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**Abstract**

This study will examine ~~the variance of~~ perceived levels of global citizenship of future teachers after participating in a study abroad program. This study also examines the design components of a study abroad program to explore if particular components have more influence on ~~affecting~~ levels of that perception. Participants in this study will be undergraduate students intending to or are enrolled in a teacher licensure program. These students will be volunteers derived from three different universities geographically dispersed across the United States. Using a pretest-posttest research design, this quantitative study will utilize a Global Citizenship Scale and a study abroad Content Survey to examine the relationship between global citizenship development and participation in a study abroad program. The anticipated findings are that global study abroad programs statistically increase a future teacher’s perceived level of global citizenship, and that certain design components of study abroad programs are critical in that increased perception. This study can contribute to the growing literature of how immersion programs contribute to future teachers’ knowledge, understanding, and confidence in teaching global citizenship to students, which is increasingly recognized as an essential element in a student’s education.
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**FOSTERING GLOBAL COMPETENCE IN FUTURE TEACHERS THROUGH**

**STUDY ABROAD PROGRAMS**

Teachers convey more than a lesson plan. Their framing of questions, cultural assumptions, biases, approach to different genders, personal background, life experiences and a host of other factors form a lens, or framework, through which they teach. However, teachers generally are not aware of those frameworks (Gallavan, 2008; Gilliom, 1993). Further, teachers often have little exposure to global issues and alternative frameworks held by their students, many of whom come from different countries, cultures, traditions and ways of knowing information (Cunningham, 2019; Gilliom, 1993; Schneider, 2003). A short-hand way of describing these frameworks that require such global, cross-cultural fluency and self-awareness is “global citizenship.”

As we ask our students to be globally competent citizens, we first must look to the teacher and assess his/her own global competency (Braskamp, 2009; Davies & Pike, 2009; Schattle, 2009). As Sutton (1998) notes in her historical overview of global education in the United States, the competencies and capacities of individual teachers will dictate the strength of global studies and citizenship taught in the classroom. Some researchers suggest schools and colleges of education are often the least internationalized divisions in U.S. post-secondary institutions (Schneider, 2003) and that consequently, the majority of teachers begin their careers with only superficial knowledge of the world. (Longview Foundation, 2008). The question is how to most efficiently and effectively build global competency and understanding among future teachers? This research study provides definitions of terms and then proposes a research design that explores how a tool, namely study abroad programs, can build global citizenship among future teachers. Specifically, the purpose of this study is to examine **how study abroad experiences affect the perceived level of global citizenship qualities among future teachers, and if particular design components of the study abroad program affect that perception.**

**Literature Review**

*Parameters*

This research study begins with a literature review narrowed by the following parameters, (1) studies that define global citizenship/international mindedness; (2) studies that include university, pre-service teachers, and current teachers engaged in international experiences; (3) and/or studies that examine how to build intercultural competency. This research study does not include review of studies if they: (1) only focus on international immersion programs for K-12 students; and (2) do not include international programs, i.e. are local programs only.

*Definitions*

Researchers use different terms and definitions of global citizenship. Samples of the various terminology used to signify “global citizenship” are “global competency,” “intercultural competence,” “critical global citizenship,” “global mindedness,” and “global cosmopolitan” (Andreotti, Biesta & Ahenakew, 2015; Morais and Ogden, 2011; Ramos, 2020; Reimers, 2009). Other examples are noted by Gallavum (2008) who uses “world citizenship” while Banks (2001) uses “multicultural citizenship.” In this study, these terms will be used interchangeably with a preference for “global citizenship.”

In addition, the concept of “global citizenship” does not have a uniform or consistent definition (Pashby, de Costa, Stein & Andreotti, 2020), although there are common themes found in the research. Reimers (2009) defines global competency as the obtainment of attitudinal and ethical dispositions, and the collection of knowledge and skills to help people integrate across disciplinary domains to understand global issues and how to address them. Andreotti (2012) suggests the process of becoming a global citizen is a transformative experience for those individuals needing international understanding, knowledge and cross-cultural skills. The definition proposed by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the Center for Global Education at Asia Society (2018) describes global competency as a capacity to review and understand intercultural issues, alternate worldviews, cross-cultural engagement with others, and acting for collective well-being. However, naming the process of becoming a global citizen as a *transformation* ignores those who already possess those skills due to their multicultural background, immigration status, “third culture kid” background, or other characteristic (Ramirez, 2013). A risk of generalizing what global competency development means must be included in broader definitions.

For the purposes of this paper, the definition proposed by Morais and Ogden (2011) will be used, which describes global citizenship as a concept containing three factors: global competency, social responsibility, and global civic engagement. Global competency includes self-awareness, intercultural communication, and global knowledge. Social responsibility includes global justice and disparities, altruism and empathy, and global interconnectedness and personal responsibility. Global civic engagement includes involvement in civic organizations, political voice, and global civic activism (see Figure 1 below).

Figure 1: Global Citizenship Conceptual Model (Morais & Ogden, 2011)



These attributes assigned to the term “global citizenship” by Morais and Ogden (2011) are reflected in the majority of definitions of the various terms used for global citizenship found in this literature review.

When applied to education, Gilliom (1997) describes “global competency education” as that which cultivates a global perspective, including the skills, attitudes, knowledge and ethical reasoning in a diverse, culturally pluralistic and interconnected world, among students. Another interpretation of the goals of global education suggests it is a process of assisting students to develop a cognitive understanding of the interdependence of nations and peoples while finding ways to identify oneself with that global community (Banks, 2001). The OECD and the Center for Global Education name four key components of educating for global competence (OECD/Asia Society, 2018). Globally competent youth:

(1) investigate the world beyond their immediate environment by examining issues of local, global, and cultural significance;

(2) recognize, understand, and appreciate the perspectives and world views of others;

(3) communicate ideas effectively with diverse audiences by engaging in open, appropriate, and effective interactions across cultures; and

(4) take action for collective well-being and sustainable development both locally and globally.

*Global Citizenship for Teachers*

Researchers assess the state of global competency among teachers from several angles. For example, some seek first to define the purpose of teachers obtaining and building their global competency knowledge and understanding. Banks (2001) focuses on teachers developing a reflective self-identification that includes a self-assessment of culture and background. In this way, he argues, teachers can effectively respond to a diverse study body, and help these students construct their own narratives (Banks, 2001). Another purpose of building teacher’s global competency is to equip students to be global citizens with the appropriate knowledge, attitude and skills, as well as a deep sense of identity and perceived role in a global society (Diaz et al, 1999; Longview, 2008). Reimers (2009) refers to the necessity of global competence in education given the frequency and type of interactions among different cultures and worldviews in the classroom. Schools serve the purpose of preparing students to effectively develop tolerance, a deep knowledge of global affairs, a commitment to peace, and how to live their lives in a highly globalized socio-economic and political construct (Reimers, 2009a). To achieve these goals, teachers must be globally competent; teachers cannot teach what they do not know (Sadruddin & Wahab, 2013; Schneider, 2003). Cultural responsiveness in the classroom is dependent on a teacher’s self-understanding of identity and role in a global community as well as his or her own global competency (Howard, 1999).

Looking at whether teachers are interested in global competency and what “global citizenship” means for teachers, Gallavan (2008) conducted a comprehensive study of teacher candidates finishing their internship as part of a teacher certification program in the southern United States. In her research, she asked, “should teacher education programs include preparation to teach students to be world citizens?” (Gallavan, 2008, p.251). The response was an overwhelming 97 percent affirmative, but a follow-up question revealed only 56 percent of teacher candidates felt their teacher education program prepared them to teach students to be global citizens (Gallavan, 2008).

This study in part responded to Robbins, Francis and Elliott (2003) earlier research, which had identified a gap in literature related to teacher candidates’ attitude toward global citizenship education, whether it was important, and how it related to the teacher’s major field of study. Both researchers found that teachers do not feel prepared to teach global citizenship (Robbins et al., 2003; Gallavan, 2008). One reason is because global citizenship demands teaching that neither excludes nor skims the surface (Flinders, 2009), which requires a depth of knowledge often unfamiliar to most teachers (Robbins et al., 2003). Teaching global citizenship is further complicated by the lack of a uniform definition of “global citizenship,” which Mutch (2004) captured in her assessment of the New Zealand education system. While teachers want to engage with and teach global citizenship topics, many are unclear on first, what their community means when referring to global citizenship and second, how best to be prepared to instruct students in global citizenship qualities (Mutch, 2004).

*Approaches to building global competency: Curriculum modification*

One way teachers learn global competency is through teacher training programs that integrate cross-cultural skills, global knowledge, and personal self-reflection into the curriculum (Sadruddin & Wahab, 2013). However, reliance on curriculum modification is a challenge when considering the multi-dimensional aspect of immersion programs. Seeberg and Minick (2012) conducted a study on how to integrate cross-cultural understanding, a key component of global citizenship (Reimers, 2009; Morais & Ogden, 2011), into the curriculum of a teacher preparation program at a mid-western university.

The objective for Seeberg and Minick (2012) was to assess the effectiveness of gaining cross-cultural competency through the use of an experiential, global learning project that was integrated into the core curriculum on campus, i.e. without utilizing study abroad programs. In their study, Seeberg and Minick (2012) identified four standards representing cross-cultural competence, and then measured teachers’ responses against these standards after completing three unique, classroom-based experiential projects. Each project involved direct interaction with students, administrators, community leaders, and teachers from Mexico and a Native American reservation through virtual platforms (such as Zoom), readings, class discussions, interviews with pre-prepared questions, and written reflections. Seeburg and Minick (2012) used the Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory measure to assess student scores in building cross-cultural competence by modifying the curriculum.

Results were mixed. Students in this study reported a surprisingly high level of flexibility and openness to other cultures, but low scores on levels of emotional resilience, perceptual acuity, and personal autonomy, which the researchers noted may be due to low levels of cross-cultural preparation (Seeberg & Minick, 2012). While students were open to other cultures, they lacked the motivation to utilize cultural awareness and understanding in their responses (Seeberg & Minick, 2012). In conclusion, Seeberg and Minick (2012) cited there remains a gap in the literature is how to build global competency among future and current teachers most effectively.

*Approaches to building global competency: Study abroad*

The American Council on Education (2002) stated that study-abroad programs “produce the core knowledge experts need for national security, economic competitiveness, and U.S. foreign policy leadership.” Educating people to become global citizens is a driving force behind justifying and validating international education and specifically study abroad programs (Davies & Pike, 2009; Schattle, 2009), despite broad acceptance that study abroad programs do develop global citizenship (American Council on Education, 2020; Braskamp, 2009; Reimers, 2009). U.S. support for study abroad opportunities for students was highlighted when the U.S. Senate named 2006 as the Year of Study Abroad, in order to intentionally build global competency among youth (United States Senate, 2005).

Expanding on the differences in engagement during a study abroad program, Santoro and Major (2012) discuss the definitions of “visitor,” “tourism,” and “empathy.” These “nonlinear dispositions” refer to our interaction with a new culture or place (Santoro & Major, 2012). As a tourist, our encounter maintains distance from ourselves to the other; in empathy, we attempt to fuse ourselves with the other; and as a visitor, we both encounter the other and ourselves (Santoro & Major, 2012). When considering the multiple dimensions faced during a study abroad program, this concept of “visitor” allows for cognitive reflection, awareness, and authentic engagement, essential elements in a holistic approach to global citizenship, with both the self and the other while holding present the differences (Andreotti, 2010; Andreotti et al., 2015).

Looking broadly at the impact of study abroad experiences on global citizenship occurred in a study sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education (Paige, Fry, Stallman, Josic, & Jon, 2009). This study was a 50-year, longitudinal study (1960 to 2010) examining the long-term impact on undergraduate students who studied abroad, including their continued local and international engagement, career choices and ambitions, and educational achievement (Paige, et al 2009). The research focused on two questions:

“*What is the near-term (1-5 years post study abroad) and long-term (6+ years post study abroad) impact of study abroad on alumni’s global engagement contributions, professional development, and personal development, as perceived by the alumni themselves and as assessed by external measures?”* (Paige et al, 2007, p. 3).

In the quantitative section of this study, the researchers used a retrospective tracer study methodology, that is, they looked back and traced the responses of participants, while a sequential mixed methods research design. Their quantitative instrument was a single, cross-sectional, online survey instrument distributed to participants (Paige et al, 2007), who volunteered after being identified as a study abroad participant within the past 50 years by their program’s institution. To execute the study, the researchers also obtained demographic variables (gender, age, socioeconomic status, ethnicity, and prior intercultural/international experience) and four study abroad program variables (program genre, destination of the program, duration, and U.S. institutional classification).

In order to conduct their research, Paige et al. (2007) developed a measuring instrument called the Global Engagement Survey (GES). This 56-question survey assessed five dimensions using a 1-5 Likert Scale to assess the impact of an individual’s study abroad experience on their future global engagement, an integral part of global citizenship (Morais & Ogden, 2011). The GES measured five dimensions: civic engagement, knowledge production, philanthropy, social entrepreneurship, and voluntary simplicity. A sample of proxies used were participants’ career choices and ambitions, gender gaps, and educational achievement (Paige et al, 2009).

The researchers received responses from 6,391 participants, which was a 29.6 percent response rate from the total sample. Disaggregated by gender, females made up 67.1 percent of the sample and males made up 32.9 percent. According to data offered by the Institute of International Studies during the time period of this study, females made up 65 percent of study abroad participants (Inside Higher Ed, 2020), thereby offering validation of the higher percentage of females participating.

The study showed a clear correlation between increased and continuing global engagement after participating in a study abroad program. Key results from this study revealed 83.5 percent of participants reported their study abroad experience had a “strong impact” on their ongoing global engagement, and another 14.9 percent indicated at least “some impact,” meaning 98.4 percent of participants said their study abroad experience increased their future global engagement, which influenced forthcoming professional and personal endeavors (Paige et al., 2007). In addition, 73.8 percent noted a strong impact on their friendships and student-peer interactions, and 96.3 percent reported their study abroad program had an impact on the undergraduate and graduate coursework they chose after completing the program. Summarily, this study demonstrated that study abroad programs are one of the most influential experiences undertaken during undergraduate education and that they continue to influence participants’ global engagement and career choices.

Confirming the results found in the Paige et al. longitudinal study, Kishino and Takahashi (2009) looked at university students’ improvement in their self-perceptions of global competency after mandatory study abroad programs (2019). Using Morais and Ogden’s Global Citizenship Scale (2011), Kishino and Takahashi (2019) showed that study abroad program participants who completed their program show higher scores on a global citizenship scale than students currently in a program or those who have not participated.

*Future teachers participating in study abroad programs*

Opportunities for pre-service teachers to participate in study abroad or other types of immersion programs has been available in the United States since the 1970s (Sleeter, 2000). To examine their experiences, Cunningham (2019) conducted an ethnographic study on teacher candidates (currently enrolled in a teacher licensure program) participating in an international student teaching program in Mexico. In her study, she focused on two questions: do immersion programs for pre-service teachers increase their capacity of “cultural noticing,” that is, the ability to notice details about a cultural context; and their ability to respond to the cultural context, which she defines as the cultural practices, values and behaviors of individuals at a particular place and time (Cunningham, 2019). By increasing cultural noticing and responding to a cultural context, future teachers can be better equipped to use their student’s cultural framework and understanding to develop effective teaching methods (Cunningham, 2019).

The results from Cunningham’s study show that pre-service teachers do increase their global competencies of cultural noticing and responding to cultural contexts, but do not always use available opportunities to engage in cultural responding. Reasons proposed as to why pre-service teaches may not culturally respond may be due to factors such as race, gender, previous international experience, and/or social identity of the participants (Cunningham, 2019). Cunningham (2019) notes that additional research is needed to determine how to prepare students prior to an immersion experience, and what demographic factors and previous exposure to different cultures may impact a participant’s success in developing global competency after a study abroad program.

Ramirez (2013) reiterated this gap of knowledge, and further emphasizes the need for authentic engagement and improved knowledge of globalization when participating in an international immersion program (2013). Researchers such as Baecher (2019), Gilliom (1993), and Reimers (2009) confirm that study abroad programs, defined as service learning, practicums, or educational tourism, are effective in building global competency, particularly cultural awareness, among teachers. Further, Gilliom (1993) emphasizes that building global competency among teachers is most effective through immersion programs specifically designed for students preparing to teach, and that these future teachers must be committed to global education.

While studies discussed here have indicated global citizenship is critical in the 21st century; that teachers want to be globally competent; and that study abroad programs are a highly effective tool to build global citizenship, there is limited research on the increase of self-perceived global citizenship following a study abroad program among specifically future teachers, and there is limited research on what components of a study abroad program have the most influence on developing that global competency. Indeed, researchers highlight there remains a gap in the literature in how do pre-service teacher study abroad programs to best support teachers in developing their global citizenship so that ultimately they can be culturally responsive as classroom teachers (Cunningham, 2019; Gallavan, 2008; Gilliom, 1993; Kishino & Takahashi, 2019; Longview, 2008). The question stands: what makes an effective study abroad program in terms of building global competency among pre-service teachers? The purpose of this study is to look at the relationship between participation in study abroad programs and self-perceptions of global citizenship among future teachers, and to investigate the differences in study abroad program structure that may affect differing levels of this self-perception.

**Proposed Method**

**Research Design**

This research study explores two related questions:

1. Do international immersion experiences affect the perceived level of global competency among future teachers?
2. Do particular structural components within the study abroad programs affect the levels of self-perception global competency?

To answer these questions, I propose a pretest-posttest research design. A control group is not used in this study given the focus of the study is on examining a self-selected group of participants who choose to participate in a study abroad program, and investigating whether certain structural components of an experience are correlated with the level of global competency perceived.

This research design seeks to respond to my hypothesis and null hypothesis:

* Hypothesis: future teachers (college students intending to enroll or currently enrolled in a teacher certification program) who participate in study abroad programs improve their global competency, and certain types of programs are more effective than others.
* Null hypothesis: study abroad programs do not improve global competency among future teachers (as defined), and the structure of a program has no impact.

**Participant Selection**

This study will use convenience sampling. Participants will be drawn from three targeted universities, each of which have a robust study abroad program and teacher certification program. The proposed universities are University of Washington (Seattle), University of Texas (Austin), and University of Maryland (College Park), each of which is a public institution, of similar size, and with a similar level of diversity among the student body (College Factual, 2020). These three universities are intentionally chosen from three distinct parts of the United States to help provide geographic diversity in the universities represented by the participants included in this research study. Each of these universities has robust and recognized study abroad programs that are widely integrated into the culture and curriculum options of the university. Below is a summary chart briefly outlining the schools, average number and percentage of students participating in a study abroad program, average number of study abroad programs offered at the university, and the reported percent of students self-identifying as minorities.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Brief overview of target schools and international immersion (IM) reported data\* |  |  |
| **School** | **Location** | **Total no. of students** | **Avg tuition (after aid)\*\*** | **% of student minorities\*\*** | **No. and % of students participating in IM programs** | **No of IM programs** |  |
| University of Washington | Seattle, WA | 54,000 | $12,899  | 43.70% | 2600 students or 5% of total | est. 350 |  |
| University of Texas | Austin, TX | 51,832 | $16,960  | 52.60% | 4400 students or 8.5% of total | 400 |  |
| University of Maryland | College Park, MD | 41,000 | $18,517  | 43.10% | 1835 students or 4.5% of total | 447 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \*Information from school websites: https://global.utexas.edu/; http://www.washington.edu/; https://globalmaryland.umd.edu/ |
| \*\*data from https://www.collegefactual.com |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Volunteer participants in this study must fall within the following parameters:

1. Identify as a student intending to teach in the future
2. Not participated in a study abroad program previously
3. Had not traveled to the intended study abroad program country previously
4. Fall within the age range of 20 to 30 years.
5. Will be participating in a semester/quarter or academic year length program

This study will include 35 students from each university for a total of 105 volunteers. To recruit students, volunteers would be requested in coordination with the university administration and/or faculty. Tools to recruit volunteers will include online communication such as emails and university websites; direct invitations from faculty, student associations and clubs; and other vehicles offered by the university. All volunteers will be offered $150 in renumeration for their participation.

**Measures**

Three different measures will be given to participants: (1) a demographic survey of participants collected pre-test, (2) the Global Citizenship Scale pre-test and post-test, and (3) a Content Survey assessing the design of the study abroad program, which will be provided post-test.

*Demographics.* All volunteers will be asked to complete an online application that will serve as a baseline of demographic information. This application will ask for general biographical data (age; school; year in school; major in school; minor in school, as applicable; race; gender; sexual orientation; marital status; intended grades to teach; previous international travel experience (purpose and location); and destination of study abroad program.

 *Global Citizenship.* The Global Citizenship Scale is a survey of 56 questions developed and introduced by researchers in 2011 to provide a conceptual framework for assessing outcomes following study abroad or other international immersion experiences for undergraduate students (Morais & Ogden, 2011). The Global Citizenship Scale (GCS) is a three-dimensional scale that includes social responsibility, global competence, and global civic engagement that provides a measurement of global citizenship (Morais and Ogden, 2011).

Each of these factors is broken down into subareas, which are captured in a questionnaire (see appendix A). The tool uses a 5-point Likert scale asking for agreement or disagreement related to self-perceptions of global citizenship. The GCS uses internal consistency based on the number of items in the scale; to check for evidence based on content, this study will use the expertise of senior researchers to examine the content to ensure it accurately represents the construct presented in this study, namely, illuminating levels of global citizenship. In addition, this survey measures three key dimensions of global citizenship; factor analysis could be used to analyze the relationships among those elements measured to determine if the construct measured is uni or multi-dimensional. If a factor analysis shows that the three components of global citizenship are present, then we have some evidence of internal structure.

 *Content Survey*. At the conclusion of the study abroad program, participants will complete a Content Survey (CS) about the program design of the study abroad experience (see appendix C). The objective of the CS is to provide information if certain components of a study abroad program have more influence on global competency than other components. The following components make up the survey: orientation and post-debrief; duration of program; housing; level of foreign language competency; required language use, if applicable (in class); use of local faculty and host institution faculty; cross-cultural communication course; experiential learning activities; internship and volunteer opportunities; reflection; travel; and time with other Americans (Engle & Engle, 2004; Whatley, M., Landon, A. C., Tarrant, M. A., & Rubin, D., 2020).

**Procedures**

Once volunteers are selected, each volunteer would be asked to sign a written consent that would explain the purpose of the study, the potential risks of participation, the freedom to withdraw, and the confidentiality and privacy of all results. All participants would also be invited to review the final research report, which would not contain names or other identifying information of participants.

Data collection begins with a pre-test assessment using the Global Citizenship Scale (GCS). Each participant will receive the GCS online, and must complete the scale within ten days prior to departure. Upon return from the study abroad program, participants will be asked to complete the GCS again within ten days upon returning. In addition, students will be asked to complete the Content Survey regarding the structural components of their program.

**Ethical Considerations**

This research study, while it does not include minors, does include human subjects and therefore would require Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval. As noted above, written informed consent will be obtained from each participant. Each participant will receive a copy of that consent, and the researchers will maintain the original copy within a locked cabinet. Also, all participants will be informed that they can withdraw from the research study at anytime without any adverse or other consequence. Any conversations that may occur between the researcher and the participants will be kept confidential. To help ensure privacy, all email correspondence would be encrypted and subsequently deleted at the conclusion of the study. Information gathered from the GCS will be anonymized by removing names and any personally identifying information.

**Limitations**

This study will seek to mitigate several potential internal validity threats such as selection bias, testing, history or attrition as well as to address the pretest-posttest research method limitations. In this research method, a risk of extraneous variables occurring during the intermediary period between testing is possible, and therefore changes in scores on the GCS cannot automatically infer causation or relationship to the study abroad program. A pretest-posttest can suggest there is an association between participation in a study abroad program and increased global competency, but this method is insufficient to determine causation.

*Selection Bias:* Several potential biases in selection are possible. For example, a possible selection bias relates to cost of participation in a study abroad program. Universities were chosen based on their average tuition and availability of scholarships for study abroad programs. By holding steady the financial implications of study abroad programs and the average tuition, this study seeks to mitigate “cost” as a significant extraneous variable. In addition, an effort to mitigate a lack of exposure to student populations of different cultures was made by choosing universities having similar diversity levels as noted in the self-identification of students upon enrollment. By mitigating this factor, the objective is to approximate some equal level of exposure to students of different races and ethnicities, even if such exposure was limited to the classroom. Finally, the parameters of accepting volunteers who had not participated in a study abroad program previously as well as had not traveled to the program’s destination helps mitigate exposure to the environment, which may impact the results given on the GCS.

A separate but additional selection bias limitation is whether there are sufficient future teacher students willing to volunteer for this study in order to meet the n sample. Should there be an insufficient number of volunteers, this study will work with fewer volunteers rather than take volunteers who do not meet the criteria in order to maintain the integrity of the parameters of the study.

 *Instrumentation.* Because this study utilizes the Global Citizenship Scale twice (pre- and post -test), the risk of recollection of questions by the participants will be introduced, which may lead to responses orientated toward what researchers would expect to see, or participants may not take the second test seriously. In addition, the survey about the study abroad program may be influenced by how the participants felt about the program, and therefore mark accordingly. To address these risks, scores will be correlated between and among participants to check for reliability. While not a formal instrument used in this study, participants will be asked to maintain a travel journal to record their observations, reflect on their experiences, and self-monitor their insights and progression of thought development, which may assist in mitigating this risk.

*History.* Another challenge is that an event may occur in one of the locations or regions that uniquely impacts a particular study abroad program. For example, a tsunami may hit Thailand (should that be a destination) but have no effect on Honduras. A conflict may rise in Ethiopia but not in Zambia. In addition, an unexpected event in the personal life of a participant may inadvertently alter the experience of the study abroad program; or, a key faculty member may depart, which disrupts the program’s experience. This challenge may be mitigated by the travel journal noted above, by attrition, or by integrating this information as data in an analysis.

**Proposed Preliminary Data Analyses**

~~The planned analysis will use participation in a Study Abroad program as the constant.~~ The Independent Variable (IV) is the structure of the program, and the Dependent Variable (DV) is the perceived level of global competency recorded by participants.

This research study will use a dependent t-test that will compare pre and post text scores of the GCS measurement tool. In addition, results from the Content Survey will be analyzed to check for similarities and differences among the programs using ANOVA (when appropriate). Further, the Content Survey data will be added to the particular student’s demographic data as predictor variables in a regression analysis to examine the relationship between the factors in the Content Survey and levels of perceived global competency.

~~Participant demographic data will be analyzed and disaggregated by each of the reported data. Where redundancies become prominent, such as participants’ major, groups will be maintained at least by gender, race, destination, and previous experience abroad.~~

**Expected Findings**

This study will likely result in the assessment that study abroad programs lead to greater perceptions of global citizenship among participants. Further, this study may show a tendency for increased levels of global competency when:

1. The destination of the study abroad program is not Europe or Australia
2. Another language was spoken in the dominant country, requiring some language ability on behalf of the participant
3. Participants live with a host family for multiple weeks
4. Participation in a cross-cultural communication class

As our perceptions, learning and attitudes are most profoundly formed during our school years, the school domain is arguably an optimal place to begin to build a global citizenship mindset among students. As the demand for global competency increases (Sadruddin & Wahab, 2013), the vision is that improving global competency among a greater percentage of future teachers will lead to more globally competent students and future adults, and hopefully change the trajectory of the continuing, and now escalating, divisiveness facing our nation and broader global community.

Stephanie-

You have added in sufficient detail since the last draft and your study components fit together well! There are still a couple of places where there is some minor lack of clarity but overall excellent work!
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### Appendix A: Initial Item Pool of Global Citizenship Scale (portion only)

### A close up of a newspaper  Description automatically generated

###

### Appendix B:

### Content Survey

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Study Abroad Program Characteristics Survey (Topics Only)\*** |  |
|  |  |  |
| **Question** | **How Question is Surveyed** |   |
| Orientation pre-departure | (No of days) |   |
| Duration | (No of months/weeks) |   |
| No of Students from host school | (Number) |   |
| Dorm/hotel | (No of weeks/days) |   |
| Host family | (No of weeks/days) |   |
| Classes in English | (No of classes: 0 to 5) |   |
| English-speaking country | (Yes/No) | (If no, list language) |
| Foreign language history (if applicable) | (No of college semesters) |   |
| Use of home institution faculty | (No of classes: 0 to 5) |   |
| Use of host institution faculty | (No of classes: 0 to 5) |   |
| Use of host institution campus | (Yes/No) |   |
| Cross-Cultural Communications Class | (Yes/No) |   |
| Experiential learning activities | (Yes/No) | (List of activities) |
| Private reflection | (None, Daily, Weekly, Monthly) |   |
| Group reflection | (None, Daily, Weekly, Monthly) |   |
| Internship | (No of days) |   |
| Volunteer work | (No of days) |   |
| Time with other Americans | (Frequent/Sometimes/Rarely) |   |
| Travel in-country | (No of days) |   |
| Post-experience debrief | (No of days) |   |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| \*Adapted from Whatley, M., Landon, A. C., Tarrant, M. A., & Rubin, D. (2020) and Engle & Engle (2004). |