations abroad. Keese and O'Brien (2011) contend that these programs provide faculty the opportunity to teach through a critical-learning lens as students learn about the world firsthand. Examples of such learning experiences are the field-intensive study abroad programs. In natural sciences, for example, students have an opportunity to examine ecosystems and biological processes in countries such as Panama and Belize, thereby expanding their knowledge of the natural world beyond the ecosystem surrounding the university itself (Webb & Wysor, 2018). At the field site, students and instructors are also immersed in an indigenous community where students can learn first-
hand about the impacts of contemporary issues like global climate change. Teaching with transformational goals and specific learning objectives helps cultivate meaningful interactions that encourage students to become global citizens and practitioners. Global citizenship proponents believe these faculty-customized study-abroad experiences lead to transformative learning as students reassess their personal values and explore their role in an interconnected global society (Landon et al., 2017).

**Best Practices**

The literature on faculty-led study-abroad programs identifies best practices for developing and leading international experiences for students. It is important to note that faculty-led programs are implemented differently than other study-abroad programs because they are designed by faculty members and are part of a course of study, whereas other study-abroad programs are typically established by administrators (Jutte, 2015) and may involve multiple courses completed by students over longer periods of time. Faculty leaders design their courses as discipline-based experiences that complement or expand an institution’s existing curriculum (Niehaus et al., 2019); therefore, experts say that the most successful study-abroad leaders are those who are passionate about their field and want students to experience the field in a global context.

One of the most important responsibilities of those developing study-abroad programs is to assure that they are academically sound and culturally relevant. They must be academic experiences based on credit-bearing courses, and not simply tourism, if they are to maintain credibility with campus constituents, parents, and students (Hulstrand, 2015). For example, the destination and itinerary of the study-abroad program should be consistent with the academic goals in the class. Once faculty have aligned the travel destination with the course learning
objectives, they can travel to that same destination with different groups of students for several years, which will allow them to make improvements over time. Wilkie (2018) notes that “faculty who lead the same program in the same location for several years are able to cultivate relationships that can enrich students’ experiences and immersion in the local community” (p. 46). Once the program is well established, students can participate in these experiences abroad as new faculty come and go.

In their book *Passport to Change*, Pasquarelli et al. (2018) recommend breaking down faculty-led programs into three phases: preparation for the trip, the experience abroad, and the return. They explain the importance of carefully designing a plan for instruction, then determining the destination and travel logistics, preparing a budget, and laying the groundwork for teaching abroad. In addition, for programs to be successful, faculty need to consider how they will seek university approval and market their program. When faculty have a clear understanding of institutional policies, they are more likely to develop a program that will be approved by stakeholders and gain student interest. Hulstrand (2016) contends that maintaining clear policies and procedures for establishing, leading, and monitoring faculty-led study abroad makes them run more efficiently. Finally, when students return, faculty should prepare them for guided reflection on the learning experience to facilitate ongoing learning beyond the study-abroad program itself. It is also important for faculty to assess their program to make improvements for students who will travel in the future.

To uphold best practices when establishing a faculty-led study-abroad program, Pasquarelli et al. (2018) also recommend the application of several theoretical principles as a way of ensuring that programs are both academically sound and culturally relevant. For example, to be academically sound, the authors invoke Kolb’s Experiential Learning Theory,
suggesting that the study-abroad experience be grounded in constructivist perspectives and be experiential in nature (Pasquarelli et al., 2018). Constructivism is based on the assumption that learners use what they already know to process new information. Experiential education is one in which educators include opportunities for learners to observe, reflect, think, and apply content to real life situations (Pasquarelli et al., 2018). Since faculty-led study abroad programs are often shorter in length than traditional study abroad programs, faculty should use these practices to establish academically sound programs for students to maximize learning opportunities. One example of this is the work of faculty who developed an interdisciplinary short-term study-abroad program with innovative, ethical, and rigorous pedagogy (Tavarez & Warren, 2018). They created a global service-learning experience abroad in El Salvador for students that were part of a global health organization. It is curriculum based with specific learning objectives to fulfill a course of study.

Furthermore, it is essential that faculty develop programs that are culturally relevant. To make the program culturally relevant, faculty must integrate a component of intercultural awareness. Bennett (2011) defines intercultural competence as “a set of cognitive, affective, and behavioral skills and characteristics that supports effective and appropriate interaction in a variety of cultural contexts” (p.4). Bennett’s (1993) developmental model of intercultural sensitivity provides a theory that explains how students move from ethnocentrism towards ethnorelativism during an international experience abroad. This means that instead of judging other groups against their own values and customs, students will move towards the belief that no culture is superior to another. These transformative changes are crucial as individuals develop relationships with diverse groups of people in a global economy.
Finally, Deardorff (2006) developed a model that includes four dimensions of intercultural competence, which serve as a framework for including intercultural learning into the study-abroad curriculum. These dimensions, which include attitudes, external outcomes, internal outcomes, and knowledge and comprehension, help faculty create learning activities that develop intercultural competence among students (Pasquarelli et al., 2018). Establishing a program with embedded intercultural learning activities, ensures that the faculty-led program is culturally relevant.

**Expectations and Preparation of Faculty**

Besides considering best practices when developing study-abroad programs for students, faculty should be aware of other responsibilities they will encounter when leading these programs. One of the most important expectations of faculty is that they deliver a “stimulating, thought-provoking, experiential, outcomes-based curriculum in one or more subjects or disciplines designed for a specific context” (Pasquarelli, 2018, p. 35). Although developing curriculum is clearly an expectation of faculty, they also have many more responsibilities when facilitating study abroad than they might have teaching courses at their home campus. For example, Willkie (2018) explains that during study abroad, faculty will be called upon to respond to concerns that campus services usually take care of, such as student misconduct, health issues, counseling, and housing.

Since faculty take on so many new roles when they develop and lead study abroad, it is critical to equip those who wish to pursue this important work with the information and skills training they need to assure program success (Willkie, 2018). For example, one way to prepare faculty to lead these programs is to involve staff from different departments such as health, risk management, and emergency preparedness when planning a study-abroad opportunity. Hustrand
(2015) recommends hosting workshops that help faculty learn about institutional policies, how to report misconduct, and how to handle emergencies abroad.

**Program Outcomes**

Establishing well thought-out student learning outcomes is an important element of a successful faculty-led study-abroad program. After all, the main purpose of creating these educational experiences abroad is to have a lasting influence on students. It is important to understand the intended outcomes of faculty-led study abroad efforts so that students know what they will gain from the experience and so the institution can evaluate program effectiveness to make ongoing improvements. Faculty-led study-abroad programs are unique in that faculty are able to determine student learning objectives and how they will be measured—all with the goal of assuring that students get the most out of the experience.

Pasquarelli et. al (2018) explain that the goal of faculty-led study abroad is to “help dispel stereotypes while promoting meaningful cross-cultural communication as explicit program objectives” (p. 18). Traditional semester or year-long programs provide opportunities for students to gain global perspectives and experience new cultures; however, faculty-led study abroad is rooted in deep academic study of appropriate subject matter goals and cultural transformation. This special focus is what makes faculty-led study abroad outcomes different. These international experiences focus specifically on skills that provide students with a valuable experience that directly relates to their fields of study. For example, Landon et. al (2017) explain that using a clear theoretical framework to align study-abroad instruction and student outcomes assessment allows educators to measure the impact of the program. Spenader and Retka (2015) describe a theoretical model of global citizenship, which is used to frame study-abroad pedagogy and the efforts guiding assessment of student learning and program outcomes. Faculty-led study-
abroad programs aim to provide effective pedagogical interventions that support these intercultural learning outcomes for students.

**Prior Research on Faculty-Led Study-Abroad Programs**

Due to the interest in studying abroad in the United States, and the different types and modalities of study abroad programs, we have today an important bulk of empirical research that has looked at student outcomes of faculty-led study abroad programs (Graham & Crawford, 2012; Landon et al., 2017; Lee & Negrelli, 2018; Spenader & Retka, 2015; Strange & Gibson (2017). But with the exception of Smith and Meier (2016), who explored faculty perceptions of how study abroad impacts accounting programs, researchers have not investigated what motivates faculty to develop and lead these experiences abroad for students. My study will add to the body of research by giving voice to the faculty themselves and eliciting their understanding of what motivates them to develop short-term study-abroad programs and what challenges they face along the way. Study findings provide insights into what institutions can do to best support these faculty members. The findings will also be of interest to other faculty members who lead study abroad programs or who are considering the possibility of taking on this important work.

**Student Learning Outcomes**

Several studies have been conducted to better understand how faculty-led short-term study abroad impacts student learning and the development of intercultural competence. One topic of concern among scholars is how the length of time abroad impacts transformative learning. Strange and Gibson (2017) conducted a study to investigate the influence of program length on transformative learning outcomes. A goal of transformative learning is to move students from ethnocentrism to new perceptions of cultural pluralism. This can be achieved in
short-term study abroad experiences when strong academic content is combined with relevance to the location of travel. Indeed, their findings, based on a survey of students at a southwestern university who completed faculty-led study-abroad programs ranging in length from one week to one semester, revealed that transformative learning was a function of the extent to which the programs emphasized experiential learning, regardless of the length of time spent abroad.

In addition, Graham and Crawford (2012) conducted an interview study to examine whether a short-term faculty-led study abroad program is as transformative as a full-immersion semester at a foreign institution. They also investigated whether a community engagement study abroad experience fosters transformations similar to faculty-led and full-immersion programs. A random number process was used to select 303 student participants and ultimately 15 interviews were conducted for this qualitative research. Findings indicated that instructor-led study-abroad participants had the highest rates of everyday learning. Engagement study-abroad students seemed to have a broader awareness of learning styles and techniques.

Landon, Tarrant, and Rubin (2017) explain that higher education institutions are challenged to measure study abroad success by fostering higher-order learning outcomes rather than by how many students enroll in the programs. Faculty-led programs provide opportunities to make experiences more meaningful for student learning because they tend to align instruction with student learning outcomes. Their study, which involved an assessment of the learning outcomes of 674 students participating in faculty-led study-abroad programs sponsored by a large southeastern university, determined that fostering higher-order thinking outcomes requires faculty to specify learning outcomes when developing study abroad programs for students. If faculty have a clear set of learning objectives, students are more likely to have developed higher order thinking skills as a result.
Faculty Perceptions of Study Abroad

Only one study, conducted by Meier and Smith (2016), investigates faculty perceptions of program outcomes. In this case, the researchers examined faculty perceptions of how short-term study-abroad programs impact the globalization of accounting programs. The authors explain that an important advantage of these programs is that they provide a balance between the needs of the stakeholders involved and the resources available. For example, short-term faculty-led programs abroad provide international immersion for students who may have limited time and financial resources. This study reveals that faculty perceive these experiences as a means of globalizing the accounting curriculum while providing course content necessary for the accounting degree. These experiences are also customizable in that they can be adapted to fit within the existing course requirements of the accounting department. The study is limited in its focus on accounting education. Further research on faculty perceptions across multiple disciplines will expand our understanding of how the faculty perceive the impacts of the study-abroad programs they lead.

Summary

Internationalization of higher education is vital in preparing students for an increasingly globalized society and workforce. Foskett and Maringe (2010) state, “internationalization reaches to the heart of the very meaning of ‘university’ and into every facet of its operation, from teaching and education to research and scholarship, to enterprise and innovation and to the culture and ethos of the institution” (p. 37). Understanding the key conversations in scholarship concerning international education, helps leaders identify what is yet to be discovered in order to develop quality international experiences for students. In addition, it is important to understand the different types of study abroad programs available to students and to become familiar with
empirical and practitioner research on study abroad, and faculty-led study abroad specifically. In an increasingly globalized society, it is crucial for educational leaders to identify remaining questions that will offer opportunities for future research and professional development for faculty doing this important work.
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study is to examine faculty perceptions of their work leading short-term study-abroad programs by investigating what motivates faculty members to do this work, the challenges they face developing and leading these programs for students, and their understanding of how these programs are meaningful to students. Several studies have focused on student learning outcomes of faculty-led study-abroad programs (Graham & Crawford, 2012; Lawton et al., 2017; Lee & Negrelli, 2018) but to my knowledge, no research exists that examines the role faculty play in establishing these educational exchanges for students. This study allows faculty to share their experiences so that institutions can determine what support will best help them design and lead study abroad programs. More specifically, this study focuses on faculty who have developed a short-term program ranging from ten days to eight weeks in the past four years and have led the program in the past three years. These criteria were chosen so that the programs being investigated were current and so that it was easier for faculty to remember and explain their experiences. The research is guided by the following research questions:

1. What motivates faculty members to become involved in the development and leadership of short-term study abroad programs?

2. What was involved in creating and leading the short-term, faculty-led program? What obstacles did they encounter and how did they overcome them? On the other hand, what seemed to facilitate or help?

3. What did the faculty members say students gained from their participation in the program? What might be done to improve their educational experience?
4. What could institutions do to better support faculty in the development and implementation of short-term study abroad?

This chapter outlines the study methodology, examining the research design and the research paradigm, as well as my positionality in terms of my role in international education and the journey that led me to develop a passion for study abroad and global exchange opportunities. In addition, I describe the site and participant selection, and, finally, data collection and analysis, the trustworthiness of the research, and ethical consideration.

**Research Methodology, Design, and Paradigm**

Qualitative research methodology allows researchers to establish the meaning of a phenomenon from the perspective of study participants (Creswell, 2009). Using a qualitative research design, I explored how faculty perceive their experiences developing and leading study abroad opportunities for students. Qualitative research allowed me to make meaningful connections between faculty perceptions of their work and how institutions can best support them in their role as study abroad leaders. In addition, interpretive inquiry is a form of qualitative research that allows researchers to “make an interpretation of what they see, hear, and understand” (Creswell, 2013, p. 39). This research was designed to include the voices of faculty members who have developed a study-abroad program in the past four years and have led that program for students in the past three years. I used these criteria so that the research focuses on experiences from programs that were recently developed and led so that faculty will be more likely to remember the details of their experiences. I used the case study design so that I could understand the similarities and differences of the participants who had access to similar resources from the same institution.
Prior research provides some insights into predictors of students who will study abroad (Anderson et. al, 2015; Deviney; Lou & Jamieson-Drake, 2015), and student learning outcomes of faculty-led study abroad programs (Graham & Crawford, 2012; Landon, Tarrant, & Rubin, 2017; Lee & Negrelli, 2018; Spenader & Retka, 2015; Strange & Gibson, 2017). Meier and Smith (2016) explore faculty perceptions of how study abroad impacts accounting programs; however, their research is limited to this specific content area. A qualitative study grounded in constructivism was needed to go “beyond what is directly said to work out structures and relations of meanings not immediately apparent in a text” (Kvale & Brinkmann, p. 207, 2009).

Case Study Methodology

Instrumental case study inquiry was used to conduct this research study. Case studies are “a strategy of inquiry in which the researcher explores in depth a program, event, activity, process, of one or more individuals” (Creswell, 2009, p. 13). Cases are also bounded by time and activity. This study is an instrumental case study involving a group of faculty members who work at a four-year university in the central United States who experienced a similar phenomenon. According to Stake (2005), an instrumental case study allows researchers to gain an insider’s view of an issue or experience. I selected the instrumental case study design because I wanted to investigate how faculty members within the same institutions used a framework of development and implementation of study-abroad programs to create international experiences for their students. I focused on a small number of participants to understand their lived experiences in order to develop patterns and relationships of meaning within my research.

Research Paradigm

A paradigm is a basic set of beliefs that inform the practice of research (Creswell, 2013). The set of beliefs determines what approach and research methods are used in a study as well as
the purpose of the research and the role of the researcher (Glesne, 1999). This research is grounded in constructivism. Constructivism focuses on how people acquire knowledge and learn from their experiences. A constructivist paradigm “portrays a world in which reality is socially constructed, complex, and ever changing” (Glesne, 2009, p. 5). It suggests that individuals construct meaning from their experiences because constructivists “seek understanding of the world in which they live and work” (Creswell, 2013, p. 20). This study investigates how faculty reflect, learn, and construct meaning from their involvement in establishing and leading study-abroad programs. By using qualitative research and constructivism, I learned how faculty reflected on their experiences developing and leading study-abroad programs so I could understand what motivated them to engage in this work. In addition, Kolb’s 1984 Experiential Theory of Learning served as a holistic theoretical framework to understand the cycles of learning that took place as participants navigated the process of developing and implementing a study-abroad program. In conclusion, a constructivist approach helps guide my research because it allows me to develop a more informed consciousness of the participants’ views of their experiences and what those experiences can teach us about how institutions might best support faculty in this important work. These frameworks serve as a guide for determining important issues and defining methods to address them.

**Researcher Positionality**

It is important to address researcher positionality when conducting and analyzing a study of inquiry. Kleinman (1989) explains that our attitudes affect what we choose to study, what we concentrate on, and our interpretation of events. Our values and feelings are caught up in the analysis of our results and we need to know which identities are central or problematic. I realize that my positionality affects my research, drives my interpretation of current problems in higher
education, and influences my understanding and interpretation of the research study results. Although it is not possible to eliminate biases, understanding my position and what drives me to research international education helped me minimize these biases as I interviewed faculty members who have led study abroad programs. I am passionate about this research because I participated in two study-abroad opportunities and have planned experiences abroad for my own students as a Spanish teacher.

With the rising momentum for globalization and international exchanges in higher education (reviewed in Chapter Two), I believe it is important for faculty to learn how to implement programs at institutions that encourage cultural exchanges and promote international learning opportunities for students. I am interested in understanding how faculty and administrators can work together to provide cultural exchanges that help students learn multiple perspectives and gain a more nuanced understanding of a globalized world.

Growing up on a small farm, in central Illinois I rarely had the opportunity to interact with people who spoke another language or had different values and traditions than the community in which I grew up. In my Spanish linguistics and culture classes, my passion for language grew, and I found myself wanting to learn more about culture and civilizations. I was curious about the culture, the people, and their lifestyle. With my senior Spanish class, I traveled to Mexico and for the first time was able to use what I had learned to communicate with native speakers. It was at this time that I set a goal to expand my knowledge of civilization, history, and customs of other cultures.

My decision to further pursue this field led to several years of formal study of the Spanish language and first-hand experiences with other cultures. At my undergraduate institution, I was inspired to study abroad to gain fluency in the language and submerge myself in another culture.
While spending a summer in Antigua Guatemala, I enrolled in an intensive language course at the Linguistic Frances Marroquíne School of Language. I had the opportunity to live with a Guatemalan family, explore ancient Mayan ruins, socialize with the locals, and learn about the history of the country and customs of the people. Eager to study overseas again, I spent the spring semester of my junior year in Madrid, Spain. I enrolled in a program specific to language (i.e., Spanish) and teacher education.

My interest in international education continued to grow, and I became a graduate assistant in Illinois State University’s Department of Languages, Literatures, and Cultures while obtaining my master’s degree in Spanish pedagogy and TESOL. After earning my degree, I was offered a position at the University’s English Language Institute where I worked with international students teaching English, assisting them with placement into college courses, and planning cultural events to help them integrate into the college community. In my current position as a high school Spanish teacher, I have attended workshops on internationalizing the curriculum and have led international exchange trips abroad so that students can interact with native Spanish speakers.

In addition, the courses I have taken as a Ph.D. student have broadened my perspective, motivating me to understand inequities and fight for justice in our current education system. For example, I realize I was able to participate in these international exchange opportunities because I come from a place of privilege. Many of my peers expressed interest in these opportunities but were unable to engage in them for many of the reasons explained in my literature review. My desire to reduce inequities in study abroad is what narrowed the focus of my study to faculty-led study abroad since these programs are shorter, cost effective, and have potential to include students who might not have otherwise had an opportunity to study abroad. Finally, I have been
challenged intellectually through my many roles in education, in which I have taught bilingual elementary students, served low-income families, provided professional development for teachers of English, facilitated cultural activities for international students, and taught high school students Spanish as a Foreign Language.

These cultural journeys have sparked my interest in faculty-led study abroad and shaped my bias towards international education, motivating me to seek positions where I can provide the most authentic learning experiences possible for others and instill in them the same passion I have for global awareness. More importantly, they impact my view of privilege and create in me a passion to afford others the opportunity to become more marketable in a globalized economy. All these experiences have contributed to my view of international experiences in higher education institutions and influence how I conduct and interpret research.

Site and Participant Selection

This study took place at a four-year public university located in the central states in the United States that offers faculty-led study-abroad opportunities for students. I used purposeful sampling to select this higher education institution so that it would be meaningful to my practice in the central United States. Purposeful sampling involved selecting my study site with specific intentions. For example, to determine the institution where my research took place, I purposefully looked at the study abroad websites of four-year universities in the central states in the US to view the faculty-led programs that are offered at each. I used this information to select an institution that offered a variety of faculty-led study-abroad programs that were recently developed to conduct my case study research.

I interviewed a total of 10 faculty members from varying content areas to explore their experiences developing and leading short-term study-abroad programs that range from ten days
to eight weeks. I used a snowball sampling technique to select my participants. Snowball sampling “obtains knowledge of potential cases from people who know people who meet research interests” (Glesne, p. 29, 1999). The study abroad website of the university provided contact information of individuals who assist with faculty-led study abroad. The website also identified several faculty-led study-abroad programs that had been developed and implemented recently along with descriptions of the programs and contact information of the faculty who developed them. I used this information to contact those individuals through email to ask if their faculty-led program met the criteria of my study or if they knew other faculty who had developed and led programs that would meet my study’s criteria.

With this information, I created an inventory of potential faculty I could ask to participate in the study. The inventory included the title of each study abroad program offered, the duration of the program, the country where the study abroad took place, the content area for which the program was designed, and the contact information of the faculty leader(s) of each program. The institutional website provided most of this information, however, contacting the faculty-led program advisor was important so I knew which of these programs had been developed in the past four years and led in the past three years. Upon completing my inventory chart of the programs that specifically met my criteria, I emailed a recruitment letter (Appendix A) to determine which faculty were interested in participating in my study. My initial goal was to interview between 10 and 15 participants but only 13 participants who were willing to participate in the study, had developed a study abroad program that met my criteria. I used 3 of the 13 faculty to pilot my study, which I explain later in this chapter, before conducting the final research. The other 10 participants who volunteered to participate in the study, represented a variety of study-abroad opportunities based on academic discipline, country, duration, and
program type. For example, the program type could be a cultural study abroad program, an internship immersion program abroad, an interdisciplinary study abroad, or a global service-learning experience abroad to name a few. The university’s study abroad website provided descriptions of these program types and they were confirmed by the faculty members. Gender, race, ethnicity, and age were not factored into the selection of study subjects. Detailed biographies of the participants and their programs are presented in the next chapter, Chapter IV.

**Data Collection/Instrumentation**

The data collection instrument in this study consisted of semi-structured interviews with faculty at a four-year higher education institution who have developed a study-abroad program in the last four years and led the study abroad in the past three years. I used semi-structured interviews with open-ended questions to understand how participants make meaning of their experiences. During the interview, I asked key, pre-planned questions (See Appendix C) that related to my research questions while also allowing questions to flow from the previous responses when possible. I chose in-depth interviewing as my method of collecting data so that participants could talk about their experiences, which helped me understand how they perceive their work developing and leading these international experiences. The data consisted of virtual zoom interviews with each faculty member as well as email correspondence for clarifications. The initial interview took approximately 45-60 minutes. Zoom audio recordings of the interviews were made so that I had an accurate accounting of what was said. I also took notes during the interview. After transcribing and coding the interviews, I followed-up with the participants through email to share my understanding of what they had said and to clarify any information necessary.
Pilot Study

I piloted the interview protocol before conducting the final research. The pilot study was designed and conducted to test the data collecting instrument, which is the interview. The results of the pilot study were not analyzed and were only used to make modifications to the interview questions. To do this, I selected 3 faculty members who met my criteria and were willing to participate in piloting my study. I used the interview protocol and conducted a virtual zoom interview with each faculty member. During this process, I recorded the interviews and made notes of the responses. After completing the pilot study interviews, I made modifications to my interview questions before conducting the interviews for my final research.

The modifications I made to my original interview script included adding a reference chart and revising my questions to make them more specific and less open-ended. I included a study-abroad reference chart so I would have a basic understanding of each study abroad program. Some examples of the information I gained from the participants to complete the reference chart included the duration of the program, the type of housing students stayed in, whether it was a language study, what type of students it was designed for, and whether the faculty taught classes abroad. Having this program information helped me make connections between the programs to better understand the faculty perceptions of their program in relation to the others in my final research. During the pilot interviews, the first question was to ask participants to talk about their study-abroad program freely and openly. They spoke for 5-10 minutes but I realized that in this initial response, they were already answering some of the questions that I would be asking later. To prompt participants to only give the specific information I was looking for with the first question, I changed it to prompt them to tell me in 2-3 sentences about their program, including what and who it was it designed for. By making this
change, I guided participants to give a more concise response about the goal of the program and then they were able to explain other details later as the interview progressed. In addition, I made sure to separate the interview into two sections so that participants could first focus on answering questions about the development of the program and then secondly, focus on the actual experience leading students abroad.

Data Analysis

Glesne (2009) explains that “data analysis involves organizing what you have seen, heard, and read so that you can make sense of what you have learned” (p. 130). By conducting in-depth interviews, my participants had the opportunity to share their perceptions of the development and implementation of faculty-led study-abroad programs. I recorded the zoom interviews and took notes during the conversations. I used the transcription feature in zoom to transcribe what my participants said during the interviews so that I could interpret and make sense of what they described. I transferred the zoom transcriptions of each of the interviews to Microsoft word, which I would later use to identify codes, categories, and themes. I revisited each of the transcriptions and compared them with my notes to make corrections and fill in any inaudible parts of the transcription.

I used a data accounting log to organize my information during the data collection process to keep track of when I conducted initial interviews, to check off when I emailed faculty members, when they completed their consent forms, and to record when member checking was complete. I created a participant and program reference chart of the factual information about each program. The reference chart helped me determine similarities and differences between the programs as well as identify how the participants perceived their experiences in relation to the type of program they led. (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009).
Thematic Analysis

Thematic Analysis was used to understand the data in this study. The goal of a thematic analysis is “to identify themes, i.e., patterns in the data that are important or interesting, and use these themes to address the research or say something about an issue” (Maguire & Delahunt, 2017). The research questions were used to develop a framework for coding and to analyze the data for overarching patterns and themes. Coding allows the researcher to organize data into categories or “families” because similarly coded data share similar characteristics (Saldana, 2013). Glesne (1999) recommends assigning each major code its own number and page and then listing an explanation of the code. Since I interviewed ten faculty members, this helped me keep the data organized. I listened to the audio recordings and read the transcripts to highlight common words and phrases from the participants.

Each major code identified a concept or central idea. For example, grant money, department money, and endowment money were major codes in the data because patterns emerged of the participants describing these throughout the transcripts. Similar words and phrases from the participants were then grouped together to produce categories. For example, grant money, department money, and endowment money were grouped together to form the category of finances. A mind map was constructed with the codes and categories to serve as a visual representation of how they intertwined to identify themes and ultimately answer the research questions. In the above example, the theme that emerged was financial support, which answers the research question inquiring about what helped faculty develop and implement a study-abroad program. I made a color-coded table in Microsoft Word of the significant themes that emerged from the transcripts and put direct quotes from the participants under each of the themes. I used the participant’s words so I could accurately interpret their experiences.
In Vivo Coding

Saldana (2013) explains that there are two levels of coding, first cycle and second cycle coding. He describes first cycle coding methods as the initial and unrestricted process to code and even re-code the data. In vivo coding was used during the First Cycle coding process (Saldana, 2013) to determine patterns and themes in my initial analysis. In vivo coding “uses words of phrases from the participants’ own language in the data records as codes (Saldana, 2013, p. 264). By using in vivo coding, I honor and prioritize the participants’ voices. For example, I used different colors to highlight specific quotes from the participants and then included these quotes withing the specific theme that it related to.

Values Coding

Values coding was the Second Cycle coding method used in this study. Values coding is “the application of codes to qualitative data that reflect a participant’s values, attitudes, and beliefs, representing his or her perspectives or worldview” (Saldana, 2013, p. 268). Saldana further describes values coding as:

- A value (V:) is the importance we attribute to oneself, another person, thing, or idea. An attitude (A:) is the way we think and feel about oneself, another person, thing, or idea. A belief (B:) is part of a system that includes values and attitudes, plus personal knowledge, experiences, opinions, prejudices, morals, and other interpretive perceptions of the social world. (2013, p. 268)

Using values coding as the Second Cycle method allowed me to identify participant values, attitudes, and beliefs from their worldview (Miles et al., 2014; Saldaña, 2013). I was able to find patterns in the data that focused on the participant experiences to understand their attitudes and beliefs about developing a study-abroad program. To do this, I read through the transcripts again
and used a new color to highlight and focus specifically on the participants' attitudes and beliefs. This ensures that the themes are aligned with my research questions and are indicative of the experiences of the participants. One example is that all faculty received some type of training as a type of support from the institution before traveling abroad with students. Values coding allowed me to focus on the attitudes and beliefs the participants had about the usefulness of the training. One participant said, “the trainings were helpful,” while another one said, “I tried to figure out a way to skip it since it wasn’t helpful the first time.” In this example, both faculty members were provided the same training; one valued the training and the other did not. What faculty value, their attitudes, and their beliefs, all contribute to how they perceive their experiences.

**Ethical Consideration**

To address ethical issues, I completed the CITI training prior to conducting interviews and collecting data. I spoke to my participants about the goals of my research before I began interviewing, and I assured them about the confidentiality of the research process. The faculty members were also informed that participation was voluntary and that they could withdraw from the study at any time. All research data was stored in a password-protected computer and encrypted for my access only. Participants were presented with a consent form (Appendix B) along with the initial recruitment letter and then consented to the study prior to beginning the interview. I removed identifiers to keep the participants’ information confidential to their specific program. I also used pseudonyms for participants and for the organization from which the purposeful sample was pulled. These pseudonyms were used in my interview transcripts, in my reflections, and in the written results and analysis. I also used the region or continent where
the study abroad took place instead of the country name to protect participants from being identified through their study abroad location.

**Trustworthiness**

One important aspect to consider during the research design and data collection process is research trustworthiness. Glesne (1999) summarizes several verification procedures to ensure a research study is trustworthy. One of the procedures I used in my study is member checking to make sure I represented the participants’ ideas accurately (Glesne, 1999). For this procedure, I shared the participant profiles and drafts of the final reports with the participants to give them an opportunity to clarify anything I did not report accurately. Furthermore, hosting multiple interview sessions at the same institution adds to the validity of my study because the participants developed and led study-abroad programs to coincide with the overarching mission of the institution. Since all participants had access to the same institutional resources, I could investigate the similarities and differences in the developmental process of study abroad and in the faculty perceptions of their experiences. Faculty at the institution did have different resources available through their individual departments; however, the resources provided by the Office of International Studies at the institution were available to all faculty.

**Summary**

This chapter discusses the details of the methodology I used in this study. I used instrumental case study inquiry to give voice to faculty who develop and lead study-abroad experiences for students. Through semi-structured interviews, participants were able to describe their perspectives of the phenomenon of faculty-led study abroad. This approach allowed me to investigate themes from their descriptions and to make meaning from the participants’ world.
view through in vivo and values coding. The next chapter will present the findings of the interviews with the participants.
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS AND FINDINGS

The purpose of this study is to examine faculty perceptions of their work leading short-term study-abroad programs by investigating what motivates faculty members to do this work, the challenges they face developing and leading these programs for students, and their understanding of how these programs are meaningful to students. The study also investigates departmental and institutional support available to faculty during the development and implementation of each program. Participants in this study included ten faculty members from a four-year public higher education institution in the central states of the United States. The faculty backgrounds and the programs they developed are notably different; however, they all have shared experiences in the process of developing and leading a study-abroad program for students. This study contributes to the literature on faculty-led study abroad and allows faculty to share their experiences. Finally, the hope is that other faculty members who would like to develop a study-abroad program for students, will use the strategies employed by these participants to implement what helped in the process and to overcome obstacles they face along the way. This research will allow administrators to hear faculty voices so that institutions can continue to implement policies and practices that best support faculty in their quest to develop study-abroad programs.

The first section of this chapter includes a reference table, participant profiles, and descriptions of each faculty-led study-abroad program. All names used are pseudonyms. A pseudonym is also used for the institution where this research took place. The pseudonym is University College. The second section of this chapter presents the answers to the four research questions along with the themes that emerged from the qualitative data analysis process. Each theme is supported with contextual examples from the participants. These themes provide
insights to the factors that influenced and guided each participant in his or her journey towards developing and leading a study-abroad program for students. The following questions guided this study:

1. What motivates faculty members to become involved in the development and leadership of short-term study abroad programs?
2. What was involved in creating and leading the short-term, faculty-led program? What obstacles did they encounter and how did they overcome them? On the other hand, what seemed to facilitate or help?
3. What did the faculty members say students gained from their participation in the program? What might be done to improve their educational experience?
4. What could institutions do to better support faculty in the development and implementation of short-term study abroad?

Section 1: Participant and Program Profiles

In this section, I describe each faculty member, their backgrounds, and the program they developed and led. I used the institution’s website to collect information about the faculty members. I used the study abroad website to gain more information about each program before conducting the interviews. Also, as part of my interview protocol, I asked a set of factual questions about each study-abroad program, which contributed to the development of the participant profiles. Along with the websites and the faculty responses to the interview questions, I also used field notes written in my journal during the interviews to construct the participant and program profiles. I provide the region or continent where each study-abroad experience took place instead of using the name of the specific country. This helps prevent the participants from being identified by the location of travel.
Table 1

Participant and Program Reference Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Participant</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Program Location</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Program Length</th>
<th>Program goals</th>
<th>Type of Stay</th>
<th>Outside Vender</th>
<th>Co-Lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Central America</td>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td>To practice Spanish that students will use in the classroom</td>
<td>Host families</td>
<td>Partner Institution</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Central America</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td>For students to see different perspectives on education and to experience a different culture</td>
<td>Host Families</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin</td>
<td>Instructional Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td>To be an immersive trip and to look at daily behaviors of Europeans, both health and recreation</td>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>South America</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>For students to understand food systems in South America</td>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td>To open the world to students and get them excited about traveling.</td>
<td>University Dorms, hotels</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flowers</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Central America</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>1 month</td>
<td>To expose students to a wide swath of the country and develop linguistic knowledge</td>
<td>Host families, hotels</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawson</td>
<td>Program Director</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>4 weeks</td>
<td>To learn what education is like in Europe and expand student experiences of their own second language.</td>
<td>Host families</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobs</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Undergrad Jr. Sr.</td>
<td>4 weeks</td>
<td>To learn about the school systems in Europe and engage in classroom observations</td>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>3 weeks</td>
<td>For geography majors to learn about various historical, cultural, and religious concepts and explore natural landscapes</td>
<td>Hostels, hotels</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Both More Grad</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td>To see what sport recreation is like in a different country.</td>
<td>Hostels, hotels</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participant 1 – Dr. Henry

Dr. Henry was motivated to develop a short-term study abroad program for students because he wanted to offer a different type of program for undergraduate students studying bilingual education so they could practice the type of Spanish they will use in the classroom
when they become teachers. He explains that many study-abroad programs available to learn and practice Spanish are designed for students to travel to Spain, yet most teachers will be working with students from Latin America. Dr. Henry developed a 6-week summer program where students study bilingual education and learn about the local culture, language, and educational system in Latin America. Students are placed in a bilingual school for clinical observations and stay with host families throughout the duration of the program.

**Participant 2 - Dr. Arnold**

Dr. Arnold was motivated to create an exchange program for students because she had studied abroad, and it was one of the best experiences of her life, so she wanted to afford this opportunity to other students. She was motivated to develop and lead a study-abroad program to help students open their eyes and broaden their experiences beyond what they have experienced in the United States. She developed a two-week program to Central America with a coworker who had a connection there. The goal of the program is for students to see different perspectives on education and to experience a different culture. Students stay with host families during their time abroad and explore the differences in the schools in Central America compared to those in the US.

**Participant 3 - Dr. Marvin**

Dr. Marvin aims to create a learner-centered environment for her students so they can develop critical thinking skills and their own learning interests. She partnered with a professor in another department to create a study abroad program for students, allowing them to examine the cultural lifestyles activities of Europeans surrounding diet and physical activity. Students in this program participate in an immersive trip within the city to observe the daily behaviors of Europeans and reflect on the differences compared to the United States. The trip is two weeks
and students stay in apartments throughout the city. Students attend classes led by University College faculty as well as guest speakers abroad and complete assignments and independent study coursework while overseas.

Participant 4 - Dr. Smith

Dr. Smith designed a summer study-abroad program to give students first-hand experience in food production from farms in South America to manufacturers to markets and restaurants. She had always wanted to create a study-abroad program for students that was different than a trip to Europe, and she took advantage of the opportunity when grant funds became available that paid for a site visit and helped lower student cost. She worked with another faculty member to develop this summer study-abroad program. She explained that other study abroad programs are a lot longer, so this ten-day trip allowed students to travel after the spring semester finals and still be home in time to start an internship.

 Participant 5 – Dr. Gary

Dr. Gary was motivated to develop a safe experience abroad for students at a good price point to encourage first-generation students to study abroad and to open the world to get students to travel. This study-abroad program is geared towards business majors and minors who want to discover the economic and social resiliency and recovery of a nation once occupied by communists. This is a two-week program where students stay in university dorms and hotels and engage in faculty-led classes that have a daily theme.

Participant 6 - Dr. Flowers

Dr. Flowers developed a summer study abroad program so that students and teachers could be exposed to Latin American culture and develop linguistic knowledge of the Spanish language. Students have ample opportunities to go to Spain, and she specifically wanted to take
them to Latin America to learn about diversity within the country. She was motivated to create a curriculum development-focused project program for preservice and in-service teachers and administrators because of the growing demographics of Hispanics in the community where she teaches. She explains that students are more successful in the classroom when their teachers understand and appreciate their cultural heritage and can support their cultural identities. Dr. Flowers specifically designed this program for participants to be immersed in the culture through host family stays, school observations, language classes, and cultural activities. The duration of this summer study abroad program is one month.

**Participant 7 - Dr. Dawson**

Dr. Dawson’s teaching interests lie in multicultural education and culturally responsive practices in higher education. Her native language is not English. She came to the United States to learn English and obtained a master’s degree. Her motivation for developing this 4-week summer study-abroad program came from knowing the importance of learning another language and culture. Her program is designed for education majors so they can have experiences in bilingual classrooms and learn how a second language can be helpful. Participants stay with host families in Europe, attend lectures, visit schools, and take educational field trips.

**Participant 9 - Dr. Jacobs**

Dr. Jacobs was motivated to develop a study abroad program for education majors so they could engage in clinical observations to reflect on the differences between the European school systems and the United States. One of the main reasons Dr. Jacobs wanted to develop this program was to change the goals and activities of a previous study abroad program offered so that the experience was more of an immersion trip into the language and culture. This summer study abroad is a 4-week experience where students take online classes while abroad.
After conducting the interview with this participant, I decided the program was a study-abroad redesign rather than an initial program development. Also, the trip has not been taken since the redesign occurred. Based off this information, I did not include the data from this interview in the analysis.

**Participant 9 - Dr. Roberts**

Dr. Roberts’ motivation for developing a study abroad program comes from a personal connection he made when living in Asia. He wanted to give students an opportunity to travel and view the world through the lens of a geographer, so he developed a 3-week field-based study abroad. This summer program is geared towards geography, language, and East Asian Studies majors/minors. Students travel by train and stay in hostels while studying various aspects of geography, history, and culture and use the country as their text for learning.

**Participant 10 - Dr. Sullivan**

Dr. Sullivan was motivated to develop a summer study abroad program for students because he had a connection to New Zealand and wanted students to gain insight into the global similarities and differences between this country and the United States, related to how sport and recreation are ingrained into a society. He worked with another professor to develop a two-week summer study-abroad program that is open to graduate and undergraduate students. Faculty members teach the courses abroad and students stay in hostels and hotels.

**Section 2: Thematic Connections**

The previous section described each participant and the program they developed. This section presents the research findings by research questions. For each question, key themes that emerged from the interviews are presented and direct quotes from faculty are used to amplify faculty voices. These data are synthesized and explained to provide a description of significant
themes. Many of the experiences the participants discussed were similar in the steps they took to create a study-abroad program for students yet their perceptions of the support they received developing and leading the program, differed significantly. When answering each research question with support from the findings, I addressed four elements: Motivation, Program Implementation, Program Outcomes, and Institutional Support. The research questions and the supporting themes are demonstrated in Table 2.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Motivation (Q1)** | Personal connections: personal connection to the country of choice, studied abroad in the past, research interests  
Outside factors: grant funding, another faculty member encouraged them |
| **Program implementation (Q2)** | Travel requirements: minimum number of students, marketing, logistics, paperwork  
Assistance from others: program vendor, partner institution, connection with others in the country of travel, co-leader, shadowing another leader  
Financial support: grant money, compensation, endowment money |
| **Program Outcomes (Q3)** | Feedback: transformative experience, positive student feedback  
Logistical and curricular changes: adjust programing, cultural activities, time of activities, courses offered |
| **Institutional Support (Q4)** | Frequently used resources: trainings, budget framework, international connections, emergency contact  
Lack of funding: compensating and recognizing faculty for their service, providing for student travel |
**Question 1:** What motivates faculty members to become involved in the development and leadership of short-term study-abroad programs?

Collectively all the participants explained how they became motivated to develop a study-abroad program and described what factors influenced this decision. The two themes that emerged from the data are that faculty are motivated by personal connections and outside factors. Faculty are motivated to design a study-abroad program because of having studied abroad in the past, which instilled in them a passion to create international experiences for students. Faculty are also motivated to engage in study-abroad development because of personal connections they have to the country of travel or by having previously lived there. Some examples of outside factors that influence the development of study-abroad programs are grant funding from the institution and being inspired by another faculty member who is willing to co-lead with them.

**Personal connections**

Three participants emphasized that studying abroad in the past had been one of the most influential experiences of their lives and voiced how they wanted to afford these opportunities to their students. For instance, Dr. Arnold explained that her own study-abroad experience gave her a passion to help others by developing a meaningful experience for them. Dr. Arnold stated the following:

I personally was motivated because I did study abroad when I was in college. I did a semester program in Europe, and it was by far and away one of the most influential best experiences of my life and you know, I'm 42 now, so I mean it was probably one of the most life changing, even more than like getting married and having a kid kind of thing, you know, it was, it was a very meaningful experience to me, and so I wanted to help
students, open their eyes and broaden their experiences beyond whatever they had 
experienced in the United States and at University College or whatever.

Dr. Smith also reiterated how her own study-abroad experience brought value to developing 
these experiences for others:

   I'm interested in study abroad because I grew up in Europe, so I know the value of going 
   and studying. I studied here as my study abroad in the United States and I see the value 
in it, so I was looking for opportunities to do something different.

Dr. Dawson also studied abroad in the United States, and through the experience, gained a 
deeper understanding of the connection between language and culture. She was motivated to 
develop a study-abroad program so that students could be exposed to a second language and 
culture just as she had. She explains:

   First, you know that my, English is not my first language, and I, so when I came here and 
   I, you know, I came here to learn English a long time ago. And then I was able to well, I, 
   I got offered you know, I learned about this, you know, opportunity to do my master’s, 
   and then I stayed here, and I ended up working with bilingual students in the College of 
   Education because they needed someone who was bilingual. In my case, I was more, you 
   know, Spanish, you know than English, but they needed someone to work with teachers. 
   So, my motivation was, you know, knowing that the students needed to be exposed to a 
   second language AND the culture. Not just to learn the language you know, like just, 
   like, in the same way I came here. They need to go abroad and learn.

Other participants describe how their own interests were a factor that influenced the 
development of the study-abroad program. For example, Dr Roberts explains how he used his 
own interests to create a program to make learning more hands-on for his students, which adds to
the bigger picture of opening students’ minds and helping them recognize where they are in their own world. Roberts reiterates:

Well, there's some personal, the personal side of wanting to maintain a connection with Asia. I lived there in the 90s when I was college age. I wasn't a student there, but I lived there from 19 to age 21 and wanted to maintain a connection with that. I've got a handful of research projects that I do, and taking students over allows me to share those with them and allows me more opportunities to visit different sites. And then from more of a program and educational perspective, pedagogical perspective, giving students a chance to learn about a different culture on-site and learn about geographic principles on site is one of the most fundamental things that I can possibly teach as an instructor, especially in geography and, and so I teach more than one field class and that's the only one I teach outside the country. But getting students into the field to learn about stuff where it happens, is very powerful. And then on top of that, the more, broader pedagogical goal of course with study abroad is that you give students an open. You help students open their minds to something else that makes them, not just more productive as a society, but makes them really recognize where they are in their own world, and they learn more about themselves through the process. So, I would, maybe, that's a good way to put it as I kind of start with my own interest, then my own interest kind of connects to learning and geography, and then the bigger picture - things with study abroad in general.

Overall, over 50% of the participants either had a personal connection to the country of travel or worked with a co-worker who had one. Having this connection was a factor that influenced why the specific destination was chosen and helped faculty when selecting program activities for the students because faculty could reach out to people they knew from that country
for suggestions. Dr. Arnold explained that she and the colleague she worked with chose Central America because of her colleague’s connection to that area. She explains, “I never in a million years would have picked Central America, though I love it. It's a beautiful, amazing country that I had never been to, but we really selected Central America because of Carrie’s connection.” Dr. Sullivan grew up in the country where he designed his study-abroad program. He chose that destination because he knew many people there who he could reach out to. He states:

“I guess one big motivating factor, um, I'm from X. I'm originally from X. I was born and raised in X so that was the main reason for picking that location. Still having contacts and colleagues in X, it was easy enough for me to plan and kind of conceptualize a study abroad.”

**Outside factors**

The second theme that influences the development of study-abroad programs is outside factors. Grant money and inspiration from other faculty members contribute to the motivation for engaging in this work. All the participants reported that they received monetary support to develop their program, which influenced their decision to create an experience abroad for students. Faculty members received a university grant to be able to go to the country for a site visit before taking students. Several of the participants had wanted to develop a study-abroad program, and when grant funds became available for a site visit, it solidified their plan to do it when they did. Dr. Roberts had plans to develop a study-abroad program to Asia once he had tenure. However, when his department encouraged him to apply for the grant that became available, it pushed him to create the experience earlier than he had expected. He explains:

I ran my first study abroad before I got tenure, because I had this kind of like, prompting.

This kind of, you know, push to get this, I had, there was money, there was money there,
and so my department, encouraged me to apply for it and I got it, and so it kind of just sort of fell into my lap. And, and then I keep continuing to do it now, hopefully will do another one at some point somewhere else as well. . . . And so that became kind of a motivation to maybe, do this two or three years ahead of when I was planning on doing it anyway. . . . And so, it was really kind of a kick that got me out the door, to have that extra money because there was no way I could have done it. You know, I couldn't have developed it without, you know, having that that sort of impetus to start.

Dr. Arnold says grant money influenced her plan to develop the program since she and her colleague were able to use the money to travel to the site to explore how it would work for students. She explains that she probably would have done the program anyway but that the grant was a factor that influenced the development of the program. She articulates:

The College had like a relatively major surplus of money at the end of the year and so they were creating these programs to like, oh, if you want to create a study abroad program and you want to travel to whatever country you're thinking of, to check it out and see how it would work, we will pay for you to go...so there was funding available for Carrie and I to go the summer before we started the program to meet with the folks there and visit schools and kind of experience what the students would experience, try, to go to some of the places we would do excursions to, to see if this would be feasible. For example, if we had a student with physical disabilities could we do that? If we had students who didn't speak any English or any Spanish at all, could we do that? You know, so that was really helpful to have that funding available to help us with setting up the program...I think we probably would have done it anyway, but I think the experience
would have been different if we hadn't sort of been boots on the ground the year before we had students go.

In addition to grant money, another outside factor that encourages the development of study-abroad programs is connecting with a co-faculty leader to work with throughout the process. About 70% of the participants worked with another faculty member to develop and lead their program. Dr. Marvin explains how connecting with another colleague to design the program contributed to her motivation to embark on the journey. Dr. Marvin narrates:

Mary and I both attended a workshop that was geared towards faculty that were interested in creating study-abroad programs but had like nothing. Like just an interest and maybe an idea, and it was really just a very general kind of starting point, and I knew Mary, personally, but I didn't really know her research area and she knew me but not mine. And so when we both went to that workshop we actually were doing some, like activities, and we're kind of like wow we both have an interest, you know, that focuses on health behaviors and chronic disease. Mine was more on physical activity patterns and hers was on, more on nutrition and diet. And we both had an interest in Europe. And that's kind of how it started. Study-abroad programs are such an incredible opportunity for students but also for faculty, but it's also an extremely daunting process and a scary thought of running one on your own, or at least it was for me. And when I found someone that had similar interests and similar desire for what it would look like and was willing to put the time in and help me build it. I was like, let's do it. And that was kind of what happened.

Dr. Smith had a similar experience in that working with another faculty and having the grant money were both outside factors that contributed to her motivation for developing a study abroad program. She explains:
So, Dr. Spafford and I talked about it, and then said Why don't we try something jointly to see if we can make this happen? And we applied for a grant at the Office of International Studies and Programs, faculty international travel program. So, if you want to design programs like this for your students, there's a grant - you apply for it. And with that grant. Dr. Spafford went to South America the year before to do the safety check, site visits and we worked with a company, Access Abroad is the name, and they picked her up from the airport, they took her to the places we were going to see. So, she was able to do everything on her own that summer. And then we were able to design the program based on our experience.

Dr. Henry explains how he “was in the right place at the right time” because his colleague had traveled to Latin America and had approached him to see if he was interested in taking over the legwork that had been done to secure a partner institution for the study-abroad program. He explains how this opportunity was just the right thing to get him started since it paired perfectly with his interest in developing a study-abroad experience “where you can go and focus on the academics and focus on the experiences and have fun at the same time.”

In conclusion, it became clear throughout the interview process that participants were motivated by personal experiences and connections well as outside factors such as grant money and inspiration from other faculty to develop and lead international experiences for students.

**Question 2:** What was involved in creating and leading the short-term, faculty-led program? What obstacles did they encounter and how did they overcome them? On the other hand, what seemed to facilitate or help?

The data analysis revealed challenges faculty faced as well as factors that were helpful throughout the processes and procedures of program development and implementation. The
themes that emerged from the data relating to this research question were *travel requirements*, *assistance from others*, and *financial support*. The participants explained how meeting the travel requirements set by the institution became an obstacle during the development of their programs. Whereas, having assistance from others was a helpful factor during the design and implementation process. Finally, funding for faculty and students to travel abroad was helpful when available but became an obstacle when there was a lack of funding.

**Travel requirements**

Faculty voiced that one of the challenges they faced was meeting the travel requirements that were set by the university. One example of this obstacle was getting enough students to enroll in their programs to meet the minimum number of students required to be able to travel. All the programs had a minimum and a maximum number of students that was established by the institution. If the minimum number of students did not enroll in the program, then the trip could not happen that year. This means that faculty members would have worked to develop the program with a possibility of not being able to travel if at least the minimum number of students did not sign up. Generally, but not in every case, the students split the cost of the faculty expenses to allow faculty to travel abroad as supervisors and instructors with the students. The minimum number is set so to ensure there are enough students to absorb the faculty cost of the trip. Smith emphasizes how challenging it is to recruit students and meet that minimum number established by the institution. The university provided money for her to do a site visit, but she had to have at least ten students enroll in her program for her costs to be covered. She explains that the system of having a minimum enrollment requirement so that faculty expenses can be built into the student cost is a major challenge on multiple levels when developing a study-abroad program. She states:
The biggest obstacle was the minimum of 10 students, and we had to have a minimum of 10 to make it happen, and that part, you know, that's the most difficult part, I want to keep the cost a minimum for our students. And we got financial support at the higher level from the university for me to go, but we have to pass that cost off to the students. It makes me sad that that's the system we have in play.

She goes on to say:

We don't have a budget for that [covering faculty expense for travel]. So we barely have enough money for me to fly over there, right, so that's another issue so I only went there once just to see what the program is like so I can promote it to the students.

Faculty also expressed that marketing the program was a challenge in order to recruit enough students to meet that enrollment requirement for travel. Dr. Marvin explains:

And then of course the marketing is always challenging too. And so, you know, I know before we went there were social media posts, and we have like, I don't know, computers that have like, you know, announcements and stuff on them all through- I’m in Canton Hall so we have those all over a quarter wall, and they would be, you know, flashing different opportunities they’d be on the website.

Dr. Smith markets her program in her classes and asks faculty to make announcements. She says, “I ask faculty to share information, and I'm assuming they do on the announcements in class, so there's no way of knowing how they are promoting anything like that. I asked them and hopefully are doing it.” Dr. Arnold also understands the challenge of marketing and recruiting students for her study-abroad program to meet the travel requirements. In the end, that was one of the reasons she decided to stop leading it for a while. Since the university had established
certain travel requirements including a minimum number of students for each trip, the study-abroad programs had to compete for students. She explains:

Another thing that was a challenge for us just on the kind of an institutional level is that when the university and the College of Education started pushing for more students to do study abroad, there was like an explosion of programs, and it became very competitive, which is not our bag. We were not, we never were in this to be like, oh, you want to go to our program because it's better because we're awesome and Central America is fabulous. And it kind of got to the point where we felt like we were kind of like selling ourselves out and it was like, this is not fun, you know, it's, it's like begging people to come on this trip. So, we just, it was time, it was time to stop for a while.

Furthermore, Dr. Arnold explains how sometimes the university had travel requirements that can be confusing and work against each other, making it harder to develop and lead a study-abroad program. She narrates:

And honestly, I mean, and sometimes that, it worked, they worked against each other. It worked against us because there would be requirements for one and requirements for another and it was very confusing for us. It was confusing for students. The students were hearing from six different people about what they needed to submit. Nobody knew why and they're asking us, and we didn't know why. And so, it was, yeah, there could be some improvements. That was one thing that was always a little bit challenging for me because they have lots of requirements for the students and we always ask that, like, could we be involved in those too because we honestly didn't know what the students were getting.
**Assistance from others**

On the other hand, some things that were helpful in the processes and procedures of the development and implementation of study-abroad programs included having assistance from others such as hiring an outside vendor/company or a co-leader to help with planning. About 60% of the participants indicated that they used an outside vendor or a company to assist with the planning and implementation of their program. Dr. Arnold voices:

So, there was funding available for Carrie and I to go the summer before we started the program. We found some universities that were already doing partnerships with either University College or other institutions for higher education in the United States and so we got some proposals from them. Ultimately, we ended up going with the Institute for Study Abroad (IFSA), which is a program, out of, well, I think it's still, at the time it was out of another institution. And they have offices all over the country or all over the world…So, that's what we did, and we worked with them throughout the, through the whole time. And they were amazing. It was more expensive for us and for the students but the peace of mind having people who lived there and who knew the system, they also vetted the families. They were amazing……two years we had students who had kind of medical emergencies, and it was like, I'm freaking out, but they took care of everything you know, like this is what they do every day so that was, that was invaluable to have them to partner with… Honestly the first year with the development, it was a breeze. I mean, truly, Tiffany was the person we worked with in Central America, she put everything together. It was amazing. It's an amazing price. We were so excited! We had lots of students sign up. Everything kind of went off without a hitch.
Dr. Smith also used an outside vendor that organizes study-abroad programs, which was instrumental in the development and implementation process of her program. She states:

Yeah, so there's a company that does study-abroad programs and friend of mine, Dr Frazer in marketing, had used them before for one of her trips. She recommended them. So, I reached out to them, and they designed a plan for us that fit what we were looking for in food. Food specific, food and agriculture specific. So, the visits were very customized for us, we visited farmer cooperatives.

Furthermore, Dr. Marvin explains how the company she and her co-leader selected was significant in the process and planning for their study abroad trip:

And so we work with a company. It's called CEA. I'm not sure how much you've gotten into kind of investigating the different resources available for these programs and kind of how they're set up but there's different ones out there, and we chose to use one, and they really have, they were fantastic because they really handle all the logistics. They figure out the apartments that the students stay in, like, you know, transportation from the airport to the apartments. They provide a classroom space for us so that we can have our guest speakers come in, or we can do different types of learning activities. They helped set up all the excursions that we went on. And if needed would provide a translator for us. And so they were extremely instrumental, especially in this first trip for the planning, development, and then when we were there of course, facilitating and implementing the program.

In addition to using an outside vendor Dr. Marvin explained that the other aspect that was helpful during the preliminary stages of planning was having her colleague to work with. When asked what was helpful during the process she responded:
My colleague. So, you know, it is daunting to create a program, and then take, you know, 20 students on the other side of the world. And if I, you know, I never, Mary and I were always on the same kind of wavelength and page. We wanted the same things. She has this, we have the same work ethic. We worked really well together. You know, academically, but also you know, we got along well personally as well, I mean, we were together non-stop for two weeks when we were on these trips. I think if you’re gonna do it with a colleague, it has to be someone that you mesh well with, because that would, I would think, would make it very challenging, if not so.

Finally, Dr. Sullivan did not use a program vendor for assistance during the planning and preparation of the study-abroad experience but reached out to the program director for study abroad in the Office of International Studies who provided resources that were crucial in leading his trip. He says, “the system and the structure put in place by the international office helped to, kind of, I guess, provide a kickstart to really actually put the idea into action.”

**Financial support**

The final theme that emerged from the data relating to the challenges and helpful factors that contributed to the development and implementation of study-abroad programs was financial support. Faculty received financial support in the form of grants, compensation, and endowment funds. The level of financial support faculty received varied depending on the department each faculty member taught in and whether the faculty member had applied for funds separate from the university. Faculty members used the financial support to travel abroad for a site visit before taking students. Other faculty members taught courses abroad and some were compensated their contract pay for teaching those courses. In addition, one faculty member described how he was able to use endowment funds to support his cost of the trip and to lower the cost of study abroad
for his students. Dr. Flowers described how having grant money from the university allowed her and her co-leader to take a site visit to help design the program. She explained that her co-leader had a vision to develop a study-abroad program for future and current educators and administrators and that “the grant to be able to go down and establish those connections with schools…that was key really for us to be able to pull it off.” Having the opportunity to develop a more specific plan for their study-abroad program strengthened their application for a Fulbright-Hayes Group Project Abroad grant. The Fulbright grant covered the entire cost of the trip for the faculty leaders and participants.

Dr. Marvin also said that the grant money provided by the institution was one of the most crucial supports for developing and implementing the program. She explains how she and her co-leader applied for the grant and how it ultimately helped them develop learning outcomes for the students. She explains:

So, we went to the workshop, and one of the reasons that they were having the workshop is that the Office of International Studies was offering essentially a grant to help faculty create a study-abroad program. And so, we knew that there was this grant, so that's what we started working on, and so we applied for the development grant, and we got it. And then, we were able to take a trip to Europe, just the two of us. And that was where we were able to kind of really put together okay, what are we going to have them do, you know, where they're going to go? What are going to be the learning outcomes? How are we going to achieve them?

Overall, the faculty members explained that meeting the requirement of having a minimum number of students enroll in the program to be able to travel was a challenge, which also went together with the challenge of keeping costs low for students. The most helpful factors
that contributed to the process of developing and implementing a study-abroad program for students was assistance from others and financial support.

**Question 3:** What did the faculty members say students gained from their participation in the program? What might be done to improve their educational experience?

Two themes that emerged when answering this question was *feedback* and *logistical and curricular* changes. All faculty members received feedback from the students that participated in their program. The feedback they received from their students is what shaped faculty perceptions of what they felt their students gained from the experience. In addition, when reflecting on the experience, most faculty would make minor changes, if any, to the logistics of the program and the curriculum.

**Feedback**

The data analysis revealed that 100% of faculty said the study-abroad experience had a positive impact on students. The participants perceived the experience as transformative for their students and gave examples of positive student feedback they received upon completion of the program. They also explained the parts of the experience they thought had the most impact on student learning and growth. For example, Dr. Arnold believed that the homestay experience had a positive impact on students. She says:

> I think that they got a lot from the homestay. I think it was the thing they were most nervous about and probably learned the most from is really, just being in, in, even though it's only two weeks, really being immersed into the culture, and a family setting. I think they got a lot from the school visits. We did the briefings every day, so we would talk about what we saw and how it compared to what they would see in the US and all that kind of stuff. And then I think they got a lot from the travel we did. We packed a lot into
a two-week period of time. We did weekend excursions so we would leave like on a Friday morning and come back on a Sunday night…So really the, the culture, the schools, and then just seeing the country.

Dr. Marvin explained how her students made connections to lifestyle differences in the country they traveled to compared to the US. She felt the students met the goals she had established for the program. She reiterates:

They learned a lot from really taking stock, in where is your food coming from, you know that, that farm to table kind of movement that we see here. That's what they do in Europe all the time, I mean that's just, that's their lifestyle. Just kind of the way that movement is kind of incorporated into downtime was one, and then the flip side of that, of course, is the food culture and, you know, when you look at the care and respect that Europeans have for food.

Dr Smith also used the student feedback to understand what students gained from the experiences. She noted that many students traveled by airplane for the first time and experienced a change in currency. Understanding cultural differences was a big takeaway from the study-abroad program. She goes on to say:

I think it's a life-changing experience to be honest, some of them, they never left their hometown before, let alone, you know, the country. So that was really good. Maybe one of them, that was their first flight ever I think...So, just being you know, able to take an international flight and going through the customs, and, you know, get your passport checked, I mean all kinds of experiences they are living. That different exchange rate right? Their money currency is so different, so they have to constantly convert everything back into dollar, okay this is cheap, oh this is too expensive, they always have
to do that juggling cultural differences. I mean, in agriculture we talk a lot about meat industry here. Their meat cuts are different than our meat cuts, like what we have, a steak maybe, it's not the same cut there. So, you were able to see literal differences, and how they are surviving in an economy that they have their high inflation, really bad economy, and they're still surviving somehow. And that was interesting, so the city is a big capital city, right? So that living, seeing the big city environment is different than X even. So that was a good eye-opening experience.

Dr. Henry tells about how students in his program reported that the experience was transformational:

They reported life changing transformational experiences. Speaking Spanish better. Feeling more prepared to take the Spanish test, having been exposed to another culture other than their own. Even those that were from a Spanish culture said being exposed to a different Spanish culture than my own. Being better prepared for the classroom when it comes to teaching bilingual students. Being better prepared for the classroom in general. Growing up. Some of them learned how to mature away from mom and dad and to realize that mom and dad don’t know everything and that they had to find their own way as well. So, like I said, a lot of transformational experiences reported.

Finally, Dr. Flowers talks about the language gains that were made by participants in her program and how the students reflected on their own identity as a result of studying abroad.

I know that they learned so much, I mean, the language gains were impressive. One of my jobs was to interview them before and after and, you know, I'm not like OPI certified or whatever but to give you, give Fulbright a gauge of how much people learned and particularly the students that started off really low, right, they had enormous jumps in
their abilities and it was fun to talk with heritage speakers, about how they, you know, they all just like from my vocabulary, right now I can talk about this that or the other thing right, just felt their language growing into new spaces in ways that were wonderful….But the, the identity piece, right, just figuring out who you are and figuring out your own relationship to this other part of the world. It's just so wonderfully rewarding.

**Logistical and curricular changes**

After leading the study abroad, faculty reflected on how they could improve their program for students. Two faculty members said they wouldn’t really change anything. The other participants explained how they would make a few minor adjustments related to programming, cultural activities, and curricular changes. Dr. Arnold made changes to the programming after the first year of leading the trip so that students would visit fewer schools and focus on the better schools they had visited. She states:

We pared it down a little after that because it was like in a two-week period of time we were in like 12 different schools. So, we went to high schools. We went to elementary schools. We went to preschools. And then we kind of like after that first year, were like okay these were the best ones, in our opinion, to get that diversity of experience.

Dr. Marvin would change some of the cultural activities so that students could go to some well-known places with a tour guide. She had mostly focused on including only activities that aligned with the curriculum, but when students expressed interest in seeing other parts of the country, she thought it would be a good idea to add those for the next year. She explains:

Having actually, more like touristy type activities, like pre-planned within the program. So, when we were, when we were creating the program, Mary and I were very academic,
you know, you know syllabus outcome driven as to, you know, here's, here's that, you
know, here's that educational outcome that we want them to understand and here is the
experience that we're going to create and they're going to participate in in Europe that's
going to help facilitate that…. What we found though was the students really wanted to
learn more about the city that they were in, specifically X City because we were there for
two weeks, I mean, and so we kind of stayed away from you know, let's take a tour of the
X which is the church, or some of the really big like the Museum, you know, we didn't do
those, as a group, and just thought that if the students want to do that they can do it, and
some did, but some of them really wanted, like they wanted that structure of us doing it
together. And then the history behind it. And so, I think that would definitely be, that, I
remember us talking with CEA [the company that assisted with planning] and saying
okay next time we do this, we're going to plan some of those in. We won't put, I mean
that won't be the whole trip, obviously, but we'll have some more of that in there,
especially since, again, you know, I'm not an art historian, like you know I don't, I'm not,
my area of expertise is not in art, like I, you know, so, or history or whatever, so you
know if we do it and organized, and we can make sure that you, CEA has, you know, like
travel tour guides, I guess that are much more specialized and able to handle that, you
know, then Mary and I are so, that would be something that we would definitely include.
We’ll still make sure we're meeting our educational outcomes but, but add that, add some
of that other touristy stuff in there too.

Dr. Smith kept most of the activities the same but wanted to add a few additional ones in for the
next experience. She says:
We kept most of the visits the same, but we really wanted to visit a farmer, like him on their farm so that's something we were going to add to the program, just to see the production side of things at the farm level, and like, even when we visited the co-op, co-op told us hey, we can take you to one of our member’s farms, because we met in the office, it's not the same thing as living in the fields. So that's one thing we talked about and maybe we were supposed to see a meat processing plant, we didn't get to do it, they had to do switching.

Dr. Gary has led his program more than once and continues to make minor changes to the itinerary stating, “I pretty much follow the same model, other than changing up excursions or company tours.” Finally, if Dr. Dawson were to change anything, it would be the classes offered. For examples, she states,

We would change the classes that we offer. That's one thing you know just making sure that because of the other programs in a study-abroad world we wanted to be more like, uniform when it comes to classes offered abroad, and one of the classes that was actually perfect, was the multicultural class, right. The curriculum was designed for students who were going abroad and all the themes in their meetings as one.

Questions 4: What could institutions do to better support them in the development and implementation of short-term study abroad?

Two major themes emerged from the data when investigating how institutions support faculty throughout this journey and whether additional resources are needed to support faculty who develop and lead study-abroad programs for students. The two themes are: frequently used resources and lack of funding.
Frequently used resources

Many of the participants expressed how grateful they were for the institutional support. Participants reported that the institution was supportive by giving them grant money and providing resources to faculty such as workshops, training, third-party contacts, and assistance with paperwork. The grant money awarded to Dr. Roberts had a tremendous impact on the ability to develop his study-abroad program. He used the grant money towards going on a site visit as well as lowering the cost for students by nearly $1000.00 per student. Roberts explains how crucial the site visit was to the development of his program:

So, okay, so we have a grant that was from - so basically it was kind of departmental money. Well, it was from the college, it's college money that was available through the College of Arts and Sciences, and through an endowment, that was donated to them to provide grant money to make curricular changes so that the faculty could get it, get the money in order to make curricular improvements for the department. And so, my curricular improvement was to add a study abroad to our set of electives…it was more than just a site visit, it was really, how does transportation networks work in different parts of Asia. How do the hotels work, how am I checking in and out of hotels and hostels and I mean it was all sorts of those logistics that I didn't want to hire, you know, faculty can hire these logistics groups that will do all that work for them, but I didn't want to do that because I knew I wanted a program that was gonna be flexible to do what I wanted and I didn't want to have that middle person in between… And so that site visit over three weeks was really, it was critical. It was really critical.

He also explains how his department provides resources for his students by helping fund the cost of the trip.
And we have department money that we've created a fund within the department that we try to feed money into every year. That helps to offset the cost for the students so that any of their, their train pass, and then their accommodations, I book and pay for out-of-the-department funds. So that offsets the cost for the students….There we have an endowment fund that unfortunately she just passed away, but an Emeritus faculty, she donated some money to the department and part of that money each year gets to the, I get to use some of that to help offset the cost even more for, for me and the students, so that the students aren't saddled with a lot of times with study abroad students end up paying the cost for the faculty. My students don't pay a dime of my costs, they pay us a very small program fee that ends up coming back to me and the department. But, they don't have to, they don't pay for my travel. And so we try to get as much of that from the department as possible.

Another type of support faculty voiced in the interviews was that the institution provided training for faculty and students before departure. All faculty received the training but when doing values coding, I found that some faculty thought the trainings were helpful while others did not. Whether perceived as helpful or not, this was a resource that 100% of the faculty received from the institution. Dr Arnold thought the training provided by the institution was a good support and explains:

We kinda go through these different meetings and orientation things through the office for study abroad, and helping us with understanding what to do in an emergency, things… I felt, always felt very good and we had to make contact with the office and let them know when we made it to the country and when all the students were there and
when all the students left and you know what I mean, all that kind of stuff, so that was
good. And, yeah, so I mean that those were good supports.

Dr. Marvin also described the training as a useful resource:

So, our institution offers. There were multiple trainings, three or four right before you
go. And they were focused on finance reimbursements. And then things like, you know,
passport and legal considerations, and what your students need to do to have the right
documentation. There's one where it's like, basically like worst case scenario, kind of
training like how to handle if a student, like, you don't know where they are and, you
know, so yeah there was a lot, we had a lot just, that was provided by University College.
And it was very helpful, one, because I felt like if something happened while we were
over there, that we could contact University College and, and get the support that we
needed. And that was really helpful….they [students] have to do essentially like this
online training. They have to work through the modules and complete activities, and
they’re specific to traveling abroad, overall like kind of they’re general and then some
that are more geared towards where the students are actually going.

In addition, Smith highlights the trainings that are frequently used by the university to offer
support for faculty leaders. She states:

The university has an orientation, so that's always good. Students are encouraged, and I
think, almost have to attend this orientation. That's really helps… I attended a faculty
preparation meeting. In that one we talked about risk management safety, security, health
issues and things like that. So, I was prepared for those things, if somebody gets sick, I
knew what I was going to do in case of emergency, things like that. The university did a
really good job providing that information to us. They give you 24 seven call line.
Finally, several participants described that the Office of International provided resources such as contacts for faculty to reach out to, budgeting frameworks, assistance with paperwork, and behavioral contract examples. Dr. Marvin describes how the director of study abroad helped throughout the process by providing several of these frequently used resources. She narrates:

First, she [the director of study abroad] was kind of helping us, you know with what we need to do to get this grant together and part of the grant, of course was a budget, and then kind of planned excursions as well as rationale and, you know, learning outcomes that, a syllabus, and all that stuff. But she provided a list of a couple of different companies that University College has used in the past, and had faculty have, you know, good experiences with so she had the list. And then we had like interviews with a few of them. And then just decided which one we thought would meet our needs best.

The office also gave Dr. Marvin a template of a behavior contract to help hold students accountable while abroad. She said, “We did have them sign, like, I called it, some kind of an agreement. The director in the office of study abroad gave us like, a kind of a draft of what some programs used, and it was basically like, you’re representing University College.”

Dr. Henry commended the support from the Office of International Programs and explained how the resources they have available were crucial in helping him implement a study-abroad program:

The Office of International Programs is wonderful support in that they work back and forth with faculty and the partnership university to secure additional contracts and to work on budgetary type things and to help with students.

He goes on to say:
I think I’ve been wonderfully supported like I talked about before. I’ve had to build fortitude and perseverance into that journey for myself. It’s been, it’s been wonderful to have good relationships with my colleagues and with my administrators. I think somebody who doesn’t have as strong of a relationship might experience a little bit more hardship. But I think that, I think that the conversations of equity and uniqueness need to continue. We don’t need all programs to look the same, but we do need to support all programs in their uniqueness.

Dr. Smith explains how she used her department as a resource and was supported by the university in this way:

We were supported. We, our department chair at the time was Dr. Jones, and he even lived in Taiwan when he was a little kid. He's very passionate about study abroad, too. So that was a really easy sell, and he's always open to new ideas like that so I always had his support, developing it. University, obviously we were able to get the grant to do some of that, that's, that was really helpful to us. What else, yeah, overall great support. And then the international office those people are amazing so helpful.

Dr. Roberts goes on to say that recognition and encouragement are a big part of the support he receives from his department for embarking on the journey of developing and leading study abroad programs.

But then I would, I would say maybe what’s important is the support that I've had from department leadership and just encouraging me to do this, and being behind me and recognizing me for doing it that's been really, really valuable to me is knowing that they've got my back. You know that this is something that they want me to do and I'm not just kind of on my own, even though they don't have to do anything. I do all the
work. But just knowing that they're behind me and supporting me with that is really helpful.

**Lack of funding**

Another theme identified in the data is *lack of funding* from the university. Some of the participants explained how they believed the institution could better support them in their journey of developing and leading study-abroad programs by offering grants to offset costs for students, which would allow more students to travel with their program. Also, compensating and recognizing those faculty who are not already compensated for their work teaching courses is another way in which institutions could better support faculty when developing and leading study-abroad programs.

Several participants suggested that institution could best support study-abroad by finding solutions to keep the cost low for students. Dr. Marvin explains that high costs can be a roadblock for the students wanting to travel. She states:

I mean from the students’ perspectives; I think it's such a fantastic opportunity. And I love that institutions are offering so many different types of trips for students to pick, you know, and to find one that really fits their interests and that they can grow from and that they can have a rich experience with, but it does always come down, I mean, it's expensive, you know, and, and money is something that makes it, you know completely off the table or roadblock for a lot of students. So, there's kind of those types of incentives that help students. Um, but other types of, you know, grants or funding opportunities to help students offset the cost. I think is, is probably one of the best ways to help students, you know, take these types of trips, because they're expensive and it makes it feasible for only certain types of students.
Arnold also concurs that institutions should provide better support by helping keep costs low for students. She explains:

One of the biggest stressors—honestly was trying to keep the cost low for students. And one of those things people don’t know either is that the university provides no support for faculty, even for travel on study-abroad programs, so we could either pay our own way, or we could build that into the student cost which I think is really crummy. And so, if Carrie and I both wanted to go as to faculty members, that doubled the price of faculty. So, like one year only one of us went, or like one person went for this amount of time, and one person went for this amount of time to try to save costs for the students, which I think is really unfortunate. Because we were committed to keeping the costs as low as possible for the students, but it made us have to cut corners that really, we probably shouldn’t have had to cut, because there wasn’t support from the department, college or university for that. Most people don’t realize that the university pays nothing for study abroad. It’s a huge moneymaker for them in fact because the money that the students pay for coursework, at least at University College goes into the general fund at the university level, doesn’t go back to the departments, which is part of why they don’t pay faculty for study abroad.

In Dr. Smith’s experience, compensation should be considered for faculty who develop and lead study-abroad programs as well as financial support for shadowing an experienced faculty who could help mentor new faculty wanting to develop and lead study-abroad programs. She explains:

And then I think financial support is needed. I don't want to put faculty’s costs to the student costs. We, if you want to keep the student costs to a minimum, maybe the
university should provide funding for faculty, to take the students, and that cost includes basically your airfare, your lodging, and your meals every day. I guess for faculty who's never done this, that will be maybe overwhelming to them. Maybe the university can provide funding for a junior faculty. When I say junior, you know, not necessarily tenured yet but Junior in a way that they never been abroad before. So, the faculty like me can take down with me as a second advisor, but the cost is, you know, paid by the university so they are exposed to that kind of experience, and they feel more comfortable than something that's on their own. So, it's not always the same faculty doing these things.

Dr. Henry also concurs that faculty compensation for teaching classes would be a welcomed support. Although this is not true for all departments at University College, in his department, faculty members do not get compensated for courses they teach during study abroad. If he were teaching the same course on campus over the summer, he would have been compensated his contract pay. He explains:

I’m teaching courses that I’m not getting paid for. So, I was not being compensated because courses with study abroad are funded differently because their contract goes to the Office of International Programs and to the Provost office. The money never actually comes to your unit…teaching a course here, I would naturally be given my summer pay as a faculty, but to teaching a course there, even though I’m teaching it the same way. And even though I’m using the same quality and same passion to teach it, if not more. And even though students can put it on their transcript. I wasn’t paid for it.

Dr. Sullivan’s department was similar in that he was not compensated for teaching courses abroad. He received grant money to take a site visit but would have felt more supported
financially had he been given his contract pay for the courses he taught. When asked how he could be better supported he stated:

   I don't think it's necessarily a school specific issue, but, that financial compensation for running the trip. We obviously we had the grant to support and get us off the ground, but when we ran the course, we had the course for the 20 students, we, that didn't count for us in terms of any salary or pay, and it was kind of just an experience above and beyond the normal role and expectation.

Dr. Arnold had the same experience with lack of compensation for the courses she was teaching abroad. She felt discouraged because faculty in other departments were getting paid to teach courses, yet she was not getting compensated from her department. She explains:

   They [administration] just said, we don't support faculty teaching classes during study abroad. And that was, and I think that was hard for us on a couple of levels because the faculty member who was teaching a course in a different department was getting paid for two courses, for teaching all of our students because she was teaching across all of the College of Education... And so, it was, it was a ton of work for her and I don't discredit her for that but it was sort of like, okay, wait a minute. She's what, why is she getting paid. Like, for two classes, and we're not getting paid. And we're doing a ton of work….I mean I think that I, I know sounds like kind of bitter about it, but I do think it was a very good experience I am glad that I did it, I, I loved taking students and helping them experience new things, I, I really really did, and I think that with more support from the university, from my department, from the university, I probably would have kept doing it, but I felt like every time we were trying to do something new and innovative, we kind of got doors shut.
Summary

In this chapter, I presented the findings from the data analysis from interview data gathered from the nine faculty members who developed and led a study-abroad program at University College. The focus of this chapter was the main ideas each participant shared in the study and the common themes generated in relation to the research questions. In the first section of this chapter, I provided a description of each participant and explained the goals and structure of the programs they developed. In the second section of this chapter, I focused on answering each research question and finding the themes that emerged from the data through In Vivo Coding and Values Coding. I presented the answers to the research questions for this study by providing direct quotes from the participants from the data collected from the interviews. In Chapter V, I complete the discussion of the findings and explain the implications and recommendations generated from this study.
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS

To review, the focus of this instrumental case study was to understand faculty members' experiences in the development and implementation of faculty-led study-abroad programs. Coding and thematic analysis of the qualitative interview data revealed conclusions that provide insight into the contextual factors that influence and guide faculty in their journey as study-abroad leaders. In this final chapter, I discuss the four conclusions drawn from the study’s findings and present the implications for higher education administrators, future faculty study-abroad leaders, and for future research.

Discussion

The research questions that guided this study were:

1. What motivates faculty members to become involved in the development and leadership of short-term study-abroad programs?
2. What was involved in creating and leading the short-term, faculty-led program? What obstacles did they encounter and how did they overcome them? On the other hand, what seemed to facilitate or help?
3. What did the faculty members say students gained from their participation in the program? What might be done to improve their educational experience?
4. What could institutions do to better support them in the development and implementation of short-term study abroad?

In response to these questions, the following themes were generated: personal connections, outside motivators, travel requirements, assistance from others, financial support, feedback, logistical and curricular changes, frequently used resources, and lack of funding. Four conclusions can be made from the analysis of the major themes and are described below. The
findings are discussed in relation to the literature on faculty-led study abroad and in relation to the study’s theoretical framework of constructivism and Kolb’s Experiential Learning Theory.

**Conclusion 1: Faculty study abroad leaders make decisions about their study-abroad program based on personal connections and research interests.**

Nearly all the faculty members who participated in this study indicated that they began designing their program by reflecting on their own experience studying abroad or through a personal connection they or their co-leader had with the destination of travel. This finding aligns with constructivism as the faculty leaders built on what they already knew, their familiar experiences, and applied that knowledge to new information as they self-guided throughout the process of designing a study abroad program. In addition, many faculty members chose to lead a study-abroad program because another faculty member wanted to collaborate with them to implement the program. Collaborative work is an important part of constructivism (Creswell, 2009).

Constructivism is illustrated through the experiences of the faculty leaders. Throughout the process of creating their study-abroad programs, the faculty members identified what they were most familiar with and formed new knowledge and ideas through their interactions with others as they developed and implemented the program. For example, Dr. Arnold studied abroad when she was in college. Since it was the most influential experience of her life, she wanted to use her personal connection to design something that would help other people have a similar experience. She collaborated with a co-worker and was active and social in the process by reaching out to several constituents. The same was true for Drs. Roberts and Sullivan. Both faculty leaders had a personal connection and familiarity with the country where they established their study-abroad program. Dr. Roberts had previously lived in the country where his study
abroad program is located and has several on-going research projects in this location. Alternatively, Dr. Sullivan is a native of the study abroad host country. He has many contacts from that region who helped him develop the study-abroad program.

**Conclusion 2: Faculty study-abroad leaders follow similar steps to develop study-abroad programs, using a variety of personal and institutional resources.**

In chapter II, the literature describes common steps faculty take to develop study-abroad programs as well as best practices for study-abroad faculty leaders. The findings from this research shows evidence of similar information. In their book *Passport to Change*, Pasquarelli et. al., (2018) recommend breaking down faculty-led study-abroad programs into three phases during development and implementation: 1. preparation for the trip, 2. the experience abroad, and 3. the return. The faculty leaders in my study followed similar steps when developing their programs.

As part of phase one, the preparation for the trip, the faculty leaders determined the program goals, the destination of travel, and the travel logistics. They sought university approval, prepared a budget, and laid the groundwork for teaching abroad. Next, they marketed their program and completed the required trainings before going abroad.

More specifically, the faculty leaders started with an idea or had a purpose in mind and reached out to other individuals to further develop their study-abroad programs. As they reached out to people throughout this process, the program goals and how they would achieve those goals came together and became clearer. Through discourse with the participants, I found that one of the key steps common among participants was to specifically design a course of study that incorporated authentic experiences related to the content they were teaching. For example, Dr. Dawson designed a study-abroad program for students in education so the students could engage...
in clinical observations and be immersed in the schools, allowing students to make comparisons between European school systems and those in the US. Dr. Smith, who designed a program for agricultural business and family consumer science majors, also explained how customizing the itinerary allowed students to visit farms first-hand to learn about how food systems work in South America.

The literature on faculty-led study-abroad programs emphasizes the importance of the programs being culturally relevant and faculty incorporating activities to assist students in gaining cultural competence. Keese and O’Brien (2011) explain that faculty-led study-abroad programs allow faculty to design a course specific to an area of study in which students apply course content to real-life situations abroad. Hulstrand (2015) states that one of the most important responsibilities of those developing study abroad programs is that the programs are academically sound and culturally relevant, and not simply tourism. Each of the faculty members explained how they took great care to ensure their program was not simply tourism and that the purpose was to move students out of their comfort zone. In fact, this goal was one of the driving factors for why the faculty leaders chose to develop their programs from the ground up, aligning the goals of the program with the goals of the students’ academic area of study.

For instance, Dr. Henry strategically chose a country in Latin America because, at the time, no other programs offered students a way to get course credit related to this experience. He also wanted his students to experience language that was similar to what education majors would hear in their future classrooms. He wanted to create a program that was meant to provide students with the opportunity to “become awakened” culturally. Developing field-intensive learning experiences that are academically sound and culturally relevant was, therefore, an important step faculty took when developing their study-abroad programs.
While faculty followed a similar process when developing and leading a study-abroad program, the order in which faculty members completed the preparation steps differed slightly. In addition, the resources faculty used to complete the steps varied. For example, one of the biggest differences in resource utilization was that about half of the faculty utilized a program vendor or a university partner who took on some of the responsibilities of the trip preparation such as developing an itinerary and coordinating student housing. The other faculty members relied on personal connections to the country and the university’s Office of International Programs to provide guidance during the trip preparation. Despite these differences, all faculty followed similar steps in phase one to ensure their program was successfully established.

During phase two of program development and implementation, the faculty members travel abroad with students. All the faculty leaders explained how they take on multiple roles abroad. Some faculty teach classes abroad and others serve as program facilitators. These roles include serving as a tour guide, instructor, translator, housing coordinator, or disciplinarian, etc. This finding is in line with the literature on faculty-led study abroad. For instance, Wilkie (2018) contends that faculty take on so many new roles when they develop and lead study-abroad programs. She notes that during the experience, some faculty are called upon to respond to concerns that campus services usually take care of, such as student misconduct, health issues, counseling, and housing.

Finally, during the last phase of development and implementation the faculty member’s role as a study-abroad leader focuses primarily on the return of students from studying abroad. Upon their return, the faculty leaders reflect on the overall experience, obtain student feedback, and decide on what modifications they would make to the next trip if they had plans to travel again with students. These concluding steps were similar among all the faculty members.
Conclusion 3: Faculty perceive their programs as beneficial to student learning and growth.

Findings gathered from the interview data revealed that the faculty members perceive their program to be beneficial to student learning and growth. Landon, Tarrant, and Rubin (2017) contend that faculty-led programs align instruction with student learning outcomes, making study-abroad experiences more meaningful. Keese and O’Brien (2011) explain that faculty-led study abroad programs allow faculty to teach through a critical lens as students learn about the world firsthand. The faculty leaders explained how they aligned instruction with student learning outcomes when developing their programs to facilitate critical thinking and promote student learning and growth throughout the experience. For example, Dr. Gary said he gives the students a theme of the day to focus on and think critically about as they engage with the cultural activities. Students write in their journals and debrief at the end of the day about the theme of the exercise. Dr. Gary indicated that he uses these reflections as teaching moments. He explains that a lot of what study abroad is “is watching them [the students] shift from their comfort zone to the uncomforted zone and to stretch themselves.” He assesses how students change throughout the experience and asks follow-up questions to reignite why they are there and that they are not just tourists. He explains that for the most part, the students meet the goals he has set for the program.

One difference between the study-abroad programs is that they varied in the length of time students spent abroad. The programs ranged from ten days to eight weeks. Irrespective of the length of time of the program, the faculty perception of the extent to which their program was beneficial to student learning and growth did not waiver. My research relates well with Strange and Gibson’s (2017) study that investigated the influence of program length on transformative
learning outcomes. Their findings indicate that transformative learning can be achieved regardless of the length of time spent abroad. Dr. Roberts said:

I absolutely love doing this and the reason I love doing it, is because the students have such a big growth - so much, it's like, it's not, I don't do it for me. I get something out of it, but the students grow and the connection that they make to the department, I mean it's so, I don't know what the right word is for it. It's this deep connection that these types of experiences, these really high impact educational practices have on their existence as a university student that they carry with them for the rest of their lives. And that's just, I think that's, really powerful.

Conclusion 4: Higher education institutions simultaneously support and hinder faculty who develop and lead study abroad.

Through discourse with the faculty leaders, it became evident that the faculty members’ university provides support for faculty who develop and lead study-abroad programs. Along with this support, the institution has policies in place that pose a challenge for faculty who engage in this work. It was most surprising to find that faculty from the same institution had such different experiences in terms of their perceived level of support from the institution. For instance, one support faculty received from the institution was in the form of grant money. This financial support allowed participants to travel to the country where they would develop an international experience for students. This grant funding was extremely influential in the faculty decisions to develop the study-abroad programs, and influential to the timing of program implementation. One faculty leader received department money to travel with a colleague from a different university so he could shadow the process before developing his program. This faculty leader also noted that he received departmental funds to offset the cost of the trip abroad,
which in turn helped keep the cost low for students since the students then did not have to split
the faculty travel expenses. Receiving department funds was not common amongst most of the
faculty members. Most of the faculty did receive the general grant money from the institution to
visit the site when initially developing the program. Faculty also received support through a
study-abroad training that focused on the health and safety of students and being provided with a
contact number that could be used while abroad in case of an emergency.

On the flip side, one example of an institutional policy that created challenges for the
faculty leaders was one that required a set minimum number of students to apply and be accepted
into a program for it to happen. This requirement was challenging for faculty because it meant
that a faculty member could spend a significant amount of time developing a program, and then
the program could be canceled if the minimum number of students did not enroll. In addition to
this challenge, several faculty members described the process of filling out paperwork for
approval of their program as “jumping through hoops” rather than being helpful. One faculty
member even decided to stop leading the program altogether because it was too much of a hassle
to try to meet all the requirements of the different stakeholders since each were requiring
different things. Participants also described another challenging policy that differentiates courses
when they are taught abroad compared to on-campus. Some faculty members reported that a
course taught abroad was not recognized in the same way as if a faculty member teaches the
same course on campus. Therefore, since the tuition students pay to study abroad does not go to
that specific college within the institution, some faculty members did not get compensated or
recognized for that course. This goes hand in hand with the challenge of keeping the study-
abroad cost low for students. Some faculty who designed study-abroad programs with co-leaders
explained how they had to take turns leading the trip abroad to keep the cost low for students
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since they had to build the faculty cost into the cost of the students. The attitudes and beliefs of
the faculty participants differed significantly due to the inconsistency among departments
regarding compensation and recognition. The differences in the attitudes and beliefs were
highlighted through the interviews. For example, Dr. Arnold explained

From my school - No support. Really from the college, honestly, not much support.
Honestly from the university not much support. I mean, the study abroad director was
good. And I guess there was some. I mean they have the study abroad fairs and stuff like
that but, yeah, we were, we very much felt kind of on our own with figuring out
everything.

However, Dr. Marvin felt the opposite. She said:

So, I got nothing but absolute full support, I mean, 100% of the entire time, which is
fantastic. So, I know the department helped with, you know, the marketing and
promotion part of it too… I felt like if something happened while we were over there,
that we could contact University College and get the support that we need. And that was
really helpful.

It is evident that although these faculty members developed and led study-abroad programs at the
same institution, they had different experiences and perceptions about the support they received.

**Implications for Policy, Practice, and Research**

In this section, I present the recommendations for higher education administrators,
faculty study-abroad leaders, and future scholars.

**Recommendations for Higher Education Administrators**

This study provides unique insight into the experiences of faculty members who have
developed and implemented faculty-led study-abroad programs at a higher education institution
in the central states of the United States. Throughout the discourse of this study, faculty expressed how they can best be supported while engaging in this work. Based on the results from the research analysis, the following recommendations for higher education administrators can be made:

Higher education administrators can:

1. Provide funding to faculty during the creation of the program. Faculty members should be compensated for the extra work they put in to creating a program as well as the travel money to go to the site visit. If faculty are financially able to travel to the destination site before taking students abroad, they will be able to make connections, experiment with different activities, learn about the culture, and figure out if the program’s itinerary is logistically possible. Having traveled to the country prior to taking students will benefit both faculty and students as it will give faculty more confidence when leading their program for the first time.

2. Generate student scholarships to help reduce student costs. One challenge faculty face is meeting the minimum number of students required to take the trip. Often the minimum number is set because the number of students enrolled is a determining factor for calculating the full cost of the trip. If faculty are not compensated for their work and the institution does not pay for the faculty travel expenses, the cost of faculty travel is generally absorbed by the students, increasing the overall cost of the trip. Developing an equitable plan to help lower student costs would afford more students the opportunity to participate in programs that faculty develop and lead.
3. Maintain consistent policies surrounding faculty compensation and recognition for tenure for those developing and leading study-abroad programs. Some faculty reported that they did not get compensated for teaching courses abroad but would have received contract pay if they had taught the same course on campus. Other faculty reported they were compensated for the courses they taught abroad. Consistency within an institution is important to rightfully recognize and support faculty who develop and lead study-abroad programs.

4. Provide funding for junior (faculty who have not traveled before) to travel abroad with and experienced faculty member. This recommendation was extracted from the interview with Dr. Marvin who says it may be overwhelming to faculty who have never done this before.

Recommendations for Future Faculty Study-Abroad Leaders

During the interviews with faculty leaders, I learned what was involved in creating and leading each short-term, faculty-led program and what benefits and challenges faculty encountered throughout the process. To help overcome the challenges, I outline specific recommendations for future study-abroad leaders.

1. One challenge study-abroad leaders face is meeting the requirement for the minimum number of students to enroll in the program, which is set by the institution. The minimum number is set to lock in a price for the study-abroad participants. Generally, if more students sign up the cost becomes less expensive for students because more students are splitting the cost of the goods and services received. If the minimum number of students do not sign up, the program will be canceled, and the faculty will not be able to take students even though they spent time developing the program. One example of
how to overcome this challenge is to advertise on social media, Twitter, and the college’s social media page by showing pictures from previous trips. Another way to promote the program is to visit classrooms to talk about study abroad. Several of the participants explained how they dropped certain requirements to attract more students. For example, dropping a language, age or major specific requirement for a program will open the door for more students to apply to participate in that study-abroad program. Finally, faculty can collaborate with other departments to offer a variety of courses so the material for the class is relevant to more students. More students are likely to sign up for a program if students get course credit towards their major or other graduation requirements.

2. Another challenge faculty face when developing study-abroad programs for students is keeping the cost low for students. Some ways faculty can overcome this challenge is to lead the trip alone, or if two faculty members create the program together, they alternate every other year who supervises the students abroad. Since the students often split the cost of faculty travel expenses, it will lower the cost for students if only one of the faculty members travel at a time. In addition, faculty can request assistance from their department or alumni to help offset some of the cost for students. Another way to reduce the cost for students is to avoid using a program vendor. Program vendors charge a fee to help plan the itinerary, communicate with host families, and assist with any emergencies abroad. Exponentially more work is involved for faculty who choose not to use a program vendor, and some make that sacrifice to lower the cost for students to make it possible for more students to travel. Finally, faculty can apply for grants to offset the cost of travel. One participant in this study applied for a Fulbright-Hayes Group Project Abroad grant that paid for the students’ cost of the experience.
3. Get to know students as well as possible before taking the trip. Also purposefully recruiting students and having a prior connection with them will give faculty more confidence when traveling because they will know what to expect.

4. A recommendation for faculty that was extracted directly from the participant transcripts is to shadow an expert faculty member leading a study-abroad program for students. Faculty who are new to the study-abroad experience should consider learning positive strategies for developing such programs and travel with experienced faculty members. This recommendation will give faculty first-hand experience and provide them with how to develop and lead a program on their own with successful tips from others.

Recommendations for Future Research

This research provides information in the field of international education and faculty-led study abroad. The research shows that faculty voices were missing from the body of literature on faculty-led study abroad and hence the focus of this study. In addition to policy and practice-based recommendations for administrators and future faculty leaders, this research lends itself to additional research in the field of study abroad. The following are suggestions for future research studies:

1. A comparative study between fully funded study-abroad programs (such as programs funded by a Fulbright Grant) in relation to unfunded programs (students pay their own way). What are the similarities and differences in terms of number of participants, the demographics of the participants, the itinerary, and learning outcomes for students?

2. A qualitative research study interviewing administrators to investigate their understanding of faculty-led study abroad, their views, and how they believe policy supports and challenges faculty who develop and lead study-abroad programs.
3. A research study to investigate departments within institutions that have high numbers of students studying abroad to determine the extent of which a student’s major influences their likelihood of studying abroad and why or why not.

4. A quantitative study using a survey to investigate to what extent faculty are willing to develop and lead study-abroad programs in relation to financial support and recognition.

5. A comparative study between faculty leaders who use private vendors to help organize the study-abroad itinerary versus those faculty who do not use a vendor to see the difference in cost and whether it is worth the extra expense.

6. Given that this was a single case study, similar studies with faculty across other institutions need to be studied.

Conclusion

An examination of faculty experiences broadened my understanding of what motivates faculty to engage in this work and the steps they take to facilitate study-abroad programs. I learned what faculty believe their students gain from participating in study-abroad programs. I also gained an understanding the challenges faculty face throughout the facilitation process, how they overcome them, and how the institution supports faculty in this endeavor.
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APPENDIX A: EMAIL INVITATION LETTER

Dear Participant,

I am conducting a research study that involves faculty who have developed a study-abroad program for students in the past four years and have led that program abroad in the past three years. I am looking for study-abroad programs that range from around two to eight weeks in duration. Your participation would involve answering questions during a 30-45 minute virtual zoom interview about how you perceive your work in this field. I would then conduct a follow-up zoom interview to answer any remaining questions. Please know that all of your information will be kept confidential. The study is being conducted under the guidance of Dr. Lydia Kyei-Blankson in the Department of Educational Administration and Foundations at Illinois State University.

If you are interested in participating, please respond to this email so we can schedule a time to meet.

Sincerely,

Tara Davis-Augspurger
APPENDIX B: PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

You are being asked to participate in a research study conducted by Tara Davis-Augspurger, under the direction of Lydia Kyei-Blankson in the department of Educational Administration and Foundations (EAF) at Illinois State University. The purpose of this study is to examine faculty perceptions of their work developing and leading study-abroad programs for students.

Why are you being asked?
You have been asked to participate because you have developed a study-abroad program within the past four years and have led the program in the past three years. Your participation in this study is voluntary. You will not be penalized if you choose to skip parts of the study, not participate, or withdraw from the study at any time.

What would you do?
If you choose to participate in this study, your participation will involve a recorded virtual zoom interview about your study abroad program and a recorded follow up zoom interview to answer any remaining questions. In total, your involvement in this study will last approximately 75 minutes. The first interview will last approximately 30-45 minutes and the follow-up interview will last approximately 20-30 minutes.

Are any risks expected?
There are minimal risks involved with participation beyond those of everyday life. Should a breach of confidentiality occur, there could be a potential risk to your reputation and employability. All data will be kept in a secure location to ensure this does not happen.

Will your information be protected?
We will use all reasonable efforts to keep any provided personal information confidential. Information that may identify you or potentially lead to reidentification will not be released to individuals that are not on the research team. Our recorded zoom interviews will be kept on my personal password protected hard drive and will be destroyed after I transcribe the interviews for analysis. I will not use your name on the transcription. However, when required by law or university policy, identifying information (including your consent form) may be seen or copied by authorized individuals.

Could your responses be used for other research?
We will not use any identifiable information from you in future research, but your deidentified information could be used for future research without additional consent from you.

Who will benefit from this study?
Although there may be no direct benefit to you, a possible benefit of your participation is gaining a better understanding of the role faculty have in developing study abroad. In addition, this study can provide institutions with information on how they can best support faculty in leading these international exchanges for students.
**Whom do you contact if you have any questions?**

If you have any questions about the research or wish to withdraw from the study, contact Tara Davis-Augspurger at tmdavi2@ilstu.edu or Lydia Kyei-Blankson at lkyeibl@ilstu.edu

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

If you have any questions about your rights as a participant, or if you feel you have been placed at risk, contact the Illinois State University Research Ethics & Compliance Office at (309) 438-5527 or IRB@ilstu.edu.

**Documentation of Consent**  
Please type your name below if you are 18 or older and are willing to participate in this study.

_____________________________

Please check the box below if you agree to be recorded.

☐

You can print this form for your records.
# APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information about the Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Program Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Time of year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Graduate or undergraduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Min/Max Number of participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Family stay vs. dorms. vs. hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Classes offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Faculty member teaches class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Language study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. How many times have you led this program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Do you lead this program alone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Interview Questions

1. Can you describe your study abroad program in a 2-3 sentences? Who was it designed for? What was it designed to accomplish?

2. What **motivated** you to create this program?
   a. When and why you created it at that time?

3. Can you briefly go over the steps you followed to develop this program?

4. I would like to know about the support or lack of support you had in creating this program?
   a. For example, what type of support did you get from your department when you posed the idea of creating this program?
b. what type of support did you get from your institution when you posed the idea of creating this program?

5. Overall, what challenges did you encounter when creating the program and how you solved them? For example, did you have any financial/curricular/scheduling/housing issues you had to overcome when you started putting this program together?

6. Overall, what do you think helped you the most in creating this program and why?

Now we are moving into your role and experience leading this program.

7. How did you prepare to lead this program the first time? For example,
   a. how did you and/or your institution prepare your students before the trip?

   b. And how did you prepare yourself? Did your institution help you prepare for this experience? If so, how?

8. While abroad, what type of support do you get from your institution?

9. What challenges do you face when you lead this program? For example, challenges with disciplinary issues abroad or culture shock from your students or safety issues, roles you take on, etc.
10. Based on your experience, what do you think your students gain from participating in your program? (can you talk about two or three thing you think students gain from participating in your program)

11. *Based on your initial goals of the program and type of students that it was designed for, how has the current program changed?

12. What can be done to improve your typical participants’ educational experience during this program?

13. How do you think institutions might better support your faculty-led programs?

14. Is there something else you want to say about the process of implementing and leading a short-term faculty led program?