

11-17-2018

What Are We Teaching Abroad? Faculty Goals for Short-Term Study Abroad Courses

Elizabeth Niehaus

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, eniehaus@unl.edu

Ashley Wegener

University of Nebraska - Lincoln, awegener2@unl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cehsedadfacpub>

 Part of the [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#), [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#), [Higher Education Commons](#), [International and Comparative Education Commons](#), and the [Other Education Commons](#)

Niehaus, Elizabeth and Wegener, Ashley, "What Are We Teaching Abroad? Faculty Goals for Short-Term Study Abroad Courses" (2018). *Faculty Publications in Educational Administration*. 89.
<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cehsedadfacpub/89>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Educational Administration, Department of at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications in Educational Administration by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.



Published in *Innovative Higher Education* (2018)

doi 10.1007/s10755-018-9450-2

Copyright © 2018 Springer Nature B.V. Used by permission.

What Are We Teaching Abroad? Faculty Goals for Short-Term Study Abroad Courses

Elizabeth Niehaus and Ashley Wegener

Department of Educational Administration,
University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 133 Teachers College Hall,
Lincoln, NE 68588, USA

Corresponding author – Elizabeth Niehaus, email eniehaus@unl.edu

Abstract

Based on survey data from over 400 faculty members who taught short-term study abroad courses, the purpose of this study was to identify the types of goals that faculty members have in teaching short-term study abroad courses and the relationship between faculty background characteristics (i.e., race, gender, discipline, and prior experience) and their teaching goals. By further understanding the goals that these faculty members have for their study abroad programs, we are better able to assess how these programs may or may not be meeting overall internationalization goals and then to use this information to assist faculty members and higher education administrators in finding ways to further align study abroad goals with the broader goals of international education.

Keywords: Faculty, Study abroad, Internationalization, Short courses

Over the past few decades, U.S. higher education institutions have increasingly focused on internationalization as a strategic imperative. A report by the American Council on Education (2017) noted that in 2016 over two-thirds of institutions were engaging in at least

a “moderate” level of internationalization. Almost half of the institutions surveyed included internationalization in their institutional strategic plan, and almost all of those institutions listed internationalization within their top five priorities. This institutional focus on internationalization is mirrored by initiatives from governmental (e.g., Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program, 2005) and non-governmental entities (e.g., Institute for International Education, 2017) that encourage an increased international emphasis in higher education.

Study abroad programs play a significant role in higher education internationalization, and increasing study abroad opportunities was reported as the number-one internationalization priority across all higher education sectors in 2016 (American Council on Education, 2017). This emphasis is reflected in the increased participation of U.S. students in such programs, which has tripled in the last three decades (Institute of International Education, 2018). This growth is in large part due to an increase of short-term abroad experiences (8 weeks or fewer), which now outnumber traditional semester- or year-long study abroad programs (Institute of International Education, 2018). Although there are many different types of short-term study abroad experiences (e.g., direct enrollment in a foreign institution or programs designed and offered through a third-party provider), the most popular form of short-term study abroad is faculty-led programs (Tuma, 2007), which are “directed by a faculty member (or members) from the home campus who accompanies students abroad” (Forum on Education Abroad, 2011, p. 14).

Considering the centrality of study abroad, and in particular faculty-led short-term study abroad programs, to the broader internationalization of U.S. higher education, there is a need to understand how the goals of those who actually control these programs, that is, the faculty members who teach courses abroad, match the different goals and rationales for internationalizing higher education. By analyzing the goals that faculty members have for these courses, we can better understand how faculty members are affecting the most popular type of study abroad program. We believe that the findings we present provide vital information to institutional leaders as they consider the role of faculty-led short-term programs in their broader internationalization efforts.

The Role of Study Abroad in Internationalization

There are many goals and rationales for the internationalization of higher education across external and internal stakeholder groups. In 2002 de Wit identified a number of rationales for promoting internationalization including political (e.g., foreign diplomacy, increasing national security, providing technical assistance to other countries, increasing peace and mutual understanding), economic (e.g., national economic growth, individual job competitiveness, institutional income generation), cultural/social (e.g., export of U.S. culture, individual development through cross-cultural contact), and academic (e.g., an international perspective in research and teaching, expanding academic learning opportunities). Many of these rationales are still front-and-center today, with institutions reporting “improving student preparedness for a global era... diversifying students, faculty, and staff at the home campus... becoming more attractive to prospective students at home and overseas.... [and] revenue generation” as the top four reasons for engaging in internationalization (American Council on Education, 2017, p. 5).

Because increased participation in study abroad is the number one priority for U.S. institutions looking to internationalize (American Council on Education, 2017), study abroad is often positioned as a way to achieve the many goals of internationalization. As de Wit (2002) noted, in the U.S. the rationale for study abroad had traditionally focused on individual development and cultural learning. This focus on individual development and cultural learning is similarly reflected in the existing study abroad research, which has focused primarily on intercultural learning as the outcome of interest (e.g., Anderson, Lawton, Rexeisen, & Hubbard, 2006; Paige, Fry, Stallman, Josic, & Jon, 2009). However, as study abroad has increasingly played a central role in internationalization efforts, the rationales for encouraging study abroad have expanded. The Institute of International Education (2017) has articulated an economic rationale in materials for its Generation Study Abroad program by focusing on the enhancement of “future employability, earnings potential, and the economic well-being of students and communities” (para. 10). Recently the study abroad literature has also focused on two additional rationales – academic success and career readiness. The Commission on the Abraham Lincoln

Study Abroad Fellowship Program (2005) justified the goal of having 1 million U.S. students study abroad with the rationale of promoting global competitiveness, national security, and U.S. leadership. The U.S. Department of State (n.d.) also lists “providing skills and knowledge to compete for jobs in the 21st century global workforce” (para. 1) as an important reason to study abroad. Undoubtedly, study abroad has been used to speak to various rationales and stakeholders in internationalization efforts.

Faculty-Led Short-Term Study Abroad Courses

Faculty-led short-term study abroad courses are increasingly central to efforts to increase study abroad participation. In a recent survey of institutions and study abroad providers, the Forum on Education Abroad (2015) found that 95% of responding institutions offered faculty-led short-term programs and that 45% of students who studied abroad through their college or university during the 2014–2015 academic year did so through such programs. Faculty-led short-term study abroad courses are often seen as a way to democratize study abroad participation (e.g., Tuma, 2007) by providing access for students who might not otherwise be able to study abroad. For example, along with the rise in faculty-led short-term study abroad courses overall there has been a concurrent increase in the number of students in historically underrepresented majors studying abroad. Notably, STEM majors now make up 25.2% of all U.S. students studying abroad, up from 16.4% in 2004/2005 (Institute of International Education, 2018).

Faculty-led programs are unique from other study abroad experiences in that they are tied to a specific academic course (or multiple courses), drawing from a faculty member’s own scholarship and/or international experience. The course-specific nature of faculty-led short-term study abroad programs can allow for greater emphasis on particular disciplinary content and integration into the overall curriculum than can other study abroad models (Tuma, 2007), such as exchange programs, internships abroad, or direct enrollment in a third-party provider’s program. Faculty members leading short-term courses generally have significant control over the course (Donnelly-Smith, 2009).

Although there has been a dramatic increase in participation in short-term study abroad programs, particularly faculty-led programs (Institute of International Education, 2018; Tuma, 2007), research is mixed on whether or not these programs are achieving the desired outcomes. Several studies have found positive outcomes including increased intercultural awareness (Chieffo & Griffiths, 2004), global awareness (Kurt, Olitsky, & Geis, 2013), and intercultural development (Gullekson, Tucker, Coombs Jr, & Wright, 2011). In a study looking particularly at faculty-led short-term study abroad programs, Gaia (2015) found that students in these programs showed enhanced cultural understanding and awareness and a willingness to interact with people from other cultures. On the other hand, Anderson et al. (2006) determined that students on short-term study abroad programs showed only modest increases in intercultural sensitivity. Coker, Heiser, and Taylor (2018) found that long-term programs had better outcomes than did short-term study abroad in the categories of critical thinking, synthesis of ideas, and acquiring a broad general education among others.

The disparities in the research on short-term study abroad likely reflect the wide variety of short-term study abroad experiences being studied. When it comes to this type of study abroad program, faculty members play a critical role in designing and facilitating students' experiences (Donnelly-Smith, 2009; Goode, 2008). There is widespread agreement in the research that simply going abroad does not lead to increased intercultural competence (e.g., Vande Berg, Paige, & Hemming Lou, 2012), so the decisions that faculty members make in designing and teaching these courses are critical in understanding their potential to contribute to student learning and achievement of the broader goals of internationalization. However, there is limited research on how faculty members approach teaching study abroad courses, and the research that does exist has generally focused on qualitative data from small groups of faculty instructors. For example, in a study of eight faculty instructors, Goode (2008) found that participants tended to focus more on the student support and logistical elements of their role in teaching abroad and less on facilitating intercultural development or teaching academic content. On the other hand, in a study of six faculty members who taught short-term study abroad courses, Kartoshkina (2016) found that participants focused primarily on intercultural learning in designing and teaching these courses.

The Importance of the Faculty

The wider higher education literature provides additional support for the importance of considering how faculty members approach teaching short-term study abroad courses. There is general consensus that what faculty members do in their teaching matters (e.g., Kezar & Maxey, 2014; Umbach & Wawrzynski, 2005), both in how they interact with students and how they design their courses. In a review of the literature on faculty-student interactions, Kezar and Maxey (2014) listed a number of positive outcomes related to these interactions, including leadership skills, critical thinking, self-confidence, and persistence and completion. Additionally, as Umbach and Wawrzynski (2005) found, student learning and engagement are directly related to the pedagogical techniques used by faculty members.

Importantly, faculty members' teaching philosophies, goals, and instructional practices are shaped by their own backgrounds and disciplinary cultures. A number of studies (e.g., Nelson Laird, Shoup, Kuh, & Schwarz, 2008; Smart & Umbach, 2007) have found that teaching goals and educational purpose vary by discipline. Smart and Umbach (2007), for example, found that faculty members in "enterprising" disciplines (e.g., business, public policy, finance, marketing) focused more on work-related skills and vocational development than did faculty members in other disciplines, while those in "social" disciplines (e.g., education, counseling, nursing) were the most likely of any discipline group to incorporate teaching about racial and ethnic diversity in their teaching. Nelson Laird (2011) similarly found that faculty members in "soft" disciplines (e.g., anthropology, psychology, sociology, humanities, education) incorporate diversity in their teaching more than do those in "hard" disciplines (e.g., biology, chemistry, mathematics, physics, engineering), and Nelson Laird et al. (2008) found that faculty members in soft disciplines also included deeper approaches to learning (e.g., integrative and reflective learning) in their courses more often than did those in hard disciplines. Other studies have illuminated the role of race and gender in shaping teaching paradigms (e.g., Singer, 1996) and approaches to teaching (e.g., Mayhew & Grunwald, 2006; Nelson Laird, 2011).

Although much of the research on approaches to teaching has focused on teaching on campus, a few studies have pointed to the

importance of considering characteristics like discipline, rank, gender, race, and prior experience in understanding how different faculty members approach teaching abroad. In a recent study of short-term study abroad course instructors, Niehaus, Reading, Nelson, Wegener and Arthur (2018) found rank, gender, race, discipline, and prior international travel experiences to be significant predictors of the extent to which faculty members engaged in various forms of cultural mentoring while teaching abroad. Other researchers have identified the importance of faculty members' prior experience, particularly prior international experience, in shaping their own intercultural competence and thus their approach to facilitating students' intercultural development (e.g., Goode, 2008; Miglietti, 2015; Paige & Goode, 2009). Discipline may be particularly important in understanding goals for short-term study abroad because faculty members' disciplinary training and socialization in some fields may lead them to emphasize disciplinary content over reflection, experience, and intercultural learning (Lutterman-Aguilar & Gignerich, 2002).

While some research studies have analyzed the way that faculty members teach their study abroad courses, very few studies have focused on what motivates faculty members to teach abroad. Savishinsky's (2012) study on faculty-led short-term study abroad programs found that faculty members "repeatedly and often passionately related the myriad personal and professional rewards" (p. 187) of teaching abroad, including developing better relationships with their students and witnessing students' excitement. However, despite their centrality to faculty-led short-term study abroad courses and campus internationalization overall, faculty members are rarely rewarded for this work. A recent American Council on Education report (2017) found that in 2016 only 10% of institutions included international engagement in promotion and tenure decisions.

The Study

Because study abroad is a central strategy for the internationalization of U.S. higher education (American Council on Education, 2017) and because faculty-led short-term study abroad programs are the main area of growth in U.S. study abroad (Forum on Education Abroad,

2015), it is important to understand how the goals of the faculty members teaching these short-term study abroad courses align (or not) with the broader goals and rationales for internationalization.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was (1) to explore the goals that faculty instructors have in teaching short-term study abroad courses and (2) to identify differences in these goals based on faculty characteristics (e.g., race, gender, discipline, and prior experience). Human subjects review and approval was provided by the Institutional Review Board at the first author's institution, and all data were collected during the fall semester of 2015.

Method

Survey Instrument and Data Collection

The data source for this study was an online survey of faculty members who had recently taught short-term study abroad courses. We first purposefully sampled institutions that had been identified by the Institute of International Education (2015) as the leading institutions, by institution type, in short-term study abroad programs to ensure representation of different institution types in the sample. From that list of institutions we used publically available information to identify study abroad directors or other staff members who worked with faculty-led short-term study abroad programs and asked them to forward a survey invitation via email to faculty members who had taught short-term (8 weeks or fewer) study abroad courses within the past year. We had no additional criteria beyond having taught a short-term study abroad course, so courses could have taken multiple formats (e.g., lectures, service-learning, site visits) or been at any academic level. Overall we contacted study abroad staff members at 111 institutions to request participation.

We provided the respondents with a list of possible goals for their study abroad courses and asked them to report how important each was to their particular course (1 = not at all, 5 = very). We developed survey items based on the existing research on the goals of study

abroad and faculty and student motivation (e.g., de Wit, 2002; Goode, 2008). We then added additional possible goals (e.g., developing students' autonomy and independence, building travel skills, inspiring interest in future international travel) based on conversations and informal focus groups with faculty members who teach short-term study abroad courses. We also included an open-ended question asking participants to write in any other goals they might have articulated for their course.

Survey Respondents: Sample

Four-hundred and seventy-three faculty members at 72 institutions responded to the survey; based on information provided by study abroad directors/staff, this was an overall participant response rate of approximately 16%. Respondents taught at 27 doctoral-granting institutions, 15 masters-level institutions, 12 baccalaureate institutions, 15 associates-level institutions, and 3 special-focus institutions. The majority of participants identified as White (86.4%) and spoke more than one language (60.4%). A slight majority identified as female (52.6%), and 50.4% were born in the U.S. Respondents were fairly evenly split across rank and appointment type and represented a wide range of disciplines (19.5% general humanities, 18.9% STEM, 15.9% social sciences, 10.7% area studies and foreign languages, 8.8% education, 7.7% business, 6.8% health professions, 6.6% other fields, and 5.2% journalism and communications). Almost half (48.3%) had taught five or more study abroad courses, but 19.3% had taught their first study abroad course in the past year.

Data Analysis

To explore the types of goals that the faculty members identified for these short-term courses, we used exploratory factor analysis (EFA; refer to Table 1); more information on the EFA is presented below in the results section. Once we identified the types of goals from the EFA, we the extent to which respondents endorsed each type of goal, using a Bonferroni-adjusted alpha level of .005. Finally, we engaged in thematic analysis of the open-ended responses in order to identify other goals that may not have been represented in the survey items.

Table 1. Factor Loadings, Reliability, and Descriptive Statistics

	Standardized factor loading	Descriptives
Cultural Learning (alpha = .894)		
Teaching students about different cultures	0.726	
Exposing students to different cultural practices	0.842	Mean = 4.46
Increasing students' comfort with people from different cultures	0.892	SD = .692
Developing students' empathy for people from different cultures	0.864	
Challenging Ethnocentrism (alpha = .819)		
Challenging students' assumptions about people from different cultures	0.833	Mean = 4.257
Challenging students' stereotypes about people from different cultures	0.642	SD = .773
Increasing students' awareness of their own culture	0.877	
Travel Skills (alpha = .832)		
Inspiring students' interest in future international travel	0.806	Mean = 4.173
Helping students develop skills related to international travel	0.884	SD = .931
Course Content (alpha = .730)		
Teaching students course-specific content knowledge	0.536	Mean = 4.16
Teaching students different perspectives on course-specific content	1.082	SD = .803
Career Development (alpha = .890)		
Developing students' professional networks	0.711	
Helping students develop career-specific skills	0.804	Mean = 2.978
Inspiring students' interest in a specific career	0.735	SD = 1.083
Increase students' future employability	0.882	
Increase students' future earning potential	0.807	

We next used the factors identified in the EFA as outcomes in separate multiple regression analyses. For ease of interpretability and to standardize interpretation across all factors, we used the mean of all items from a particular factor as the outcome measures. Our predictors included variables representing key demographic and background characteristics (race, gender, number of languages spoken, and place of birth), rank, prior study abroad teaching experience, and discipline. As described in the literature review, these variables have been identified in prior research on pedagogy and/or education abroad as important determinants of instructors' teaching philosophies and pedagogical practices, both on campus and abroad (e.g., Mayhew & Grunwald, 2006; Nelson Laird, 2011; Nelson Laird et al., 2008; Paige & Goode, 2009; Schuherholz-Lehr, 2007).

Gender identity was measured by a single question asking participants to select male, female, transgender, or other; no participants selected transgender or other, leaving one dichotomous variable (0 = female, 1 = male). Racial identity was measured using one item where

participants could select all that applied: White/Caucasian, Black/African American, Hispanic/Latino, Asian American/Pacific Islander, Native American, Bi/Multiracial, or other. Because too few participants selected categories other than White/Caucasian to provide meaningful analysis, we dichotomized this item for the regression analysis (0 = White, 1 = Faculty of Color). We also included participants' place of birth (0 = U.S. born, 1 = born outside of the U.S.).

We did not have a direct measure of participants' intercultural competence, so we used participants' proficiency in other languages as a proxy. Olson and Kroeger (2001) had found that faculty members with high intercultural competence were seven times more likely to have advanced proficiency in multiple languages than those with lower intercultural competence. Due to the distribution of the number of languages spoken, we created a dichotomous variable of 0 = one language spoken and 1 = more than one language spoken.

With regard to appointment type, participants could select from a variety of options, including Full, Associate, and Assistant tenure-track professor, instructor, lecturer, graduate teaching assistant, and staff. As there was no reason to select any rank or appointment type as a referent group in this analysis, we used effect coding (Mayhew & Simonoff, 2015) in order to compare all groups to the unweighted average of the group means (an "overall level" of the outcome, as Mayhew and Simonoff described). All non-tenure track respondents were combined into one group. We created two sets of variables for rank, one in which we excluded Full Professors and another in which we excluded Non-Tenure Track Faculty; and we conducted each analysis twice, once with each set of variables. In this way we were able to obtain parameter estimates for all groups.

We measured participants' prior teaching abroad experience using two items that asked them to indicate how many times they previously had taught their current course and how many times they had taught any other study abroad course. These two items were combined to form one overall measure of how many times respondents had taught any study abroad course. From this we created three groups – no prior experience, some prior experience (those who had taught 1–3 prior study abroad courses), and much prior experience (those who had taught 4 or more prior study abroad courses). As it conceptually made sense to compare each level of prior study abroad experience to those who had no prior experience, we dummy coded this variable,

resulting in two variables (some and much prior experience) with no prior experience as the referent group.

Finally, we grouped participants' disciplinary affiliations into nine different discipline groups: science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) disciplines; area studies and foreign language; business; journalism and communication; education; health professions; general humanities; social sciences; and other disciplines. Similar to our coding for participants' rank, we used effect coding because there was no rationale for setting one particular discipline as the referent group. We created two sets of effect-coded variables, one excluding STEM disciplines and the other excluding the social sciences. Parallel to our approach to rank, we conducted each regression analysis twice to obtain parameter estimates for all groups. Those estimates can be interpreted as the effect of being affiliated with a particular discipline relative to all other groups.

All analyses were conducted in MPlus 7 using maximum likelihood estimation with robust standard errors to account for the nesting of faculty within institutions and full-information maximum likelihood estimation to handle missing data.

Results

Goals for Teaching Abroad

In the exploratory factor analysis, we first examined inter-item correlations for all items, removing two items that were not strongly correlated (at least .5) with any others. We next examined model fit (RMSEA, CFI, SRMR) for 1–8 factors with the remaining 25 items. The most parsimonious model (the fewest factors with acceptable model fit) was a five-factor solution, but we found that there were a number of items with strong cross-loadings. After removing nine items with high cross-loadings we settled on a five-factor solution (RMSEA = .051, CFI = .963, SRMR = .047). See Table 1 for items and standardized loadings for each factor. Although one factor (course content) had one item with a loading greater than one and only two items total, we decided to retain this factor because it reflected a conceptually useful and important goal area that instructors would have in their teaching; and the overall model fit was comparable with and without

the factor included. Based on this analysis, participants had five different types of goals for their courses: course content, cultural learning, career development, travel skills, and challenging ethnocentrism.

In rank ordering goals based on the overall mean across all survey items related to each goal area, we found that, as a whole, respondents most strongly endorsed goals related to cultural learning (mean = 4.46, SD = .692), followed by challenging ethnocentrism (mean = 4.257, SD = .773), travel skills (mean = 4.173, SD = .931), course content (mean = 4.158, SD = .803), and finally career development (mean = 2.978, SD = 1.083). Using the Bonferroni-adjusted alpha level of .005, we determined that, overall, participants had a significantly higher endorsement of cultural learning than all other goals. We found no significant differences among challenging ethnocentrism, travel skills goals, or course content goals. Participants had a significantly lower endorsement of career development goals than all other goals.

The thematic analysis of the 113 open-ended responses from the survey yielded 213 coded segments, as responses often included multiple goals. The results generally supported the results of our factor analysis; 60% of the codes ($N = 129$) reflected the five types of goals described above. Faculty members representing disciplines of politics, business, economics, art, education, health fields, and environmental studies mentioned the goal of increasing content knowledge a total of fifty-four times. Cultural learning responses included learning about culture in general, learning about the host culture, or interacting with host nationals. Challenging ethnocentrism replies dealt with understanding the cultural norms of the host country and using that experience to critique their home culture. Responses detailing career development (only three) centered on using the study abroad experience to be competitive in the job market after college. Five open responses related to travel goals, that is, having students be able to navigate public transportation, explore foreign sites independently, and handle unexpected travel issues.

We did find a few other goals outside the parameters of the five goals that had arisen from our quantitative analysis. These goals included getting students outside of their comfort zone, promoting interdisciplinary or integrative learning, enhancing research or language skill development, and teaching about social justice issues or critical perspectives. Several participants expressed goals of facilitating students' personal development in areas such as self-confidence,

teamwork skills, adaptability, leadership, creativity, mindfulness, and compassion.

Surprisingly, seven responses listed a specific goal that they did *not* focus on as part of their study abroad course: cultural learning. Several of these responses stated that their course goals focused more on content knowledge in their related discipline areas, and one participant said that his/her study abroad course was “not a program aiming specifically to increase students’ exposure to different cultures per se, though we see this as a highly desirable outcome.”

Predictors of Teaching Goals

The full regression results are listed in Table 2. The combination of participants’ gender, race, language proficiency, place of birth, rank/appointment type, prior study abroad experience, and discipline explained 20.4% of the variance in endorsement of challenging ethnocentrism goals, 14.3% in cultural learning goals, 9.5% in travel skills goals, 12.7% in career development goals, and 6.8% in course content goals.

Demographic/background predictors were significant in only a few cases. Participants who identified as male endorsed goals related to challenging ethnocentrism less so than did those identifying as female ($B = -.154, p < .05$), participants who identified as faculty of color endorsed career development goals more so than did White faculty members ($B = .401, p < .01$), and participants who spoke more than one language endorsed course content goals more so than did those who only spoke one language ($B = .195, p < .05$). When it came to participants’ rank and appointment type, full professors endorsed travel skills goals more than any other group ($B = .212, p < .01$); there were no other differences by rank/appointment type.

Prior experience teaching abroad was a significant predictor of endorsing both challenging ethnocentrism and career development goals. Those participants with some prior study abroad experience ($B = .255, p < .05$) and much prior experience ($B = .275, p < .01$) endorsed challenging ethnocentrism more strongly than did those who had never before taught a study abroad course. In terms of career development, only those faculty members with much prior study abroad experience significantly differed from those with no prior experience ($B = .283, p < .05$).

Table 2. Regression Results (Unstandardized coefficients)

	<i>Cultural Learning</i>	<i>Challenging Ethnocentrism</i>	<i>Course Content</i>	<i>Travel Skills</i>	<i>Career Development</i>
Intercept	4.463	4.148	3.972	3.889	2.752
Demographics/Background					
Race: Faculty of Color	0.022	0.171	0.171	-0.014	0.401*
Gender: Male	-0.062	-0.154*	-0.112	-0.114	0.071
More than one language spoken	0.086	0.052	0.195*	0.179	0.132
Born outside of the U.S.	0.020	-0.062	-0.038	0.090	-0.025
Rank					
Full Professor ²	0.073	-0.057	-0.029	0.212**	-0.134
Associate Professor	-0.070	-0.088	-0.046	-0.114	-0.002
Assistant Professor	0.010	0.065	0.025	-0.115	-0.016
Non-Tenure Track ³	-0.013	0.080	0.049	0.017	0.152
Prior Experience ¹					
Some Prior Study Abroad Experience	0.043	0.255*	0.141	0.231	0.130
Much Prior Study Abroad Experience	0.006	0.275**	0.192	0.213	0.283*
Discipline					
STEM ²	-0.508***	-0.547***	-0.148	-0.252	0.034
Other	-0.122	-0.132	0.129	0.124	0.037
Area Studies/Foreign Language	0.178*	0.214*	-0.053	-0.116	-0.439***
Business	-0.082	-0.104	-0.106	0.158	0.661**
Journalism/Communication	0.325***	0.351**	0.237*	0.224	0.417
Education	0.058	0.105	-0.124	-0.360	-0.095
Health Professions	0.118	-0.128	-0.063	-0.003	0.215
Humanities	0.041	0.107	0.122	0.164	-0.436***
Social Sciences ³	-0.006	0.134*	0.006	0.061	-0.394**
R ²	.143***	.204***	.068**	.095**	.127***

1. Referent group: no prior experience

2. Excluded from the first analysis

3. Excluded from the second analysis

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

Finally, discipline was a strong predictor of the type of goals that participants had in their courses. STEM faculty members had a lower endorsement of cultural learning ($B = -.508$, $p < .001$) and challenging ethnocentrism ($B = -.574$, $p < .001$) relative to faculty in other disciplines. Respondents in area studies/foreign language and journalism/communications disciplines had a higher endorsement of challenging ethnocentrism ($B = .214$, $p < .05$ for area studies, $B = .315$, $p < .01$ for journalism) and goals related to cultural learning ($B = .178$, $p < .05$ and $B = .325$, $p < .001$, respectively) than did those in other disciplines. Faculty members in area studies and foreign languages also had a lower endorsement of career development goals ($B = -.439$, $p < .001$), and those in journalism and communication had

a higher endorsement of course content goals ($B = .237, p < .05$) than did those in other disciplines. Similarly, faculty members in the social sciences and general humanities disciplines had a lower endorsement of career development goals ($B = -.394, p < .01$ for social sciences, $B = -.436, p < .001$ for humanities), while faculty members in business had a higher than average endorsement of career development goals ($B = .661, p < .01$) than did those in other disciplines. Finally, in addition to having a lower than average endorsement of career development goals, faculty members in the social sciences had a higher endorsement of challenging ethnocentrism goals ($B = .134, p < .05$) than did other faculty members.

Limitations

Before moving on to a discussion of the findings, it is important to note a few limitations of this study. First, although the data represent a relatively large number of faculty members (473) across many institutions (72), the overall response rate to our survey was relatively low (16%). Second, in our EFA analysis we found a number of items with high cross-loadings and a small number of items that clearly loaded onto course content and travel skills factors. Although the findings can provide insight into some of the types of goals that faculty members have in teaching abroad, more research is needed to develop stronger measures of these goals in future studies. Third, although we were able to include a number of faculty-level predictor variables in our analysis, faculty members' goals might vary in many more ways (e.g., within-discipline differences, individual motivation for teaching abroad, effects of institution type) that were outside the scope of the current analysis. Future research should examine other factors that may influence faculty members' teaching goals in study abroad. Finally, the purpose of this study was to examine faculty members' goals; more research is needed to examine how these goals influence course structure, content, and pedagogy; how these goals align (or not) with student goals; and how faculty members' goals relate to students' experiences and learning.

Discussion and Implications

Considering the importance of study abroad programs for their potential contribution to broader internationalization efforts (American Council on Education, 2017) and the centrality of faculty-led short-term study abroad courses in increasing study abroad participation (Institute of International Education, 2018; Tuma, 2007), understanding the ways that these programs can contribute to a campus's internationalization goals addresses a critical need. Study abroad is often seen as a silver bullet for achieving the wide array of goals that an institution may have for internationalization, but the results of this study clearly point to a number of ways in which the goals of those controlling the content and pedagogy of faculty-led short-term study abroad courses – the faculty members themselves – align (or not) with these broader internationalization goals and rationales.

Consistent with de Wit's (2002) assertion that U.S. study abroad is often framed in terms of personal development and cultural learning, we found that the top two goals for faculty members were around cultural learning and challenging ethnocentrism and that many of the other goals that faculty members wrote in on the survey could be seen as falling under this broad "personal development" umbrella. However, we also found a great deal of variation in faculty members' goals, particularly by discipline; and seven faculty members noted on the survey that they specifically did *not* focus on cultural learning in their courses. This variation on goals may be one of the reasons why we see such variation in the research literature on the outcomes of short-term study abroad programs (e.g., Anderson et al., 2006; Chieffo & Griffiths, 2004; Coker et al., 2018; Gullekson et al., 2011; Kurt et al., 2013). If intercultural learning is not the central goal of a course, we would not expect to see significant gains in students' intercultural competence resulting from participation in that course. We also found that career-related goals were the least endorsed in our survey, a result that contrasts to the Generation Study Abroad (Institute of International Education, 2017) emphasis on career development. As with cultural learning and challenging ethnocentrism in our study, though, significant disciplinary differences did exist.

The extent to which faculty members' goals in teaching study abroad courses varied by discipline is not particularly surprising based

on the literature on the role of discipline in shaping teaching goals broadly (e.g., Nelson Laird et al., 2008; Smart & Umbach, 2007) although our findings differed from the general higher education teaching literature in a few notable ways. For example, both Smart and Umbach (2007) and Nelson Laird et al. (2008) found that faculty members in many of the “soft” disciplines (e.g., social sciences, humanities, education, counseling) were more likely to emphasize diversity in their teaching than were those in fields such as business, public policy, and STEM. Our data similarly pointed to faculty members in area studies/foreign languages, journalism/communication, and social sciences placing significantly more emphasis on cultural learning and/or challenging ethnocentrism than did faculty members in other fields, while STEM faculty members placed significantly less emphasis on these areas. Faculty members in other humanities disciplines and education, however, did not differ from other faculty members in their emphasis on these culture-related goal areas; and faculty members in the social sciences only reported a stronger emphasis than others on challenging ethnocentrism, not on cultural learning. The differences between our findings and those of Smart and Umbach and Nelson Laird et al. may be due to the different teaching context (study abroad vs. traditional on-campus courses) or may be due to the fact that we were looking at more specific goal areas (cultural learning and challenging ethnocentrism), while prior research focused on diversity more broadly.

Faculty members’ prior international experience/intercultural competence was another notable area of difference among the goals of the faculty members in our survey. The study abroad literature points to the importance of considering faculty members’ own intercultural competence as a predictor of their approaches to teaching abroad (e.g., Goode, 2008; Miglietti, 2015; Paige & Goode, 2009); and we found some limited, but nuanced, support for this assertion. Although we did not have a direct measure of intercultural competence, which may have led to different conclusions, we did not find two variables that are likely to be related to intercultural competence – speaking multiple languages and being born outside of the U.S. – to be significantly related to faculty members’ goals. The one exception to this finding was that faculty members who spoke more than one language placed somewhat more emphasis on course content goals than did other faculty members. We did find, however, notable trends in that faculty

members with prior study abroad teaching experience were significantly more likely than those with no such experience to emphasize challenging ethnocentrism as a goal for their courses; and those with much prior experience teaching abroad also placed more emphasis on career development than did others. The emphasis that those with prior teaching abroad experience placed on challenging ethnocentrism may reflect their greater intercultural competence, either developed through their prior teaching experience or prior international experience that had motivated them to teach abroad in the first place.

Our findings point to a number of important implications for those leading institutional internationalization efforts. It is clear that faculty members have an array of goals in teaching their short-term study abroad courses. They are designing short-term study-abroad courses that align with many of the broader goals of internationalization; but the extent to which any individual course or even an array of courses align with institutional goals will vary. This finding may seem like an obvious statement; but, considering the overwhelming emphasis that U.S. institutions place on study abroad in their internationalization efforts (American Council on Education, 2017), it is crucial to understand the extent to which faculty-led short-term study abroad courses, the most common form of study abroad, are actually designed to achieve an institution's internationalization objectives.

International leaders on campus might consider a number of ways to respond to these findings. Working to shift faculty members' teaching goals to align more specifically with institutional objectives is one option. In doing this, leaders may want to pay particular attention to disciplinary differences in teaching goals; our findings in this area can help leaders target efforts towards particular faculty members and courses to achieve the institutional objectives in question (e.g., one might work with STEM faculty members to promote more emphasis on cultural learning or with faculty members in the humanities and social sciences to emphasize career development). Considering the lack of external rewards for faculty members teaching study abroad courses (American Council on Education, 2017), these findings might also help study abroad leaders consider ways to tap into faculty members' teaching goals when recruiting faculty members to teach study abroad courses although more research is needed to determine whether these goals would be effective motivational tools. Perhaps a more likely and fruitful path forward is for institutional

international leaders to use these results to think more strategically about how study abroad is positioned within an institution's broader internationalization goals.

Conclusion

As study abroad programs have become one of the key initiatives to internationalize higher education, researchers and administrators should take note of the importance of one of the most popular forms of study abroad programs – short-term programs led by faculty members. In further understanding the goals that these faculty members have for their study abroad programs, we are better able to assess how these programs may or may not be meeting overall internationalization goals and then to use this information to assist faculty members and higher education administrators on ways to further align study abroad goals with the broader goals of international education.



Elizabeth Niehaus is Assistant Professor of Educational Administration at the University of Nebraska–Lincoln. She holds a Ph.D. in College Student Personnel from the University of Maryland, College Park, an M.A. in American Culture Studies from Washington University in St. Louis, and a B.A. in Linguistics from the University of Virginia. Her research focuses on the ways in which particular educational environments facilitate students' learning and development in postsecondary education.

Ashley Wegener is a Program Coordinator and Academic Advisor in the College of Business at the University of Nebraska–Lincoln. Her research interests focus on college student success and transition. She received her master's degree in Educational Administration from the University of Nebraska–Lincoln and her bachelor's degree in Business Administration from the University of Nebraska at Kearney.

References

- American Council on Education (2017). *Mapping internationalization on U.S. Campuses: 2017 Edition*. Washington, DC. Retrieved from <https://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Documents/Mapping-Internationalization-2017.pdf>
- Anderson, P. H., Lawton, L., Rexeisen, R. J., & Hubbard, A. C. (2006). Short-term study abroad and intercultural sensitivity: A pilot study. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 30, 457–469.

- Chieffo, L., & Griffiths, L. (2004). Large-scale assessment of student attitudes after a short-term study abroad program. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 10, 165-177.
- Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program (2005). *Global competence & national needs: One million Americans studying abroad*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Coker, J. S., Heiser, E., & Taylor, L. (2018, April). Student outcomes associated with short-term and semester study abroad programs. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 30(2), 92-105.
- de Wit, H. (2002). *Internationalization of higher education in the United States of America and Europe*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Donnelly-Smith, L. (2009). Global learning through short-term study abroad. *Peer Review*, 11(4), 12-15 <https://www.aacu.org/peerreview/2009/fall/donnelly-smith>
- Forum on Education Abroad (2011). *Education abroad glossary*. Carlisle, PA: Author. Retrieved from <https://forumea.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/Forum-2011-Glossary-v2.pdf>
- Forum on Education Abroad (2015). *2015 state of the field survey report*. Carlisle, PA. Retrieved from <https://forumea.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ForumEA-2015-State-of-the-Field-Survey-Report.pdf>
- Gaia, A. C. (2015). Short-term faculty-led study abroad programs enhance cultural exchange and self-awareness. *International Education Journal: Comparative Perspectives*, 14(1), 23-31.
- Goode, M. L. (2008). The role of faculty study abroad directors: A case study. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 15, 149-172.
- Gullekson, N. L., Tucker, M. L., Coombs Jr., G., & Wright, S. B. (2011). Examining intercultural growth for business students in short-term study abroad programs: Too good to be true? *Journal of Teaching in International Business*, 22, 91-106. doi 10.1080/08975930.2011.615672
- Institute of International Education (2015). *Open doors report on international educational exchange*. Retrieved from <http://www.iie.org/opendoors>
- Institute of International Education (2017). *Why study abroad*. Retrieved from <https://www.iie.org/Programs/Generation-Study-Abroad/About/Why-Study-Abroad>
- Institute of International Education (2018). *Open Doors 2017 Executive Survey*. Retrieved from <https://www.iie.org/Why-IIE/Announcements/2017-11-13-Open-Doors-2017-Executive-Summary>
- Kartoshkina, Y. (2016). *Exploring pedagogical decision making and metacognition of faculty teaching abroad*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of North Dakota.
- Kezar, A., & Maxey, D. (2014). Faculty matter: So why doesn't everyone think so? *Thought and Action*, 30, 29-44.
- Kurt, M. R., Olitsky, N. H., & Geis, P. (2013). Assessing global awareness over short-term study abroad sequence: A factor analysis. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 23, 22-41.

- Lutterman-Aguilar, A., & Gignerich, O. (2002). Experiential pedagogy for study abroad: Educating for global citizenship. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 8, 41–82.
- Mayhew, M. J., & Grunwald, H. E. (2006). Factors contributing to faculty incorporation of diversity-related course content. *Journal of Higher Education*, 77, 148–168. doi 10.1353/jhe.2006.0005
- Mayhew, M. J., & Simonoff, J. S. (2015). Non-white, no more: Effect coding as an alternative to dummy coding with implications for higher education researchers. *Journal of College Student Development*, 56, 170–175.
- Miglietti, C. (2015). Teaching business classes abroad: How international experience benefits faculty, students, and institutions. *Journal of Teaching in International Business*, 26, 46–55. doi 10.1080/08975930.2014.929513
- Nelson Laird, T. F. (2011). Measuring the diversity inclusivity of college courses. *Research in Higher Education*, 52, 572–588.
- Nelson Laird, T. F., Shoup, R., Kuh, G. D., & Schwarz, M. J. (2008). The effects of discipline on deep approaches to student learning and college outcomes. *Research in Higher Education*, 49, 469–494. doi 10.1007/s11162-008-9088-5
- Niehaus, E., Reading, J., Nelson, M. J., Wegener, A., & Arthur, A. (2018). Faculty engagement in cultural mentoring as instructors in short-term study abroad courses. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad.*, 30, 77–91.
- Olson, C. L., & Kroeger, K. R. (2001). Global competency and intercultural sensitivity. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 5, 116–137.
- Paige, R. M., Fry, G. W., Stallman, E. M., Josic, J., & Jon, J. (2009). Study abroad for global engagement: The long-term impact of mobility experiences. *Intercultural Education*, 20, S29–S44.
- Paige, R. M., & Goode, M. (2009). Intercultural competence in international education administration: Cultural mentoring. In D. K. Deardorff (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of intercultural competence* (pp. 121–140). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Savishinsky, M. (2012). *Overcoming barriers to faculty engagement in study abroad*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Washington.
- Schuhholz-Lehr, S. (2007). Teaching for global literacy in higher education: How prepared are the educators? *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11, 180–204.
- Singer, E. R. (1996). Espoused teaching paradigms of college faculty. *Research in Higher Education*, 37, 659–679.
- Smart, J. C., & Umbach, P. D. (2007). Faculty and academic environments: Using Holland's theory to explain differences in how faculty structure undergraduate courses. *Journal of College Student Development*, 48, 183–195. doi 10.1353/csd.2007.0021
- Tuma, K. (2007). Program models. In S. E. Spencer & K. Tuma (Eds.), *The guide to successful short-term programs abroad* (2nd ed., pp. 41–45). Washington, DC: NAFSA, Association of International Educators.

- Umbach, P. D., & Wawrzynski, M. R. (2005). Faculty do matter: The role of college faculty in student learning and engagement. *Research in Higher Education, 46*, 153-184. doi 10.1007/s11162-004-1598-1
- U.S. Department of State (n.d.) *Information for parents*. Retrieved from <https://studyabroad.state.gov/experiencestudying-abroad/information-parents>
- Vande Berg, M., Paige, R. M., & Hemming Lou, K. (2012). Student learning abroad: Paradigms and assumptions. In M. Vande Berg, R. M. Paige, & K. H. Lou (Eds.), *Student learning abroad: What our students are learning, what they're not, and what we can do about it* (pp. 3-28). Sterling, VA: Stylus.