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The purpose of this study was to determine if a semester of study abroad influenced the development of global-mindedness among students enrolled in International Programs at Florida State University. The primary research question focused on whether a significant difference in global-mindedness was achieved in students after a semester of study abroad. The study also examined (a) whether a significant difference in global-mindedness occurred for all study participants after one semester, (b) if those among the study abroad group who had frequent contact with members of the host community differed significantly in global-mindedness from those who did not, and (c) if study abroad location influenced global-mindedness development.

The instruments used for the study were the Global-Mindedness Scale (Hett, 1993) and the Host Culture Contact survey (HCC). The GMS measures five dimensions: cultural pluralism, responsibility, efficacy, globalcentrism, and interconnectedness. The HCC measures the type and frequency of contact with the host culture. Pre- and post- surveys were then administered to participants in a web-based format.

The study abroad group and a non-study abroad group completed a demographic profile and the Global-Mindedness Scale at the beginning of the Spring 2005 semester. At the end of the semester both groups completed the Global-Mindedness Scale and the study abroad group completed the additional instrument. Of the 576 surveys that were emailed to students, 196 students responded to the pre-test. After post-testing, 73 usable surveys were returned. Results were based on those respondents.

Post-test results for the study abroad group (n=49) were significant for cultural pluralism and the total post-test. There was no significant difference found on any dimensions of global-mindedness or the total post-test in the non-study abroad group (n=24). Post-test results also indicated a significant difference for cultural pluralism, responsibility, globalcentrism and the total post-test for all respondents (N=73) after one semester.

A non-significant result was found among study abroad students who had frequent contact with the host culture. However, a positive correlation existed between “home-stay” and the development of overall global-mindedness for students (N=13) who responded “yes” to staying with a member of the host country at some point in their study abroad program. Location was found to be non-significant.
The results confirmed two of the four hypotheses: (a) that there would be a significant difference in the global-mindedness of students after one semester, and (b) that there would be a significant difference between the global-mindedness of students who studied abroad and those who studied only at their home campus. The results obtained could be attributed to the study abroad experience, previous travel or work abroad, or students’ multicultural experiences in their home country. For the study abroad group, cultural pluralism was the only dimension of global-mindedness found to be significant along with the total post-test. Learning in other dimensions may require instructional methods such as service learning or culture education to examine both the objective and subjective aspects of culture.

Recommendations for future research include comparisons between the lesser attended Spain, Italy, and Panama study centers with the London study center to examine the impact of language or culture on global-mindedness development; the addition of focus groups and longitudinal studies to reveal more information about student characteristics and more detail on individual experiences and how they relate to the transformational learning; comparisons between the global-mindedness of study abroad students who have had a greater degree of domestic multicultural interaction with those who primarily originate from homogenous backgrounds; and the addition of Bennett’s Intercultural Development Inventory to gauge at what stage a student is in intercultural competence.
CHAPTER 1

Introduction to the Problem

Americans are faced with a formidable challenge of trying to adjust to and manage a rapidly changing environment. With globalization affecting every aspect of society, America’s future will largely depend on the ability of its citizens to embrace the global community and work toward a state of mutual respect and shared responsibility with its neighbors.

The global community is going through a transitional phase; a metamorphosis of structures and institutions that is advancing toward an unprecedented state of interconnectedness. Many definitions exist for this phenomenon, but most agree that humans and human activity across earth’s landscape is becoming more interactive and increasingly interconnected.

Held and Mcgrew (1999) defined globalization as “a process (or set of processes) which embodies a transformation in the spatial organization of social relations and transactions, generating transcontinental or interregional flows, and networks of activity, interaction, and power.” Technology sets contemporary globalization apart from that of the pre-modern era. Globalization has displayed different systemic and organizational features at various periods in our human history (p. 3).

The United States has been linked to the global system since the European settlement (Law, 1997, p.90), and the effects of globalization can be observed today in our cities as we adjust to the influx of people from other nations. Hispanics are the fastest growing population in the US according to the US Department of Commerce. Census Bureau data (2004) estimates the nation’s Hispanic population at 41.3 million. Hispanics, who may be of any race, account for about one-half of the national population growth of 2.9 million. Additionally, the Census Bureau estimates the number of Asians in the US at 14 million. (US Census Bureau News Released: 12:01 A.M. EDT, June 9, 2005 [Thursday]). Law postulated that immigration is directly related to the globalization of the economy (p.90).

Apart from our local communities growing more diverse, globalization has impacted society in other ways. Global outsourcing for example has not only altered the US economy and job market, but also the provision of goods and services. Environmental issues such as climate changes and weather related disasters are problems now requiring a global approach to identifying solutions. It is no wonder that Americans find themselves on a collision course with
culture and unsure of the way in which to respond. At least two important questions emerge from this quandary:

1. What cross-cultural skills are needed to work effectively with others in the global community? And,

2. How do we become more globally-minded?

We know that our survival as a nation depends on working collaboratively to find solutions to those problems that affect all people. Therefore, it is imperative that Americans become more adept at blending the demands of multiculturalism with those of internationalism in order to address our common concerns.

The Effect of Globalization on Students

There is a general concern that students are exposed to diversity in their learning experiences in order to gain an appreciation for the backgrounds, interests, and points of view of others. However, a more specific concern exists for students to gain the attitudes and competencies that will result in meaningful and productive cross-cultural interaction.

The development of a globally minded attitude is particularly relevant to college students who are faced with the prospect of having to select careers that require global skills. Our globalized economy has redefined the range of opportunities, the way in which we seek them, and where we go to find them. Off-shore employment in countries like China and India is becoming increasingly common.

In an article that appeared on the CNN Money.Com website, (Needs job, moves to India) a healthcare information technology expert began contacting headhunters in Bangalore, Southern India to find employment for him and as many as twenty of his co-workers to consult on healthcare IT projects. As it turns out, India needs overseas workers from Europe and the US with special knowledge (Geary, 2004). It is anticipated that the number of US workers willing to move to India is expected to grow.

The overseas jobs page of the Federal Jobs Network, a resource created to help federal job hunters find government jobs, cited 93,891 federal employees stationed overseas in over 140 countries in 2004. In addition, the Defense Department is the largest overseas employer with 53,827 workers, and the State Department is the number two overseas employer with 20,162 employees stationed abroad. The need for globally prepared graduates is increasing in both
private and government sectors and some unique opportunities are becoming available to those
prepared and willing to meet the challenge.

A study by Brown (2003) examining the effects of globalization on careers found that a
reduction of trade barriers, opening of new international markets, and advanced information and
communication technologies have a resounding effect on the job market (p.1). Brown believed
that workers who are educationally, socially and mentally prepared for a changing workplace
will be able to reap benefits from global integration (p.2).

The positive effect on jobs in the US will be an increased demand for jobs that require
higher degrees and increased skill levels realized through post-secondary training (p.2). Students,
upon entering post-secondary schools, should be advised of the impact of globalization on their
area of interest, and encouraged to pursue a global approach to their program of study to the
degree possible. Higher education must enable students through curricula and programs focused
on the demands of globalization.

Not surprisingly, globalization affects students in other parts of the world, as they too are
entering the global workforce and will have to be equally prepared. In a study by Kefalas and
Weatherly (1991) the authors examined whether a propensity toward a global mindset existed
among business students around the world (p.2). Examining business students from six countries,
results indicated that students around the world seem to possess most of the attributes of a global
mindset.

As the authors hypothesized in the study, the US students seemed considerably more
global than the rest of the sample taken as one group. They further noted that in general, the
degree of global-mindedness of students is a function of the length of experience with political
openness of the country in which they reside (p.9). Unfortunately, despite the political openness
the US is accustomed to, Americans still seem to lack adequate global skills.

The Kefalas and Weatherly study also noted that in a recent global leadership study by
the International Consortium for Executive Development Research (ICEDR), 1500 executives
from 12 large corporations, self described as global organizations, rated their corporation’s
effectiveness in cultivating a global mindset last among 34 organizational capabilities (Ready,

Corporations generally rely on colleges and universities to prepare students with domain
skills and the knowledge and attitudes essential for doing business in the corporate arena. Some
corporate communities however, have expressed concern about the ability of higher education to prepare future employees to live, work and communicate in a globalized economic environment.

In a study conducted by Bikson and Law for the Rand Institute (1994) on the implications for human resources, researchers gathered data from corporate and academic sites. Participants were interviewed and asked questions related to factors that contributed to successful work performance. Among the findings, prior cross-cultural experiences and foreign language fluency received relatively low ratings as predictors of workplace effectiveness. Many corporate respondents believed that study abroad programs were too isolated and academic, creating “mini-Americas” or “American ghettos” within the host country (p. 26).

Respondents did indicate however, that there were few schools that provided strong language training and intensive cultural exposure, but these were exceptions. Many participants conceded that universities do little to promote interaction among ethnically diverse groups of students on campus, and fail to exploit opportunities for exposure to different cultures (p. 27).

Both the academic and corporate communities agree that cross-cultural competence is a “critical new human resource requirement.” As well, university participants concurred that cross-cultural competency is the most critical task facing US educators (p. 52). Finally, academics suggested that internationalizing curricula, improving and expanding study abroad activities, faculty development and innovative cooperative ventures, will improve the prospects of students achieving cross-cultural competence (p. 53-62).

**Internationalizing Higher Education**

In response to concerns expressed by members of the business and academic communities, higher education along with many of its advocacy organizations has begun to take serious steps toward implementing an agenda to address policy, internalization of curriculum, and improvement in the quality of foreign study offerings.

The American Council on Education (ACE) defined an internationalized curriculum as “a course, program or activity that includes perspectives, issues or events from specific countries or areas other than the United States” (Strategies for Internationalizing the Curriculum. What is an internationalized curriculum? para. 2). Internationalized curriculum is created by adding a global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of postsecondary education (Knight, 2003).

Higher education institutions have described internationalization as their effort to increase global awareness both in their mission statements and by designing globally-focused
courses and foreign study opportunities that have now come to represent the standard offerings. Colleges and universities often compel students to add multicultural courses to their programs of study.

Education organizations like NASFA: Association of International Educators lists among its top priorities the creation of an international education policy. In a recently revised policy statement, NASFA advised, “... international and cross-cultural awareness and understanding on the part of U.S. citizens will be crucial to effective U.S. leadership, competitiveness, prosperity, and national security in this century” However, while recognizing the importance of international awareness and understanding for US citizens, NAFSA declared, “... the United States effectively lacks a coherent, clearly articulated, proactive policy for imparting effective global literacy to our people as an integral part of their education and for reaching out to future foreign leaders through education and exchange” (NAFSA, 2003, para. 7).

The American Council on Education (2002) in collaboration with 33 other higher education organizations proposed a national blueprint for global education. The policy focused on three national objectives: (a) producing international experts and knowledge to address national strategic needs; (b) strengthening US ability to solve global problems; and, (c) developing a globally competent citizenry and workforce. The strategy for meeting these objectives included strengthening and expanding internationalization efforts on higher education campuses by building partnerships between the federal government and higher education institutions.

Advocates for internationalization agree that developing skills for the global environment is essential to the broad development of students and that a national policy is essential for institutionalizing global education in the US. In addition, a national policy would not only encourage relationships with national partners, but build vital relationships with international partners as well. This linkage is important to the creation of study opportunities, the dissemination of scholarly activity, and the cultivation of collaborative scholarship with colleagues in other parts of the world.

Internationalizing the curriculum provides an effective way for students to gain global capital and to improve cross-cultural communication skills. However, educators must take a more comprehensive approach to insure that the goals expressed in an international commitment
are being met by selecting complimentary pedagogical practices that increase inter-cultural learning and performing effective assessments of a school’s courses, programs, and activities.

**Conceptual Framework**

The conceptual framework for this study draws upon the theory of adult learning known as transformative learning and the worldview of global-mindedness (Hett, 1993).

**Transformative learning**

Transformative learning is grounded in human communication and is partly a developmental process (Taylor, 2002). The theory involves the revision of the interpretation of meaning derived from one’s experience (Mezirow, 1996 p. 162 as cited in Taylor).

According to Mezirow, meaning structures are made up of meaning schemes and meaning perspectives. Meaning schemes are specific knowledge, beliefs, value judgments and feelings that constitute interpretation of experience. Meaning perspectives are general frames of reference, world view, or personal paradigms (Mezirow, 1999a, pp.5-6, as cited in Taylor, p. 6). Mezirow contends meaning perspectives are innocently acquired through the process of socialization and acculturation with teachers, parents, and mentors. Meaning perspectives become the criteria from which we view and evaluate the world and our daily lives.

What is perceived through experience is filtered through our meaning perspectives. Experiences (disorienting dilemmas) that conflict with our existing frames of reference, world view or personal paradigm are processed through a series of stages identified by Mezirow that ultimately gives rise to the acceptance of new meaning, or its rejection in favor of old assumptions. Changes in meaning perspectives leading to perspective transformation reflects the shift in attitudes or behaviors needed to support personal growth and development.

Critical reflection is additionally an important theme in Mezirow’s theory (Mezirow, 1991). Of the three types of critical reflection, premise reflection prompts us to explore invalid, undeveloped, or distorted meaning schemes or perspective; revise meaning schemes or perspective; and act on the newly revised schemes or perspectives, the result of which is transformative development (Cranton, p. 82). Premise reflection leads us to question the underlying assumptions, beliefs, and values of a problem.

Figure 1 illustrates the impact of experience on college students as adult learners. According to the diagram, students bring with them prior meaning schemes. Students have experiences within their academic and social environment that challenge previously held
knowledge, beliefs, value judgments and feelings. The new knowledge can either lead to positive changes in students’ meaning perspective resulting in personal or intellectual growth or be rejected leading to contradictory results.

In a discussion on the transformational impact of service learning on student development, Martin (2001) writes:

“In a service-learning course students might be confronted or faced with disorienting dilemmas. Students will likely have their stereotypes challenged and their personal values questioned and they will be forced to ‘walk in another’s shoes’ as they become more aware of real life social problems” (p. 39).

Service learning researchers, Eyler and Giles 1999 (as cited in Martin), report among their findings a reduction of negative stereotypes and an increase in tolerance for diversity; increased feelings of being connected to a community; and, an increased ability to work with others, illustrating a few of the areas in which service-learning, as a college experience, impact the attitudes of students.

Disorienting dilemmas can be the result of contact between ethnically or culturally disparate individuals or groups like that which can occur in the context of a service-learning experience or international sojourn. Variables such as location where contact occurs, time span, purpose, type of involvement, frequency, and degree of intimacy, relative status and power, numerical balance, and distinguishable characteristics of the participants influence how contact is experienced and the degree to which that experience is incongruent with our existing perspectives (Bochner, 1982).

Global-mindedness

The concept of worldview as it relates to meaning perspectives is important relative to the outcomes for study abroad. A worldview pertains to the totality of human existence and most aspects of social life (Olsen, Lodwick & Dunlap, 1992). As stated, our worldview is learned through socialization and social interaction. Most people see their world view as unified and tend to interpret events in ways consistent with this view (Olsen, et al, para. 4). Worldviews that are narrow, ethnocentric, or discriminatory, run counter to attitudes conducive to operating in a global environment. Shifts in worldview that make it more inclusive, ethnorelative, and tolerant are what should be the goals for study abroad and global education in general.
Global-mindedness is defined by Hett as “a worldview in which ones sees oneself as connected to the world community and feels a sense of responsibility for its members. This commitment is reflected in an individual’s attitudes, beliefs and behaviors (p. 4). Global-mindedness consists of five dimensions: responsibility, cultural pluralism, efficacy, globalcentrism, and interconnectedness.

Being globally-minded means that an individual shares a deep personal concern for people in all parts of the world and have a sense of moral responsibility to try and improve conditions. It means an appreciation of the diversity of the cultures of the world, and a belief that all have something of value to offer. There is also a belief that one’s action can make a difference. A globally-minded person thinks in terms of what is good for the global community and shares an awareness and appreciation of the interrelatedness of all peoples and nations.

The present study explores the impact of study abroad on changes in meaning perspectives with respect to a change in worldview. Figure 2 shows the relationship between prior meaning perspectives as they come into contact with studying abroad and cross-cultural exchange, generating disorienting dilemmas that challenge existing worldviews. Students experiencing disorienting dilemmas resulting from confrontation with a new culture begin to re-examine previously held knowledge, beliefs, value judgments and feelings and arrive at new or modified world views. Under favorable conditions, the new knowledge subsequently leads to the development of a worldview that is globally-minded.
Figure 1

A conceptual framework for transformative learning in college students
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Figure 2
A conceptual framework for the development of Global-Mindedness in college students after study abroad
There is a shared belief among education professionals that cross-cultural experiences promote positive changes in students’ personal and intellectual growth. Increasingly, schools are doing more toward encouraging study abroad by creating programs that fit the needs and schedules of their students. Short-term programs ranging from several weeks to one semester to yearlong programs are available to most college students. There is also an array of program types ranging from excursions, study, work, volunteer service, and internships, available to meet a variety of needs.

Despite some research on study abroad which has yielded contradictory results, most research has shown that study abroad does have positive benefits for students. Of growing interest is research on perspective change concerning global attitudes. This study is an attempt to examine this phenomenon through the lens of transformative learning. As Morgan (1975) stated, the valued outcome of study abroad is “simply to help the individual acquire a deep understanding of another culture, and to begin to appreciate and develop empathy for people who are different” (p. 210).

**Purpose of the Study**

Global education is primarily implemented through courses that focus on global themes and through study abroad programs which allow students to study in countries outside of the US. Unfortunately, few institutions measure the effects of study abroad on changes in student’s perception of the world. More research is needed to assess students who are involved in internationalized activities like study abroad by evaluating the efficacy of programs and the ability of these programs to transform perspectives leading to changes in worldview.

In an effort to add to the body of research that exists in this regard, the purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of the Florida State University’s study abroad program on the development of an attitude of global-mindedness and the impact that host contact may have on global-mindedness development among undergraduate program participants.

**Research Questions**

The following research questions were addressed in this study:

1. Over the course of one semester are there differences in the development of global-mindedness among students?
2. Over the course of one semester are there differences in the development of global-mindedness among participants in a study abroad experience and those who study at their home campus?
3. Among the study abroad group, do students who have more frequent contact with the host culture differ significantly in the development of global-mindedness?
4. Does study abroad location influence the development of global-mindedness?

Hypotheses

The study was guided by the following research hypotheses:

1. There will be a significant difference in the global-mindedness of students after one semester.
2. There will be a significant difference between the global-mindedness of students who study abroad and those who study only at their home campus.
3. There will be a significant difference between the global-mindedness of students who study abroad and have frequent contact with the host culture and those who do not.
4. Study center location will have a significant effect on the level of global-mindedness achieved.

Significance of the Study

The importance of becoming globally-minded is necessary to meet the needs of our rapidly changing environment. The status of America as a strong nation depends upon whether higher education can effectively train US citizens to work and live in a global community. Supporters of an internationally focused curriculum agree that global competence is a necessary human resource requirement and a critical task facing educators. Moreover, a cohesive national policy that is proactive is needed in order to fully realize global education.

Meanwhile, internationalized activities like study abroad need regular assessment and evaluation to ensure that pedagogical practices are in place to facilitate global-learning in students. A number of studies have been undertaken to determine the impact of study abroad. Some studies suggest that returning sojourners experience gains in personal or intellectual growth (Herman, 1970; Hofman & Zak; 1969; Marion, 1980); while others find little or no change (Nelson, 1976; Carlson, Burn, Useem & Yachimowicz, 1990).

Since the purpose of this study was to assess global-mindedness in students enrolled in Florida State University’s International Programs, the major assumption of this study was that
study abroad does transform students’ international perspective (Kauffmann, Martin, Weaver & Weaver, 1992).

In addition to the value of program review for FSU, other research institutions of similar size and demographic profile could benefit from this research by similarly examining students from their own programs to determine whether those programs are instrumental in perspective transformation and where needed, encourage improvement in program design and purpose.

**Delimitations**

This study was limited to Florida State University students eligible to participate in International Programs and those students enrolled in International Programs that regularly attend other higher education institutions. The experimental group was comprised of students who have earned at least a 2.5 grade point average and who applied and were accepted into the program. The control group was comprised of students enrolled in majors located in the College of Social Sciences. Because these students are from a state supported research university in the South, findings have limited generalizability to other populations. Students also self-select into study abroad and into majors in the College of Social Sciences.

The September 11th tragedy has deeply affected everyone in our nation. Although the attacks occurred four years ago, the events of 9/11 called attention to issues that heretofore have been largely ignored. Americans began to realize that some of their international relationships were tenuous. This revelation became reality when terrorists struck the World Trade Center. Consequently, many Americans now have a biased opinion about the region where the attackers originated without the benefit of historical or current information to make an informed judgment. Some may find it difficult or even be unwilling to gain a greater understanding of the reasons for these actions by others.

The current war with Iraq has generated a range of opinions and emotions about war in general and the legitimacy of this war in particular. Depending on where one stands in their belief about looming threats and whether one views the military action in Iraq as progress or destruction, the war in Iraq will remain a contentious topic for years to come.

The recent presidential election has also divided the nation to a degree unprecedented in recent years. The American media has portrayed this national conflict as an ideological battle between conservative and liberal thought with no middle-ground. Propaganda surrounding the
debate of ideological differences and the threat of speaking out against the conservative majority has had a chilling effect on those who might otherwise voice their true opinions.

It will not be possible to know how these national and international events will influence survey responses gathered in this study. However, it seems probable these respondents had to be influenced by these events.

**Definition of Terms**

For the purpose of this study the following terms are defined as follows:

**Culture**: Patterns of learned perception, behavior, attitudes, and beliefs shared by a group of individuals (Martin, 1994, p. 10)

**Globalization**: a process (or set of processes) which embodies a transformation in the spatial organization of social relations and transactions, generating transcontinental or interregional flows, and networks of activity, interaction, and power (Held & McGrew, 1999).

**Global education**: Teaching about other people and other countries as well as the teaching of knowledge, skills, values, concepts, and ideas from a global perspective.

**Host Culture Contact**: Regular, on-going communications and transactions between the sojourner and the “foreign” country nationals.

**Disorienting Dilemmas**: Confrontation with new and unfamiliar situations or realities that challenge preconceived notions. The dilemmas prompt new ways of interpreting experience leading to changes in attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors.

**International education**: Educational studies or activities, involving two or more nations, for the purpose of facilitating cross-cultural knowledge and understanding.

**Learning**: “The process of making a new or revised interpretation of the meaning of an experience which guides subsequent understanding, appreciation, and action” (Mezirow, 1990, p. 1)

**Perspective transformation**: A world view shift. “…a more fully developed (more functional) frame of reference…one that is more (a) inclusive, (b) differentiating, (c) permeable, (d) critically reflective, and (e) integrative of experience” (Mezirow, 1996, p. 163 as cited in Transformative Learning, n.d., p. 7). “Perspective transformation is the process of becoming critically aware of how and why our assumptions have come to constrain the way we perceive, understand, and feel about our world; changing these structures of habitual expectation to make
possible a more inclusive, discriminating, and integrating perspective and, finally, making choices or otherwise acting upon these new understandings” (Mezirow, 1991, p. 167).

**Study Center**: A study center is a program designed by a campus to allow students to take courses they need from the campus curriculum while abroad. A study center often has a narrower curricular base, perhaps focusing on a particular academic discipline such French or eastern European studies. It offers home-campus-like studies in a foreign setting. Because such programs are largely separate from foreign institutions, they are also sometimes referred to as “island,” “un-integrated,” or, from those who do not favor such separation, “ghetto” programs. Students from these programs come primarily from the institution – though some models allow participants from other U.S. institutions to apply also. Housing may also be in rented facilities, or, in some cases, an institution may wish to buy a local facility (Soneson, Lochner-Wright, & Navari, 1997, pp.280-281).

**Study abroad**: Study abroad is an umbrella term for educational programs, both credit and non-credit, that takes place outside of the boundaries of the United States. Such activities include, but are not limited to, classroom study, research, intern- or externships, and service learning.

The terms that have been defined for this study are intended to clarify meaning in the context of identifying those concepts, interactions and activities that may be related to facilitating new attitudes toward others in the global community.
CHAPTER 2

Review of the Literature

Introduction

A review of the literature was conducted to first provide a historical background and contemporary look at the current trends in educational exchange. This section is followed by a review of factors to consider when reviewing and interpreting study abroad research. The next section reviews studies that examine experiential learning, cross-cultural contact, student development, cultural learning, and impact on careers. The review concludes with studies that specifically examine the development of global-mindedness.

Historical Background of Studying Abroad

Traveling abroad to receive education is an early tradition that dates back to the ancients who traveled to distant lands seeking the wisdom and knowledge of other civilized people. Pythagoras, Thales, and even Aristotle are said to have studied in Egypt to gain knowledge of the ancient Egyptian Mysteries (James, 1954; Bernal, 1987). Alexander the Great through his conquest made the Egyptian Library at Alexandria available to the Greeks for research (James, 1954 p. 17). Much later, during the colonial period in America, “wealthy colonist sent their sons to European universities to compensate for the perceived weaknesses of American institutions” (Hoffa, n.d.).

After World War I, study abroad became institutionalized in American higher education. Beginning in the 1920’s with Junior Year Abroad (JYA), numerous study abroad models began to take shape. Faculty led tours, followed by the World University Cruise, the Fulbright program in 1946, language and area studies programs funded under Title VI of the Higher Education Act, and the National Defense Education Act in the late 1950’s served to either support or provide study abroad opportunities.

Over the last forty years, American colleges and universities continued to build new programs and create other opportunities for internships and service. Programs now range from as little as two weeks to as much as one year and are available in as many as 20 countries. This has made it possible for students who had the interest, academic qualifications, and financial means to experience the challenge of cross-cultural learning.
Current Trends in Education Exchange

The Institute of International Education (IIE) publishes *Open Doors*, the most comprehensive report on international students in the United States and US students who study abroad. The 2005 publication reported the majority of students (61%) who studied abroad in 2003-04 chose Europe as their preferred destination. There were increases in students going to other host countries and non-traditional destinations particularly those that may offer career opportunities. China saw the greatest increase (90%), followed by India. Both countries are growing in economic importance to the US. The United Kingdom followed by Italy, Spain, France, Australia, Mexico, Germany, Ireland, and Costa Rica all saw increases in the number of students selecting these locations.

Non-traditional locations like Africa increased by 18% with 5,699 students opting for this destination. South Africa is among the top 20 host nations and North Africa also experienced an increase in the number of students studying there. In the Middle East, the greatest increase was seen in the number of students going to Israel. The percentage of students going to Jordan, Lebanon, and the United Arab Emirates was up although the actual number of students remains small.

The social sciences remained the most popular field of study among student who go abroad. Some 23% of students reported social sciences as their major. Business and management majors comprised 18% of study abroad students followed by humanities majors. Females (66%) consistently studied abroad at a higher rate than males (34%), as did Caucasians (84%), at a higher rate than all minority students combined (16%).

Although the number of students studying abroad continued to increase, students remained for shorter periods of time. Only 6% of students in 2003-04 studied abroad for a calendar year. Most students (38%) participated in semester long programs while slightly less participated in summer term sessions.

According to *Open Doors*, the number of U.S. students studying abroad increased 9.6% in 2003-04. The total number of students studying abroad in 2003-04 was 191,321. It is important to note immediately following the attacks of September 11, study abroad continued to make gains. In 2002, the IIE website reported that a majority of study abroad programs reported increased or steady study abroad participation:
Of the 440 respondents, 42% saw an increase in the number of US students applying for study abroad for the coming term/year (2002-2003), and 31% reported no noticeable change in the number of applications or requests for information on study abroad for the coming term. (Study Abroad, para. 1)

In a recent article by Lum (2002), Victor Johnson, associate executive director for public policy at NAFSA, was quoted as saying the terrorist attacks “sparked an intellectual curiosity among college students about other nations, cultures, other people and their beliefs” (p. 25). Faculties too, have expressed the importance of a global education (p. 26). Many in higher education are recognizing the value of a greater geopolitical understanding of the world community.

**Challenges and Considerations in the Research**

Before reviewing the literature on study abroad research it is important to be cognizant of the methodological issues and that can affect how we interpret the results. By considering these issues we begin establishing a framework from which to evaluate the research and start to identify programs, activities, and environments that result in positive change among participants.

In general, there is a widespread belief among international education professionals that study abroad results in increased global competence, and that study abroad leads to positive lasting change. The changes vary and extend into both cognitive and affective domains. They include increased global knowledge, greater maturity, and greater tolerance for diversity; improved cross-cultural skills, identity development, academic achievement and increased self-confidence.

Research on the benefits of study abroad has achieved mixed results when it attempts to ascertain the direct value and impact on student. Drews, Meyer, and Peregrine (1996) pointed to methodological considerations such as pre/post versus study group/control group strategies or closed versus open ended data collection techniques as contributing to this mixed pattern of results (p. 452). Sell (as cited in Stimpfl & Engberg, 1997) argued that infrequent follow-up studies and lack of a theoretical base upon which further research can be assessed are recurring problems in the research. Nevertheless, Bachner (1994) made the case that despite the methodological weaknesses found “exchange is an effective vehicle for developing attitudes that support the realization of global competence” and, the research is sound enough basis to make this argument (p. 190).
Much of the research into educational exchange tends to study the transformation of attitudes, beliefs and behaviors and academic and intellectual development. Studies that focus on cultural learning are assuming greater prominence due to the need for citizens to develop a broader cultural perspective.

Bachner described the three types of attitudes that are involved in change: (a) feelings, i.e. affective, subjective evaluation of goodness or badness; (b) beliefs, i.e., a person’s cognition and information about the object; and (c) behavioral intentions, i.e., the “conative” component associated with one’s desires. (conative: in cognitive psychology this is the component of attitude that involves actual behavior; Oxford University Press, [n.d.]). He further noted that changes in these attitudes are influenced by personality, duration, and contact variables.

Bachner cited the following studies in support of his assertions: Craig and Sells (1983), who found that personality starting points vary the type of change that takes place in sojourners; Smith (1951) and Grove (1983) who discovered that longer duration resulted in greater impact on attitudes; and, Hoffman and Zak (1969) who found face to face interaction between sojourners and host country nationals can influence positive attitudinal change toward host nationals (p. 192).

In contrast, LaBrack (1994) cautioned that “unwarranted jumps in logic” are serious and continuing problems (pp.201-202). Assumptions like “they are going to study abroad and therefore they are likely to gain global competencies,” or “they have studied abroad so they must have gained some degree of global competence” are not unusual. Owing to the mixed results, one should be hesitant to make these kinds of assumptions prior to evaluation.

Wilkinson (1998) suggested the following questions be considered when examining student participants:

1. What happens during a sojourn in a different cultural and linguistic environment?
2. What kinds of contacts do students have within such a context?
3. How do participants themselves perceive these encounters, particularly in view of their expectations for immersion? (pp.121-122)

Freed (as cited in Wilkinson) noted “there are numerous variations of study abroad experience and it is rarely, if ever possible to describe with precision the quality and extent of social contact and linguistic interaction” (p. 122). In addition, the sheer number of possible
combinations of program, host culture, and participant factors, “makes attempting to establish a singular generalized understanding of the overseas context hardly advisable” (p.123).

Study abroad research generally falls into two groups: those that lack a conceptual framework and are exploratory in nature; and, others that employ theories and hypotheses testing. Several studies have been designed to develop instruments to measure intercultural learning usually defined as “worldviews” that are described by the particular attitudes that comprise them. Below are some of the more commonly used frameworks that are classified as either worldviews or theories:

**Worldviews**
1. Worldmindedness (Smith, 1957)
2. International Understanding (Carlson & Widaman, 1988)

**Theories**
1. Inter-group contact theory (Allport, 1958)
2. Transformative Learning (Mezirow 1978)
3. Experiential Learning theory (Kolb, 1984)
4. Intercultural Sensitivity (Bennett & Bennett, 1993)

Studies by Carlson and Widaman (1988); Kiely (2004); Medina-Lopez-Portillo (2004); and, Williams (2005); have employed these theories or worldviews in an effort to ground their research with conceptual underpinnings. All of these conceptual frameworks continue to offer productive opportunities for theoretically based studies, but must be joined with appropriate methodologies to demonstrate their usefulness.

In summary, there is a set of considerations around which to frame and analyze research involving study abroad. These issues are critical to the pursuit of discovering what changes occur in students, how they occur, and what program designs and host country environments effect or inhibit change.

Attention to variables like personality, duration, contact, and prior experiences is required to identify factors of influence. These factors can interact with the distinct character of programs which can create challenges for researchers when attempting to generalize outcomes. The variables however, can help identify unique cross-cultural opportunities that can help distinguish the more effective study abroad models.
Although we evaluate the rigor of the research based on the use of conceptual frameworks, methodologies, sample sizes, etc., we should begin to view the research in terms of what outcomes are achieved, under which conditions, and in what cultural environments rather than unrewardingly attempting to cast a blanket conclusion about overall effectiveness. The most important idea is that positive transformation continues to occur in a variety of areas that move students toward greater awareness and global perspectives.

**Study Abroad, Student Development, and Cultural Learning**

Study abroad is a form of experiential learning. Hopkins (1999) asserted that immersion provides an opportunity for students to learn by doing (p. 36). Montrose (2002) added to this notion by stating that study abroad provides some of the richest and most powerful forms of experiential learning, and that experiential learning complements traditional models of education (pp.1-2). Classroom learning becomes applicable in real life settings. According to Hopkins, students, when abroad, “find themselves looking inward as well as outward, reconciling their views of themselves and their cultural assumptions with the new cultural context” (p.36).

It was theorized by Festinger (1957) that cognitive dissonance causes individuals to seek consistency among their beliefs and opinions, and occurs most often in situations where individuals must choose between two incompatible beliefs or actions (Theory Into Practice Database, n.d.). Immersion into new cultures presents situations of fundamental cultural difference that challenge beliefs and opinions. To increase cultural learning, sojourners must analyze their experiences through critical reflection to promote the transformation learning process leading to changes in attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors. Hopkins declared, “self- and other examination forms an entirely different sense of experiential learning and often leads to dramatic self development” (p. 36).

Experiential learning can lead to perspective transformation. In Sanders and Morgan (2001), first-hand experience of African Americans returning to Africa, experiencing “what it means to be in the majority” is transformational beyond question, as was the experience of the non-black participants who lived as the minority. It was also transformational for the entire group of students in this study to live in a culture that was technologically and infrastructurally archaic.

Students confronted racism and prejudice as well as poverty and government inaction prompting changes in worldview and realizations of inconsistencies in what was held to be true.
(p. 5). This type of experiential learning, acquired through the disorienting effect, compelled students to reexamine their existing assumptions and integrate new meaning into previously held attitudes and beliefs (p. 3).

Laubscher (1994) investigated “out-of-class” experiences on intellectual, psychological, and emotional learning. Using an “embedded case study design” the researcher examined study abroad programs at various foreign locations. He used personal interviews using open-ended questions to collect data. Focusing on process rather than outcomes, Laubscher identified categories of activity on which to develop a systematic pedagogical approach to integrating the experiential, out-of-class component into the overall education abroad experience (p. xv).

Laubscher found that in addition to developing independence and self-reliance, students spoke of a heightened sense of tolerance and acceptance of others, as well as for difficult situations (p. 79). Going further, the informants provided insight into the process that carried them beyond mere contact to a more intimate relationship with the host culture. Students often referred to frequent discussions or conversations among students in the dormitories where they resided. Other important aspects of the experience were the lack of conveniences such as computers, typewriters, and telephones. This made some students appreciate what was available back in the US.

African-American students have gained a sense of ethnic identity through “diasporic travel.” Day-Vines, Barker and Exum (1998), in a qualitative study based on Phinney’s model of adolescent ethnic identity, examined 15 African-American undergraduates, mostly female, who participated in a two week educational tour to Ghana. Drawing on Hooks’ (1995) notion that seeing is an avenue by which our own realities are constructed, sojourners were permitted to “restore, reorder, reframe and reconstruct the negative images of Africans” (p. 4).

The results of the study suggested that diasporic travel impacts African-American college students in at least five ways. Among them, dispelling myths such as stereotypes, distortions, and omissions related to Africa; contrasting values between those of America versus those of Africa; and psychosocial development in the domains of ethnic and racial identity and intercultural sensitivity.

Another form of experiential learning is service-learning. In a study by Pyle (1981) concerning the impact of cross cultural service-learning on student development, Pyle used Perry’s theory of Intellectual and Ethical Development to support his belief that students needed
to experience incongruity to relate data or opinions to other data. He also employed Chickerings’s view of education –that differentiation and integration- adds value to the service-learning concept and that a heighten awareness and sensitivity can lead to increased differentiation and integration.

Pyle measured students doing service learning in Jamaica using the Student Development Task Inventory (SDTI), an instrument based on Chickering’s theory. Employing a non-equivalent control group design, Pyle found that students gained in 4 of the 13 variables, in the areas of autonomy, interdependence, mature life-style plans, and the total SDTI, with significant gains made by the experimental group. The situation of poverty and living in close proximity to people in the host community provided an intimate level of contact that supported growth in students functioning on their own, working together to achieve their goals, and developing of a sense of personal direction.

Kiely (2004), who understood international service learning to be instrumental in perspective transformation, then questioned the appropriateness of this assumption by conducting a longitudinal case study to help uncover students’ understanding of the long-term impact on their perspective transformation and subsequent actions taken as a result of their transformational learning experience.

Performing social justice-oriented service learning in Nicaragua, students experienced a significant transformative impact on worldview and lifestyle. Among the findings was the Chameleon complex, perhaps the most provocative finding, which demonstrated the struggle between perspective transformation, and action, that continued after their return to the US. Students grappled with acting on their emerging global consciousness and the opinions of friends, family and co-workers which were often in conflict or unsupportive.

Keily concluded that conceptual models and studies that assumed perspective transformation in service learning would follow a linear or developmental continuum, (e.g. from charity to social change) were problematic as a result of his findings. He added that the “the link between perspective transformation, behavioral change, and social action is much more complex and tenuous” (p. 16).

In an article discussing the importance of intercultural communication in international education, Martin (1994) spoke of the importance for study abroad professionals to create
programs that develop students’ communicative competence and opportunities for positive communication with hosts (p. 23). This can be facilitated through structured contact.

Furnham and Bochner (1982) wrote, “Although international education is only one of many forms of cross-cultural contact, it is a very important meeting ground” (p. 161). International education or study abroad can result in “culture shock” defined as the “distress experienced by the sojourner as a result of losing all the familiar signs and symbols of social interaction (Oberg, 1960, as cited in Bochner).”

Contact itself does not guarantee favorable results (Brislin, p. 197). Other factors including “time of contact” and “history of dominant-subordinate relations among groups” can affect the attitudes, beliefs and behaviors that develop as a result of contact. Equal-status contact where one group does not have more power than the other can result in positive benefits (p. 197). What’s more, “stereotype-breaking contact” like observing minority group members in high-status roles, can alter preconceptions and lead to the formation of more positive attitudes (p. 181). Thus, how cross-cultural contact is structured plays a significant role in, and will help determine, the positive development of globally minded students.

Service-learning presumes a greater opportunity for intimate contact than traditional study abroad. Salter and Teager (1975) argued that the type of contact students have with their host is important in determining the degree to which students’ develop positive or negative attitudes. The researchers examined American tourist in Europe who either traveled or worked abroad. Those who worked had more genuine contact than those among the travel group. The contact was more often unpleasant as the work group “lived in inferior conditions to the travel group, worked hard, and often outdoors in the hot sun” (p. 216).

Using the theory of generalization, the researchers found that the negative feelings of the work group generalized to attitudes and reduced their favorableness toward the host. Conversely, they found that satisfying conditions experienced by the travel group made up for superficial contact. In an earlier study by Hofman and Zak (1969) researchers found that individuals making more contact with Israelis became more favorable toward Jewishness and Israel, than those making less contact which resulted in either no change or less favorable attitudes (p. 170).

Carsello and Creaser (1976) wanted to know how college students changed during study abroad. They decided to survey students while those students were attending European programs of American colleges. Students were asked about changes in interests, attitudes, skills and
whether they considered the changes positive or negative. Of the thirty categories, the survey revealed the top five positive changes as interest in travel, interest in arts, interest in foreign language, interest in history, and relating to strangers (p. 277). Of the thirty negative changes, study habits ranked number one.

One of the essential reasons for concern about the effects of study abroad is the impact it has on attitudes toward careers. Personal development and cultural learning is central to preparation necessary for working in global environments. Global perspectives and attitudes toward cultural diversity among agricultural students were examined in a study by Zhai and Scheer (2004). The agricultural sector is fundamental to the global economy and therefore an important discipline in which to gauge preparation.

Results indicated a moderate global perspective and a positive attitude toward cultural diversity. When tests for differences between males and females and those with overseas experiences and without were conducted, results showed females had a higher level of global perspective than males and a more positive attitude toward cultural diversity than males. No significant difference was found between students with prior overseas experiences and those without overseas experience (p. 48).

Career development in terms of vocational self-concept crystallization (VSCC) was shown to increase for students in an overseas practicum group as compared to students in a non practicum group (Hannigan, 1996). VSCC is the “clarity of an individual’s self perception of attitudes, value, interests, needs, and abilities for career choice” (p.1). Findings also showed there was no significant difference in work commitment between overseas participants and the non-practicum group.

Orahood, Kruze, and Pearson, (2004) studied the impact of study abroad on business students’ career goals and found that 94% of respondents who had studied abroad reported having an interest or strong interest in working for US companies with an international focus; ninety-three percent reported an interest or strong interest in working for a multinational company; and, eighty-three percent reported an interest or strong interest in working overseas (p. 123).

Developing positive attitudes toward strangers is a precursor to developing greater global awareness. Kauffmann, Martin, and Weaver (1992) wrote, “It is the research measuring affective change that is at the heart of pinning down global understanding” (p. 79). Drews, et al., focused
on the affective dimensions of the effects of study abroad on the conceptualization of national groups. Findings indicated that those who studied abroad had a more personalized view of people rather than views that represented generalized or stereotypical assumptions.

Terminology used to identify constructs related to global attitudes has varied; however, most constructs describe similar characteristics. In a study by Carlson and Widaman (1988), students who spent their junior year abroad at University of California Study Center locations and students who remained on their home campus were asked to participate. Both groups consisted only of students born in the US. Students who studied abroad were integrated into the host country and took courses with the host nationals in the local language. Researchers hypothesized that living in a foreign country led to heightened levels of international understanding.

Participants were asked to complete a three-part questionnaire. Part 1 of the survey gathered demographic data, while parts 2 and 3 assessed attitudes related to international understanding. Among the results, group comparisons showed that females had a greater cultural interest as compared to males; students in the humanities had higher levels of cultural interest than those in social and behavioral science; and, the study abroad group had a significantly greater positive change in cultural interest than did the comparison sample (pp. 9-10).

Study abroad students also reported significantly greater increase in political concern than did the comparison sample (p. 8). Researchers concluded “the sojourn seemed to result in more mature and objective perceptions of the students’ home country as well as changes in attitudes on a number of dimensions related to international awareness” (p. 14).

Carlson, Burn, Useem and Yachimowicz (1990) found within the cognitive dimensions of international understanding that no significant difference existed between the before and after data in either the study abroad group or the comparison groups (p. 59). For the affective dimensions, the comparison group appeared to be higher in “Domestic Orientation” on the post-measure than on the pre-measure. The opposite was inferred for the study abroad group. In “International Concern” there was no significant difference between- or within-subject F values calculated (p. 63).

Hensley and Sell (1979) examined the impact of study abroad on students’ world-mindedness, support for the United Nations, and self-esteem. The results of the study showed that change occurred only on the variable of self-esteem, findings that were consistent with
earlier studies (p. 406). The researchers also looked at closeness of contact with non-Americans and overall enjoyment of the overseas experience. The results supported the view that attitude changes were more a direct result of what the sojourner pre-trip attitudes were and less a result of what happened while he was away.

Jones-Rikkers and Douglas (2001) concerned with the issue of job preparation for the global economy investigated the relationship between study abroad programs, study abroad program locations and world-mindedness. The researchers found that students who participated in study abroad had a stronger sense of world-mindedness than non-participants.

Developing a global perspective and becoming globally minded is an important goal of study abroad. Global-mindedness not only influences career choices, but the way in which we view others and ourselves as members of a global community. Developing an attitude of global-mindedness requires preparation that can be gained through internationalized coursework, cross-cultural interaction, and international sojourns. The persistent question is which type of activity or combination of activities contributes most effectively to this development? The following section reviews those studies that attempted to measure the development of a worldview of global-mindedness in a variety of learning environments.

Global-mindedness is defined as a worldview in which one sees oneself as connected to the world community and feels a sense of responsibility for the members of that community. This commitment is reflected in the individual’s attitudes, beliefs and behaviors. There are five dimensions that are associated with the construct: (1) responsibility, (2) cultural pluralism, (3) efficacy, (4) globalcentrism, and (5) interconnectedness. The Global-mindedness Scale (GMS), a 30-item, five point Likert scale instrument, is grounded in research from a variety of areas, which identify attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors associated with being global-minded (Hett, p. 16). The GMS was used as the research instrument in the following studies.

Gillan (1995) used the Global-mindedness Scale to examine the global-mindedness of study abroad students, non-study abroad students, faculty, and administrators at the University of Northern Colorado. Study abroad students were found to have higher Global-Mindedness Scale scores than non-study abroad students. Other significant predictors of global-mindedness were gender, age, and duration of study or travel abroad. Females, on average were more global-minded and the age range group of 45-54 had the highest mean score for global-mindedness.
Bates (1997) found significant differences in the control and experimental groups in three of the five dimensions and the total posttest after study abroad. The three dimensions were cultural pluralism, globalcentrism, and interconnectedness. Two dimensions that did not show significances differences between the two groups after study abroad were responsibility and efficacy.

Zong and Farouk (1999) conducted a study examining the effects of participation in an internet-based project, the International Communication and Negotiation Simulation (ICONS), on the development of pre-service social studies teachers’ global knowledge and global-mindedness using the Global-Mindedness Scale. ICONS is a world-wide, multi-institution, computer-assisted, simulation network that uses a interdisciplinary approach to teach international negotiation and intercultural communication skills at both the university and secondary school level. Participants consisted of pre-service teachers registered for the course entitled “Developing a Global Perspective in Education: Contents and Methods. The control group took the course a semester earlier.

Pre-service teachers in this study communicated with participating country-teams around the world through regular email messages to each other for five weeks. Participants were given a scenario laying out the differing perspectives of countries on seven global issues and were asked to create negotiation strategies, understand the interdependence of international issues, and appreciate cultural differences and approaches to world problems. Researchers found that there was no significant difference in the levels of global-mindedness between the experimental group and the control group after participation in ICONS (p. 12).

Ballou (1996), in a study to determine if a semester of classroom teaching in international/intercultural courses in a university’s general education program influenced global-mindedness of entering freshmen, observed a decline in pre-test and post-test and in some cases significantly for both the experimental and control groups. The more globally-minded students were those who participated in more activities focusing on another culture or country, had more cross-cultural friends, those more liberal politically, and women (Abstract).

Walton (2002) examined teachers’ global-mindedness, their demographic characteristics and their instructional classroom communication using the Global-Mindedness Scale and the Communication Satisfaction Scale designed by Hecht and Ribeau (1984). Eighty-one percent of the participants in that study had traveled internationally; 39% percent had traveled
internationally on short vacations; 15.6% had traveled on extended tourist trips; 12.8% had lived and worked abroad; and 11.4% lived and worked abroad for extremely long periods of time. Only 15% had never traveled outside of the United States (p. 69-70).

The study found that international travel and global-mindedness were significantly related in the dimensions of responsibility, cultural pluralism, global-centrism, and interconnectedness. The study also found that there was a positive correlation coefficient relationship (r = .303, p< .05) between global-mindedness and classroom communication competence implying that as teachers increased their global-mindedness, their classroom communication competence also increased (p. 71).

Unlike the Gillan and Bates studies, which found significance differences on certain dimensions of global-mindedness in students after study abroad, the Ballou and Zong and Farouk studies found no significant differences in the scores of subjects who remained at their home institutions. Participants in the Zong and Farouk study communicated via the internet with 17 country teams, and the Ballou study examined the influence of international/intercultural coursework within a classroom setting. Although participants in the Walton study also remained at their home campus, a large number of those (81%) had previously traveled internationally. As mentioned, the results showed that international travel and global-mindedness were significantly related on four of the five dimensions.

Lower scores could be attributed to the lack of a physical presence in a foreign country at some point prior to or while participating in the given studies; an environment that would normally lead to cross-cultural contact and interaction with foreign nationals.

Summary

While the results of study abroad research have been mixed, most studies seemed to suggest that study abroad in general does have an impact on student development. As suggested by Hopkins, et al, the experiential nature of study abroad creates an ideal environment for students to learn by doing and increases the opportunity cultural learning. The quality of host contact impacts the degree and direction of attitude changes that students’ experience. However, as Kiely noted, the link between perspective change and changed behavior is weak. At present we can only trust that positive attitude shifts support the development of competencies needed for living and working in the global environment.
For individual ethnic groups like African-Americans, studying abroad can be rewarding. Identity development is an important goal, not just in terms of the individual, but in terms of the group. Many African-Americans feel a void as few know their precise African origin. Traveling to Africa may not immediately provide details on an individual’s ancestry, but it can offer insight into a cultural heritage providing a sense of grounding, satisfaction, and wholeness. It can also help non-African-Americans to better understand that African-Americans do have a history before their entry into America; that the social construction of racial superiority is contextual, and that African culture is rich and diverse.

The research on study abroad presents a plethora of findings both significant and non-significant suggesting that programs are unique and not always structured in ways that promote transformational learning. Positive outcomes such as personal and identity development, self-esteem, worldmindedness, international career interests, and global-mindedness, require further examination to determine under what conditions these outcomes were achieved.

Negative outcomes should not be ignored because they offer opportunities for comparative analysis and exploration into reasons for non-significant differences. What is clear is that study abroad experiences are not predictable nor are outcomes generalizable, but with the identification program designs where students achieve positive gains, we can then begin to develop models that we know can duplicate those results.
CHAPTER 3

Methodology

This study attempted to quantify global-mindedness among students who participate in a semester-long study abroad program. The study addressed the following research questions: (1) Over the course of one semester are there differences in the development of global-mindedness before and after study abroad? (2) Over the course of one semester are there differences in the development of global-mindedness of participants in a study abroad experience and those who study at their home campus? (3) Among study abroad participants do students who have frequent contact with the host culture develop greater levels of global-mindedness than students who do not? (4) Does the location of the study abroad program influence the development of global-mindedness?

Mezirow’s transformative learning theory and the worldview of global-mindedness formed the basis of the conceptual framework for this study. Transformative learning theory states that individuals acquire meaning perspectives at an early age through a process of socialization. By adulthood, individuals have reached a level of analytical ability that facilitates reflection on the values, beliefs and behaviors that make up meaning perspectives. When values, beliefs and behaviors are challenged by certain types of experiences, new knowledge is either accepted to create new meaning schemes or rejected in favor of long established frames of reference. Global-mindedness is a worldview in which ones sees oneself as connected to the world community and feels a sense of responsibility for its members. This commitment is reflected in an individual’s attitudes, beliefs and behaviors (Hett). Study abroad is considered to be a significant experience which may or may not influence students established manner of meaning and understanding or their development of an attitude of global-mindedness.

Description of Florida State University

The Florida State University is a comprehensive, graduate research university in the liberal arts tradition. FSU offers undergraduate, graduate, advanced graduate and professional, programs of study. In spring 2004, the University enrolled a total of 35,346 students. Whites made up 70.97% of total student body followed by blacks (11.58%); Hispanics (9.07%), Asian or
Pacific Islander (2.96%), American Indian or Native Alaskan (0.35%). Males represented a smaller proportion (43%) than females (56%) (Preliminary Enrollment Reports, Spring, 2004).

The mission statement of FSU professes a strong commitment to its mission in international education and demonstrates this commitment by providing a broad range of study-abroad opportunities for both students and faculty. FSU International Programs (IP) operates year-round programs and study centers in London, England; Florence, Italy; Valencia, Spain and Panama City, Republic of Panama which it operates for the State University System. FSUIP also offers summer-only programs in Asia, Central America, and Europe. Specialized study programs are available in the summer in a variety of locations. There are international internships available for students to work while earning academic credit. In addition, high school students, adults and non-traditional students can attend specially designed summer programs. Finally, FSU co-sponsors Florida bi-national linkage institutes in Costa Rica and France.

International Programs expanded upon the University’s commitment in their departmental statement of International Commitment. In this statement, International Programs recognizes some important ideals. Among them are:

1. The interdependent world, the welfare of the state and the well-being of its citizens are linked to the welfare of all people.
2. The teaching, research and service of the Florida State University should support the economic and social development of the state, the nation, and other countries.
3. The University’s major responsibility is to educate students to become citizens of the world; and
4. The accomplishment of goals will be carried out through educational exchange and study abroad; evaluation of existing and proposed international programs and services; planning for continued improvement and innovation to further the goals; the availability of facilities, and resources to offer diversified programs; and financial support through university resources and other funding agents.

In 2000-01, FSU ranked fourth among the top twenty research universities in America for sending students abroad (Florida State University Press Release, November 2002). During the 2000-01 school year, FSU had 1, 464 students studying abroad in 37 programs. In 2002-03, the total enrollment was 1,418 in 23 programs (FSU Enrollment by Location, 2002-03).
The present study was conducted through the Florida State University International Programs department. Through many international offerings, International Programs sends approximately 1400 students per year overseas to participate in study abroad programs located in over twenty countries. This study focused on students participating in the four, year-round; FSU owned and operated study centers located in London, England; Florence, Italy; Valencia, Spain; and Panama City, Panama.

Approximately 30% of the students enroll in FSU International Programs attend other institutions. This number speaks to the quality of FSU’s program and the role it plays in facilitating study abroad for students in Florida and the Southeast region. For that reason, it was important to study the efficacy of FSU International Programs.

Students with a grade point average of 2.5 and above are given priority for admission into International Programs. However, admission into the programs was not limited to FSU students. Students attending other institutions inside and outside the state of Florida are also eligible to apply.

FSU students complete an application and submit it along with a nonrefundable application fee by the designated deadline for the term for which they applied. Non-FSU students also submit an application along with a fee and official transcripts from all colleges attended. Students are accepted on a first come, first served basis. Students enrolled in the fall or spring are required to take at least 12 credit hours, but could take additional credit hours by paying additional fees.

Research Design

The proposed study used a matching-only pretest-posttest control group design (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003). A sample of students who participated in study abroad was compared to a randomly selected sample of junior and senior students who did not participate in study abroad. Random assignment of the study group was not possible due to the self-selection condition. The threat to internal validity was managed by ensuring all participants have at least a 2.5 GPA.

Instruments

Scales measuring similar constructs to global-mindedness were considered for this research, but scales such as the World-mindedness Scale (Sampson & Smith, 1957) were reflective of the values and concerns of the post WWII period and are less relevant in today’s world. Milton Bennett’s Intercultural Development Inventory, based on his Developmental
Model for Intercultural Sensitivity (1993; see Olson & Kroeger, 2001) was also not appropriate for this study because of its length of 50 items and because it was designed to assess students’ predominant stage of intercultural development which would not have addressed certain aspects of global attitudes. Barrow’s (1981) Global Understanding Survey was designed to measure college students’ understanding of world affairs and not necessarily attitudes toward members of the global community. The same can be said about the Global Awareness Profile (Corbitt, 1998) that was designed to measure knowledge of global issues and geography. It was also considered too lengthy for web-based surveys taken by students and would likely have a negative impact on the return rate.

The GMS was developed through a process of retroductive triangulation and is grounded in sociological theory construction research drawn from Schrag [1967] (Hett, p. 10-11). Using this approach, data was gathered from literature reviews of related constructs as were analyses of related empirical instruments. Information was compiled to identify the dimensions underlying the constructs. A determination of whether those dimensions were previously measured by existing scales followed.

A series of interviews were conducted to gather more information about the area of interest from people whose personal and professional involvement or academic expertise deemed them knowledgeable. A conceptual schema was developed to link the three data sources followed by an assessment protocol which identified measured and unmeasured components. An initial version of the scale was developed along with a scaling and scoring format. A panel of expert judges established content validity. Psychometric properties of the scale were then tested and a final 30 item version of the scale emerged.

Students were asked to complete the Global-Mindedness Scale developed by Hett. The Global-Mindedness Scale consisted of a 30 item Likert-type scale ranging across five choices from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The internal reliability for the GMS, using Cronbach’s coefficient alpha was .90 overall. Alpha subscales ranged from .70-.79 (Hett, p. 102). Students were also asked to complete a demographic profile to collect basic data such as age, gender, class level, previous travel abroad, etc.

Principal components factor analysis with orthogonal varimax rotation was the method used for item selection in determining item reliability (Devellis, 1991; Nunnally, 1978, as reported in Hett, p. 104) and construct validation in the development of the instrument (Devellis;
Polit & Hungler, 1989; Waltz & Bausell, 1981; Zeller & Carmines, 1980, as reported in Hett). A Content Validity Index (CVI) was established by a panel of four content judges. The CVI for the overall tool was .88 (p.149). The Global-Mindedness Scale demonstrated a strong correlation of .65, significant at the .001 level, with the Chauvinism subscale of the Global Understanding Project (Barrows et al., 1981; Hett, p. 151).

The theoretical definition of global-mindedness and its dimensions in the scale is as follows:

**Global-Mindedness** is a worldview in which one sees oneself as connected to the world community and feels a sense of responsibility for its members. This commitment is reflected in an individual’s attitudes, beliefs and behaviors.

**Responsibility** is a deep personal concern for people in all parts of the world; which surfaces as a sense of moral responsibility to try and improve conditions in some way.

**Cultural Pluralism** is an appreciation of the diversity of cultures in the world and belief that all have something of value to offer. This is accompanied by taking pleasure in exploring and trying to understand other cultural frameworks.

**Efficacy** is a belief that an individual’s actions can make a difference and that involvement in national and international issues is important.

**Globalcentrism** is thinking in terms of what is good for the global community, not just what will benefit one’s own country. A willingness to make judgments based on global rather than ethnocentric standards.

**Interconnectedness** is an awareness and appreciation of the interrelatedness of all peoples and nations which results in a sense of global belonging or kinship with the “human family” (Hett, 1993).

I developed the Host Culture Contact Survey in order to capture the frequency and type of contact during a study abroad experience. I relied on Bolen (n.d.) and Bachner (1994) for identifying questions relevant to the types of cross-cultural contact that would likely occur during the course of daily activity. Seven of the questions were derived from the Bolen document. Those questions were "Did the study abroad program create opportunities to interact with local people? How often did you interact with local people in the course of a week? How many hours did you spend talking to local people in the course of a day? How many hours did you spend listening to local news broadcast in the course of a week (radio or TV)? How many
times did you read a local newspaper or magazine during the course of a week? Do you know people from the host country that you currently interact with on a regular basis? Did the study abroad program create opportunities to interact with local people? The remaining questions were used to gather demographic data (see Appendix F for survey instruments).

Variables

The independent variable (IV) for the study was a study abroad experience. The dependent variable (DV) was global-mindedness. The criterion variables of host contact and location were examined to determine the influence, if any, on the statistical outcomes of the study.

Subjects

The population was represented by undergraduate college students enrolled at Florida State University, others universities within the state of Florida and colleges and universities outside of the state of Florida (see Appendix E). The samples were drawn from students enrolled in International Programs for the Spring, 2005 semester and undergraduate junior and senior level students enrolled in the College of Social Sciences. College of Social Science (COSS) offers the following disciplines: geography, economics, political science, sociology, public administration and urban and regional planning. COSS also offered the following interdisciplinary programs: African American studies, demography, international studies, health policy research, and interdisciplinary social science. Students enrolled in disciplines within COSS were likely to have taken, or plan to take courses that have an international focus.

Procedures

Data Collection

Permission was sought to conduct research on students enrolled in International Programs during Spring semester 2005. A letter explaining the nature and purpose of the study was addressed to the Director, Dr. Jim Pitts, requesting permission to conduct the research. Dr. Pitts agreed to the research and to provide access to IP support staff for any assistance that was needed. I requested and was emailed an Excel list containing the email addresses of program participants attending the four study centers for use as the experimental group. I then contacted the Registrar’s Office by email with a similar request and was emailed a list of junior and senior College of Social Science students to be used as the control group. I then made arrangements with the Florida State University, Survey Research Laboratory (SRL) to prepare the letter of
consent and surveys in a web-based format and email the questionnaires and consent letters to participants on both Excel lists.

The letter of consent, the Global-Mindedness Scale, and the link to the survey was emailed to all students (N = 586) on the lists. Students received a letter (see Appendix F) explaining the study and asking for their consent to participate. Consistent with the requirements of the FSU Human Subjects Committee consent was discussed in the cover letter. Students acknowledged their consent by electing to complete the survey. When students clicked on the survey link and entered a password, they were connected to the survey site. The survey was accessible to students from the beginning of December 2004 until the first week of the spring semester 2005. Students were emailed on at least three separate occasions during this period.

During the post-test phase, the Global-Mindedness Scale and a second letter of consent was emailed to all participants in April 2005, the end of the spring semester. The study abroad group was additionally emailed the Host Culture Contact survey to complete. Participants were sent the same passwords to re-enter the survey site and were emailed on at least five occasions to insure an adequate response rate. The password was then used to match pre- and post-tests.

At the end of the data collection period, I received and email from the Survey Research Laboratory with a file containing the raw data which I downloaded onto a floppy disc. The data was then analyzed using SPSS v. 13.

Data Analysis

Data collected via the GMS was used to compare and contrast groups; evaluate the frequency and type of host culture contact; and determine if study abroad location contributed to the development of global-mindedness. The survey yielded quantitative data, and the data were analyzed using SPSS v. 13. Statistical analysis included basic descriptive statistics, analysis of variance (ANOVA), Independent and Paired t-tests, and Pearson’s Product Moment.

Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the data and examine the means, frequencies and percentages of the study abroad and non-study abroad groups. Data is represented in both tabular and narrative forms. Research question #1 was analyzed using Independent samples t-tests to compare the means of the two groups and determine if there were significant differences in both groups prior to and after study abroad.

For Research Question #2, a paired samples t-test was used to analyze post-test data to determine significant differences in the two groups after a semester abroad and to examine
significant differences in the amount of change pre to post in the study abroad and non-study abroad groups. Results are presented in tabular and narrative forms.

Data for Research Question #3 was analyzed using descriptive information and Pearson’s Product Moment Correlation to correlate global-mindedness with host culture contact. Host culture contact is the regular, ongoing, communications and transactions between the “sojourner” and foreign country nationals.

For Research Question #4, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test the “main effects” of the independent variable, study abroad location, on the dependent variable, global-mindedness, to determine if there was a significant difference of means between the four study center groups. Results are presented in the form of degrees of freedom (df), observed F value ($F$), and significance level ($p$), to confirm whether location has a significant effect on global-mindedness.

The results of the study indicated whether students developed an attitude of global-mindedness after one semester; developed an attitude of global-mindedness after a semester of study abroad; developed an attitude of global-mindedness as a result of contact; and whether study abroad location had a positive effect on the development of global-mindedness.

The purpose of this study was to examine the effectiveness of the Florida State University’s study abroad program on the development of an attitude of global-mindedness and the impact that host contact may have on global-mindedness development among undergraduate program participants. This chapter described the methodology used in the study including a demographic profile of Florida State University and International Programs, the research design, instruments, variables, subjects and procedures. The procedures included the method of data collection and methods of data analysis.
CHAPTER 4

Results

Overview

This chapter presents the results of the research which was designed to explore the effects of study abroad on the development of an attitude of global-mindedness on participants enrolled in FSU International Programs. Four hypotheses were tested. These hypotheses were: (1) there will be a significant difference in the global-mindedness of students after one semester; (2) there will be a significant difference between the global-mindedness of students who participate in a study abroad experience and those who only study at their home campus; (3) there will be a significant difference between the global-mindedness of students who have frequent contact with the host culture and those who do not; and, (4) study center location will have a significant effect on the development of global-mindedness.

The conceptual framework was based on Mezirow’s (year?) transformative learning theory and considers that meaning perspectives transform in response to disorienting dilemmas. Engaging in critical reflection after confronting differences challenges the validity of prior knowledge and helps reformulate assumptions to permit a more inclusive, discriminating, permeable, and integrative perspective. The transformative process captures the essence of change in the affective domain of culture learning stemming from the contextual and cultural experiences of students when they report that study abroad changed their lives and changed the way they view others in the global community. The disorienting dilemmas experienced in the new cultural environment prompt new ways of thinking and interpreting experiences leading to changes in attitudes and beliefs resulting in perspective change or shifts in worldview.

All participants completed a one-time demographic profile and the 30-item Global-Mindedness Scale at the end of the Fall semester 2004. The survey was posted and emailed to participants in early December and remained available electronically for completion until January during the first week of the Spring semester 2005. All students were emailed the survey three times during the pre-test phase. Students in the study abroad group and non-study abroad group completed the GMS pre-test during the same period. After detecting a low response rate from the non-study abroad participants, I requested the email addresses of an additional 200
COSS students in order to increase the rate of return. A total of 185 study abroad participants and a total of 401 (200 + 201) College of Social Science students were emailed the survey.

During post-testing, the study abroad and non-study abroad groups were emailed the surveys during the final week of the Spring semester in April 2005. After Spring semester students often return home to areas located outside of the University community; therefore, an attempt was made to decrease the threat of subject mortality due to subjects dropping out of the study. Intervention studies often experience a decrease in post-test response rate since these types of studies take place over time (Fraenkel, 2003). An additional challenge for this study was students departing at the end of the Spring semester and going to their home schools located outside of the Tallahassee area. In order to minimize the drop out rate, all students were sent several reminders via email by FSU International Programs to complete the post-test and emailed the survey on five separate occasions by the FSU Survey Research Lab.

In addition to the GMS, the study abroad participants were asked to complete a one-time descriptive questionnaire assessing the type and frequency of contact with the host culture (see Appendix D). All surveys were returned electronically. Matching of the pre-test/post-test scores relied on the password used by the participant to access the survey site. Students provided 73 usable responses to the web-based instruments. This chapter reviews the results of the statistical analyses of those responses.

**Responses**

A total of 586 students representing the study abroad and non-study abroad groups were emailed the Global-Mindedness Scale. After graduate students were purged from both groups, the process yielded 196 pre-test surveys (n = 89 for the study abroad group and n = 107 for the non-study abroad group). After post-testing, pre- and post-test responses were matched on the basis of the password provided to each student who was emailed the survey. Seventy-three usable post-test surveys were returned. Comparisons are based upon the 49 subjects in the study abroad group and 24 subjects in the non-study abroad group.

**Data Analysis**

**Descriptive Statistics for the Study Abroad Group**

Among the undergraduate study abroad respondents, females (71.2%) constituted a larger proportion than males (28.8%). This statistic was consistent with the literature that reports a greater number of females than males studying abroad. Juniors (42.9%) and seniors (30.6%)
made up the majority of those students. Seventy-five percent were at least 20 years of age or older. All respondents had a GPA of 2.5 or above.

The majority of respondents (89.8%) self-identified as White. Hispanic or Latino made up 6.1%, followed by African-Americans (2.0%), Asian (2.0%), and those reporting “other” (2.0%). There were no native Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders. Ninety-four percent were born in the United States and 95.8% reported English as their first language. Ongoing have been issues of minority access to study abroad. A number of factors have been identified that impede their participation. Among them are finance and cost of program, marketing, and admissions requirements (Carter, 1991).

Sixty-five percent indicated that they had previously worked or studied abroad (see Table 1); 38.8% indicated that they had taken 3-4 college courses, which dealt with global issues (see Table 2; for additional demographic characteristics, see Appendix A).

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work/study abroad</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No work/study abroad</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency and Percentages of Respondents by Previous Work or Study Abroad
Table 2

*Frequency and Percentage of Respondents by Number of Global College Courses Among Study Abroad Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of College Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – 4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – 8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 8 courses</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Descriptive statistics for the non-study abroad group**

Males (54.2%) represented slightly over half of the non-study abroad group returning usable surveys. Females (45.8%) made up a slightly smaller proportion of those respondents. There were no freshmen or sophomores represented in the usable surveys and one who failed to report for this group. Seventy percent were seniors and 25% were juniors. Eighty-eight percent of the non-study abroad respondents reported being 21 years of age or older.

The majority of respondents were White (33.3%) followed by African-Americans (16.7%), Hispanic or Latino (8.3%), Asian (4.2%), and those reporting “other” (4.2%). There was no American Indian, Alaska native, native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islanders in this group.
The majority of respondents (91.7%) were born in the United States; 91.3% reported English as their first language. Seventy percent reported no previous study or work abroad (see Table 3).

Table 3

*Frequency and Percentages of Respondents by Previous Work or Study Abroad Among the Non-Study Abroad Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work/study abroad</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No work/study abroad</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All respondents represented in the usable surveys of this group held a GPA of 2.5 or above; 29.2% indicated they had had 5-6 college courses, which dealt with global issues as reported in Table 4 (For additional demographic characteristics, see Appendix A).
Table 4

Frequency and Percentage of Respondents by Number of Global College Courses Among the Non-Study Abroad Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of College Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – 4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – 8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 8 courses</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both groups shared similar characteristics, but in comparison it is important to note that 65% of study abroad group previously studied or worked abroad in contrast to the non-study abroad group of whom only 29% of these students had similar experiences. In contrast, one-third of the non-study abroad group indicated taking eight or more courses focused on global issues. Nearly all of the participants for this study ostensibly had an international interest, with the study abroad group having a higher percentage of international sojourners.
Group Comparisons

The level of significance on all measures was \( \alpha = .05 \). Cronbach’s alphas for the five dimensions of global-mindedness were .80, .86, .79, .73, and .74 for cultural pluralism, responsibility, efficacy, global-centrism, and interconnectedness, respectively. The Cronbach’s alpha for the total post-test was .93.

Before examining the results from the post-test, it was important to see where the all of the students were on global-mindedness and its dimensions. An independent samples \( t \)-test was conducted to determine if there was a significant difference between the means of the study abroad group and the non-study abroad group at the beginning of the Spring 2005 semester on overall global-mindedness or on any of its five dimensions.

In a two-tailed test of the means, the students in the sample significantly differed on the dimension of cultural pluralism, \( t (179.3) = 3.04, p = .003 \). There were no significant differences found on the other dimensions of global-mindedness or the total pre-test. All students in the sample appeared to have a similar disposition toward an appreciation and openness to cultural diversity.

For the post-test, each of the following questions was examined:

Research Question 1

Over the course of one semester are there differences in the development of global-mindedness among students?

It was hypothesized that there would be a significant difference in the global-mindedness of students after one semester. To answer this question a two-tailed independent samples \( t \)-test was performed to compare the means between the study abroad group and non-study abroad group at the end of one semester on overall global-mindedness and on its dimensions. A significant difference was found in the mean on the dimensions of cultural pluralism, \( t (71) = 2.73, p = .008 \); responsibility, \( t (29.96) = 2.40, p = .023 \); global-centrism, \( t (71) = 2.59, p = .012 \); and the total post-test, \( t (32.30) = 2.53, p = .016 \), at the end of one semester.

The results for all students suggested there were changes in attitudes related to diversity and personal concern for people in other parts of the world, thoughts about the greater global community and what is best based on global standards, and attitudes pointing toward a growing sense of connectedness to the world community.
However, a paired samples test revealed a significant difference pre- to post on the dimensions of cultural pluralism and the total post-test indicating students increased in these areas (see Table 5). The results supported the hypothesis that there would be a significant difference in global-mindedness among students after one semester.

Table 5

*Paired Differences For Both Groups After One Semester (N=72)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global-mindedness</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural pluralism</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>-2.78</td>
<td>.007*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-1.61</td>
<td>.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-.950</td>
<td>.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global-centrism</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>-.680</td>
<td>.499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interconnectedness</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>-.967</td>
<td>.337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total global-mindedness</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>-2.04</td>
<td>.045*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

Research Question 2

Over the course of one semester are there differences in the development of global-mindedness between participants in a study abroad experience and those who only study at their home campus?

It was hypothesized that there would be a significant difference in the development of global-mindedness between students who participate in a study abroad experience and those who only study at their home campus. A paired samples *t*-test was performed to measure pre- to post.
differences. After one semester of study abroad, the study abroad group showed a significant difference pre- to post on the dimensions of cultural pluralism and total global-mindedness (see Table 6). The mean scores showed positive increases on those dimensions.

Table 6

*Paired Differences For The Study Abroad Group After One Semester (N=49)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Abroad Group</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global-mindedness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural pluralism</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-2.41</td>
<td>.019*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-1.86</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-1.50</td>
<td>.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global-centrism</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-.510</td>
<td>.612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interconnectedness</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-.1.74</td>
<td>.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total global-mindedness</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-2.38</td>
<td>.021*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p< .05

These results suggested that students became more interested and/or appreciative of cultural diversity after one semester and developed a greater sense of global-mindedness. Students may have felt their greatest sense of dissonance confronting cultural differences within the host country environment. There was a non-significant result for the non-study abroad group as reported in Table 7.
Table 7

**Paired Differences For Non-Study Abroad Group After One Semester (n=23)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>ns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural pluralism</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-1.36</td>
<td>.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-.249</td>
<td>.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.554</td>
<td>.585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global-centrism</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-.450</td>
<td>.657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interconnectedness</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.919</td>
<td>.368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total global-mindedness</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-.203</td>
<td>.841</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p< .05

The results support the hypothesis that there would be a significant difference between the global-mindedness achieved in the study abroad group and the non-study abroad group after a semester of study abroad.

The highest mean scores were for questions on the dimension of cultural pluralism. The average score on post-cultural pluralism questions was $M = 4.60$, $SD = .38$. Eighty-one percent of respondents answered strongly agree or agree to questions related to this dimension. The highest scoring questions were *I generally find it stimulating to spend evenings talking with people from another culture*, 100% (n = 49) of study abroad respondents answered strongly agree or agree to this question; *Americans can learn something of value from all different cultures*, 100% of the study abroad respondents answered strongly agree or agree to this question; *I enjoy trying to understand people’s behavior in the context of their culture*, 100% of study abroad respondents answered strongly agree or agree to this question; and, *It is important that American
universities and colleges provide programs designed to promote understanding among students of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds. 100% of study abroad students answered strongly agree or agree to this question.

An interesting result was found in the analysis comparing pre to post gains in the study abroad groups. Among the eight students attending the Florence Study Center, a paired *t*-test revealed a significant difference in pre- to post scores on the dimensions of responsibility, *t*(7) = 2.37, *p* = .049, interconnectedness, *t*(7) = 2.64, *p* = .033, and global-mindedness, *t*(7) = 2.37, *p* = .049. These results suggested that there may have been something unique about the Italian experience. Unfortunately, the size of the sample does not permit any sort of generalization across groups.

**Research Question 3**

Among the study abroad group, do students who have more frequent contact with the host culture differ significantly in the development of global-mindedness?

The frequency of host culture contact was examined using the Host Culture Contact survey, the results of which can be reviewed in Appendix A. The Host Culture Contact survey was designed to offer a general picture of the cross-cultural interaction taking place between students and their host community. The survey recorded the frequency and type of daily activities taking place during the study abroad experience to determine the effect on global-mindedness.

It was hypothesized that that there would be a significant difference between the global-mindedness of students who have frequent contact with the host culture and those who do not. The hypothesis was tested using Pearson Product-Moment Correlation. Among the types and frequency of interactions recorded, the results showed a significant correlation between homestay and the development of total global-mindedness among the 13 respondents who reported staying with a member of the host community, *r* (13) = .58, *p* = .036.

In general, all of the students in the study abroad group had contact with members of their host communities. The majority of students shopped for groceries, took public transportation and conversed at least an hour per day with their host. Forty percent of students indicated that their programs often created opportunities for cross-cultural interaction. Thirty-nine percent spent 1 to 5 hours watching local news and 45% read the local newspaper once or twice a week. Finally, 59% indicated that they had attended cultural events often and 27% had
spent time with a member of the host community. Most had spent 3 days or less, but it was this subset whose gains in total global-mindedness were correlated to home-stays with host community members. This result suggested that more intimate contact may have influenced this outcome. The statistical results however, did not support the hypothesis that frequency of contact would have a significant effect on the development of global-mindedness.

Research Question 4

Does study abroad location influence the development of global-mindedness?

It was hypothesized that study abroad location would have a significant effect on the development of an attitude of global-mindedness (see Appendix A for a breakdown of study abroad groups by location). A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed to test the differences in the mean between and within the four study center groups after one semester. The ANOVA yielded no significant $F$ value. There was no significant difference in the development of global-mindedness or any of its dimensions between or within groups at the four study center locations. The results suggested that location did not influence the degree to which students achieved global-mindedness and therefore did not support the hypothesis.

Summary

The data collected via the Global-mindedness Scale was analyzed using $t$-test for independent samples, $t$-test for paired samples and analysis of variance. The Host Culture Contact survey was analyzed using Pearson’s Product Moment Correlation. All tests were conducted with a significance level of $p<.05$.

It is an important finding that the mean scores of the two groups differed significantly on the pre- and post-test measures. More noteworthy are the results that indicated that the study abroad group differed significantly between themselves and from the non-study abroad group after one semester. The study abroad group was exposed to a learning environment in an international setting while the non-study abroad group was exposed to a traditional learning environment at their home campus. The results suggest that study abroad does have an impact on the development of an attitude of global-mindedness.

An examination of differences within and between student groups at the four study centers showed no significant difference in the level of global-mindedness achieved. Thus, study abroad location did not influence the development of global-mindedness. Conversely, there was
a correlation between the development of total global-mindedness and home-stay, suggesting that intimate contact with members of the host community can influence this outcome.

The definition of cultural pluralism is the appreciation of the diversity of cultures in the world and belief that all have something of value to offer. It is also stated that this appreciation of diversity is accompanied by taking pleasure in exploring and trying to understand other cultural frameworks (Hett). The study abroad group seemed to embrace this attitude as demonstrated in their desire to participate in overseas experiences.

Because there were no focus groups conducted at the end of the study due to the inability to gather a representative sample, the ability to confirm that cultural challenges presented themselves as disorienting dilemmas was lost. However, we can assume that growth of cultural pluralism indicates a growth in the acceptance of diversity which can be considered transformational. In this way, the connection is made to other human communities. As students study abroad, they begin to focus on human similarities and place the dissimilarities into an appropriate cultural context. This is the impact of transformational learning that is important for study abroad programs to capture.
CHAPTER 5

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Summary

This chapter presents a summary of the findings of this study, a discussion of their implications, and recommendations for future research. This study examined the impact of study abroad on the development of an attitude of global-mindedness in students enrolled in Florida State University’s International Programs during the spring semester 2005. The study explored four research questions:

1. Over the course of one semester, are there differences in the development of global-mindedness among students?

2. Over the course on one semester, are there differences in the development of global-mindedness of participants in a study abroad experience and those who only study at their home campus?

3. Among the study abroad group, do students who have more frequent contact with the host culture differ significantly in the development of global-mindedness?

4. Does study abroad location influence the development of global-mindedness?

The Global-Mindedness Scale (GMS) was used to measure overall global-mindedness and its five dimensions of cultural pluralism, responsibility, efficacy, global-centrism, and interconnectedness. The Host Culture Contact survey was used to measure the type and frequency of contact between sojourners and the host community.

Using a nonequivalent control group design, the study abroad and non-study abroad groups were tested. Each completed the Global-Mindedness Scale prior to and at the end of one semester. The Host Culture Contact survey was completed by the study abroad group during the post-test phase. The GMS is a five-point Likert type scale ranging from 1-strongly disagrees to 5-strongly agrees. Comparisons were made between both groups completing the pre and post-test. Seventy-three usable surveys were returned.

Cronbach’s Coefficient Alpha tests indicated strong reliability for the total test and on each of the five dimensions. Independent samples t-tests; paired t-test, Analysis of Variance, and Pearson’s Product Moment correlation were the statistical test used to determine significance of change in scores. Two of the four hypotheses advanced for the study were supported by the data.
For research question number one the results suggest that both independent samples may have been influenced by similar factors regardless of where they studied. The scores for both the study abroad and the non-study abroad groups differed significantly over the course of one semester on the dimensions of cultural pluralism, responsibility, global-centrism, and the total post-test. We can assume that global media coverage of the war in Iraq and other significant world events, were routinely heard, read, or spoken about. Furthermore, students are exposed to situations in the college environment that impact their growth and development (Evans, Forney, & Guido-Di-Brito, pp. 25-28) such as Greek organizations, volunteer community service, and other typical college curricular and co-curricular activities.

What is acquired through the media and students’ experiences in college and otherwise, contribute to the natural maturation process that may enable students to change on the dimensions noted. In spite of this finding, further investigation uncovered that all students’ differed significantly pre- to post- on the dimension of cultural pluralism and the total post-test.

For research question number two, the pre- to post- scores differed significantly in the study abroad group on the dimension of cultural pluralism and the total post-test. The study abroad experience seemed to have an additional influence on the affective growth of students, but again, only relative to the development of cultural pluralism and an overall attitude of global-mindedness.

For research question number three, frequency of contact was not significant; however, home-stay as a contact variable appears to have a valuable influence of students’ global-mindedness. Home-stays would naturally bring students into greater personal contact with the new culture. Students would see and experience everyday life, including customs and traditions, habits, and attitudes that may not be seen if the contact was superficial or low level (e.g. shopping, taking local transportation, or reading the local newspaper). Home-stay may also allow students to become involved through taking part in meals, religious observances, or other activities common to the host culture.

For question number four, the findings indicated that study center location did not influence the development of global-mindedness in this study. The study center environments alone did not translate into significant intercultural experiences where students would have faced challenges to their traditional ways of thinking, prompting students to re-examine previously held views that could result in more open-mindedness.
Conclusions

Study abroad did have a significant effect on the level of global-mindedness achieved on the dimension of cultural pluralism and overall global-mindedness. Students’ willingness to go abroad speaks to a desire to learn more about other cultures and possibly a greater appreciation for diversity. The concomitant cross-cultural interaction can enhance this appreciation as students learn culturally through the transformative process.

Bennett (1993) theorized that pluralism is an adaptive stage of intercultural sensitivity, and that pluralism is the existence of two or more internalized cultural frames of reference (p. 55). Additionally, the development of an attitude of pluralism involves significant living experiences in another culture. Bennett further noted that people of color develop pluralism as the result of routine interaction with European American culture; and, to a lesser extent, European Americans who have routine exposure to other ethnic groups “such as inhabitants of culturally heterogeneous urban neighborhoods” may also develop pluralism (p. 55). Thus, the significant difference found in the study abroad group on the dimension of cultural pluralism could very well be the result of a combination of previous work or study abroad (65% indicated having done so) and their multicultural experiences here in their home country both of which contributed to a transformation in cultural attitudes.

Entry into a new culture either domestically or internationally, even if the culture is similar as in the case of London, may still have a disorienting effect. Martin (1994), noting the findings of a study by Martin and Rohrlich (1991) stated that students reported “more unmet expectations and more difficulties in cultural adaptation” after studying in England than those studying in Spain, Germany, and Italy” (p. 15). It would be interesting to know about the communities these students grew up in, their values orientation, and the degree and type of inter-ethnic communication they experienced.

The study abroad group also shared a greater sense of what it means overall to be globally-minded. These students appear more connected to the world community and feel some sense of responsibility for its members, likely a result of their international interest and experiences.

The non-significant scores on the dimensions of responsibility, efficacy, global-centrism, and interconnectedness suggests that students do not feel that their actions can make a difference, nor do they think yet in terms of what is best for the larger global community. They do not share
an awareness and appreciation for the interconnectedness of all peoples and nations and do not necessarily have a sense of moral responsibility to improve conditions. The development of the dimensions of efficacy, global-centrism, interconnectedness, and responsibility warrants further examination.

These dimensions may require other modes of learning in order to encourage growth. For example, responsibility and efficacy may be task oriented outcomes. Research related to service learning (a teaching method that combines academic instruction with organized community service) suggests that service learning increases social responsibility and self-efficacy (Astin & Sax, 1998; Myers-Lipton, 1998; Eyler, Giles & Braxton, 1997; Giles & Eyler, 1994; as cited in Eyler, Giles, Stenson, & Gray, 2001). Students participating in study abroad may develop in these dimensions if the program design incorporates service-learning into the international setting as a teaching/learning methodology.

Globalcentrism and interconnectedness may be more effectively imparted through learning about the objective aspects of cultures (e.g. institutions, artifacts, social customs, and political structures), as well as the more subjective aspects such as assumptions, values, and patterns of thinking and behaving (Bennett & Bennett, 1994, p. 154).

Furthermore, teaching students about the interrelationships that bind countries and continents together including economies, technologies, and foreign policy, as well as the wide-ranging impact of global warming and immigration, may also help to create a sense of connectedness and attention to what is best for the global community.

Frequency of contact did not influence the development of global-mindedness, however; there was a correlation between home stay and the total post-test. These findings suggest that substantive interaction in the form of more intimate cross-cultural contact with the host people in the country may play an important role in transforming global attitudes.

Communicative learning, which Mezirow describes as “understanding the meaning of what others communicate concerning values, ideals, feelings, moral decisions, and such concepts as freedom, justice, love, labor, autonomy, commitment, and democracy” (Mezirow, 1990, p. 8), can only occur when substantive interactions like home-stays or service learning acts as the medium. It is also during this time that disorienting dilemmas present themselves as people gain more knowledge of one another and confront differences head on. From this point students can engage in the transformative process, revising meaning schemes leading to changes in
perspective. As Furnham and Bochner noted, cross-cultural contact is an important meeting ground, and satisfying contact can lead to more favorable attitudes (Salter & Teager).

Gudykunst, 1979 (as cited in Medina-Lopez-Portillo, 2004, p.179) makes the point that contact of short duration however, does not allow enough time for attitudes to change. Bennett also charges that it takes at least two years in the new cultural environment for students to acquire a new worldview (p. 55). This could also explain why the study abroad group, having only spent one semester, did not score significantly on the other four dimensions of global-mindedness.

Study center locations offered students sophisticated and up-to-date accommodations including showers and bathrooms, color television, microwave ovens, washing machines, and wireless computer connections. Students were able to adjust psychologically and functionally (Martin, p. 14) with minimal discomfort. The centers also offered excursions to other areas of their host country, but mainly those focusing on historical sites, cosmopolitan cities, or areas of unspoiled beauty. Unless participants took it upon themselves to go into depressed or rural areas, or spend extended time with members of the host countries during opportunities for personal travel, then most participant experiences were non-threatening, comfortable, and protected.

As the results of the study indicate, study center location did not influence the development of globally-minded attitudes, likely because the co-curricular activities were not designed to challenge students’ critical thinking skills relevant to the more pressing issues that face the global community, such as poverty, human rights, or HIV/Aids, but rather to introduce them to the outstanding cultural heritage that these wonderful cities and countries possess. Nevertheless, the correlational relationship between home-stay and global-mindedness was present and speaks to the need for more intimate contact between sojourners and their host.

The number of students enrolled at the London study center was greater than at any of the other three study centers. In the Martin and Rohrlich study, the researchers found that students who studied in England expected to encounter few cultural differences and little problem adapting (Martin, p. 15). This may explain why more students choose to attend the study center in London versus Italy, Spain, or Panama. Students may have wanted to remain, as much as possible, in their comfort zone, speaking English and encountering people racially similar while studying abroad.
Women and Caucasians dominated the sample of study abroad students. The statistics concur with the traditional profile of students who study abroad. Men study abroad at a lesser rate than women and Caucasians study abroad at a greater rate than all minority students combined. Minority students have traditionally been less inclined to study abroad and often financially less capable. The results of the study may have differed had a more diverse group participated.

In summary, cultural pluralism is likely a product of both the student’s domestic multicultural background and the study abroad environment. The other dimensions of global-mindedness: efficacy, responsibility, interconnectedness, and globalcentrism, are attitudes that may be most effectively acquired through targeted instruction or activities. Study abroad does however impact the development of attitudes of global-mindedness as hypothesized.

Students who study abroad bring with them all of their cultural and contextual experiences; however, differences in learners and their expectations, the lack of sufficient opportunities for cross-cultural interaction, and trips of short duration may reduce or minimize the chances for students to actually achieve maximum transformative learning. In addition, not all learners will transform. We must then discover how educators can foster a transformative learning environment so that even the most resistant learner can benefit.

Transformative learning also involves reflection which is an important theme in Mezirow’s theory. Reflection, in general, is a natural thinking activity particularly after engaging in new activities, witnessing significant events, interacting with unfamiliar people, etc. According to Clark (n.d.), “reflection is thinking for an extended period by linking recent experiences to earlier ones in order to promote a more complex and interrelated mental schema. The thinking involves looking for commonalities, differences, and interrelations beyond their superficial elements” (Reflection, para 1). We can assume that students naturally reflected on the variety of experiences that were had in the host country. However, we do know to what degree any of the reflection was part of a structured reflective activity.

The study abroad experience can generate many opportunities for reflection, allowing for the exploration of new ideas and opportunities to gain knowledge and develop global attitudes. Environments that promote interpersonal interaction may result in greater reflection (Bandura, 1977, as cited in Clark, n.d., Encouraging Reflection: Environmental Characteristics section, para 2).
The limitations of this study, notwithstanding its limited generalizability, also rest with an inordinate number of students attending the London study center. In addition, the demographics of the study abroad group were inconsistent with that of the non-study abroad group in relationship to gender as well as total number of respondents. The majority of study abroad participants were female (83%), whereas the number of females to males in the non-study abroad group were closer, 45% and 54%, respectively. In terms of total respondents for each group, the study abroad group had 49 respondents and the non-study abroad group, only 24 respondents.

Nevertheless, the present study supports what a number of previous studies have shown, that international experience outside of the US does promote changes in global attitudes. The findings also suggest that significant cross-cultural contact does enhance cultural learning. Yet, other factors such as prior cultural interaction, duration, sojourner expectations, instructional methods and content, and opportunities in the form of experiences that promote critical thinking about global issues, may influence the degree to which students develop on certain dimensions of global-mindedness.

**Recommendations**

In an effort to extend the findings of this study into new areas, further exploration is necessary. For example, comparisons between the lesser attended Spain, Italy, and Panama study centers with the London study center may provide additional information about the impact of language or culture on global-mindedness development. The addition of focus groups and longitudinal studies could reveal more information about student characteristics and more detail on individual experiences and how they relate to the transformational learning. Comparing the global-mindedness of study abroad students who have had a greater degree of domestic multicultural interaction with those who primarily originate from homogenous backgrounds may provide insight into their openness toward cultural pluralism. The addition of Bennett’s Intercultural Development Inventory could allow the researcher to gauge at what stage a student is in intercultural competence.

Research into ways to increase gains on the non-significant dimensions identified in this study could serve to improve program design. Programs that increase students’ cross-cultural interactions and involvement in their host communities could be piloted and examined using the
GMS and other instruments that measure civic engagement to determine if a relationship exist between global-mindedness and community involvement.

Finally, more opportunities should be created to facilitate “positive intimate contact” between sojourners and members of the host community so that the contact variables can be further scrutinized. Lastly, surveys designed to identify barriers to study abroad at FSU among men and ethnic and racial minorities are needed to begin to remedy this disparity.

The research can be used to gain support for study abroad. In the age of accountability, it is useful to know if programs are actually creating global citizens by transforming worldviews. It is important to policy makers and funding agencies, upon which we depend, to help institutionalize global education. It is also important to students who want genuine cross-cultural educational experience through international sojourns. As a final point, the research can be used for program improvement, to promote faculty interest in study abroad, to design better preparation/orientations for prospective sojourners, and to build academic prestige.

In summary, the ultimate goal of achieving global-mindedness is to facilitate sustained perspective transformation- an ongoing ability to reflect, critically analyze, and create new meaning from experiences. Perspective transformation is achievable in the right environment under the right conditions. We must identify through research, those elements in a study abroad experience that contribute most effectively to developing globally-minded attitudes among college students. This study serves as an introduction to the possibilities of discovering much more about the effectiveness of Florida State University’s International Programs and to better meet the expectations set forth in its International Commitment -
APPENDIX A

Tables A8-A11
### Table A8

Demographic Characteristics of Study Abroad Group (N = 49)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>83.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current class level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age on last birthday</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 – 20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 – 24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.5 GPA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>89.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Born in the United States</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>93.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First language</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>95.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A9

Demographic characteristics of the non-study abroad group (N = 24)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current class level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age on last birthday</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 – 20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 – 24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>87.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.5 GPA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Born in the United States</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First language</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>91.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did host use English as primary language?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If non-English, did you speak in host language?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know people from the host country?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In what way do you interact?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>91.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-person</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>73.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopped for groceries?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to bank?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to post office?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>69.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take a taxi or other public transportation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table A10 continued)
(Table A10 continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stay with a member of the host country?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>73.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes to question, how long was your stay?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 3 days</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – 5 days</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 7 days</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than a week</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to interact with the local people?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often was interaction with local people?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once/twice per week</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three to five time per week</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyday</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of hours spent talking with local people per day?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 hour or less</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – 5 hours</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 8 hours</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 8 hours</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of hours listening to local news per week?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 hour or less</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 5 hours</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 10 hours</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more hours</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of times you read the local newspaper per week?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once or twice per week</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three to five times per week</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend cultural events, plays, films, art exhibits, dance or musical performance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A11

Breakdown of Study Abroad Groups by Location (N = 49)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England: London</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain: Valencia</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy: Florence</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama: Panama City</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

Human Subjects Approval
Office of the Vice President For Research
Human Subjects Committee
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2763
(850) 644-8673 · FAX (850) 644-4392

APPROVAL MEMORANDUM

Date: 10/11/2004

To: Patricia Golay
8951 Celia Road
Tallahassee, FL 32305

Dept.: EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

From: John Tomkowski, Chair

Re: Use of Human Subjects in Research
   The effects of Study Abroad on the Development of Global-mindedness in Students
   Enrolled in International Programs

The forms that you submitted to this office in regard to the use of human subjects in the proposal
referenced above have been reviewed by the Secretary, the Chair, and two members of the Human
Subjects Committee. Your project is determined to be Exempt per 45 CFR § 46.101(b) and has been
approved by an accelerated review process.

The Human Subjects Committee has not evaluated your proposal for scientific merit, except to
weigh the risk to the human participants and the aspects of the proposal related to potential
risk and benefit. This approval does not replace any departmental or other approvals, which
may be required.

If the project has not been completed by 10/10/2005 you must request renewed approval for
continuation of the project.

You are advised that any change in protocol in this project must be approved by resubmission of the
project to the Committee for approval. Also, the principal investigator must promptly report, in writing,
any unexpected problems causing risks to research subjects or others.

By copy of this memorandum, the chairman of your department and/or your major professor is
reminded that he/she is responsible for being informed concerning research projects involving human
subjects in the department, and should review protocols of such investigations as often as needed to
insure that the project is being conducted in compliance with our institution and with DHHS regulations.

This institution has an Assurance on file with the Office for Protection from Research Risks. The
Assurance Number is IRB00000446.

Cc: Robert Schwartz
HSC No. 2004.688
APPENDIX C

Permission to use the Global-Mindedness Scale
December 23, 2003

Patricia A. Matthews
8951 Celia Road
Tallahassee, Florida 32305

Dear Ms. Matthews:

I want to extend my best wishes to you for much success with your dissertation. I'm pleased you plan to use Jane Hett's Global Mindedness Scale. She was an excellent student fully committed to global peace.

Enclosed you will find a letter of authorization from Dallas B. Boggs, the husband of E. Jane Hett, who is now deceased.

Sincerely,

Mary Woods Scherr, Ph.D.
Dissertation Director
APPENDIX D

Demographic Profile, Global-Mindedness Scale, Host Culture Contact Survey
DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

In order to analyze the data on your survey, some information about your background will be helpful. Please check the box or supply the most accurate response for each of the following statements or questions.

1. Gender: _____ Female _____ Male

2. Current class level: ____ FR _____ SO _____ JR _____ SR

3. Age on your last birthday ___

4. Major field of Study ______________________________

5. Is your GPA 2.5 or above? ____ Yes _____ No

6. How would you describe yourself? (select one or more races)

   ____ American Indian or Alaska Native
   ____ Asian
   ____ Black or African American
   ____ Hispanic or Latino
   ____ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
   ____ White
   ____ Other

7. Were you born in the United States? ____ Yes _____ No

8. What is your first language? ____ English _____ Other ____________________

9. Previous study/work/travel abroad? ____ Yes _____ No

10. Please estimate the number of college courses (including this semester) you’ve taken which deal with global issues or in which you’ve learned a lot about countries besides the United States.

    ____ None _____ 1-2 _____ 3-4 _____ 5-6 _____ 7-8

    ____ More than 8 courses
GLOBAL-MINDENESS SCALE

Student Attitude Survey

On the following pages you will find a series of statements. Please read each statement and decide whether or not you agree with it. Then circle the response that most recently reflects your opinion. There are no correct answers.

Strongly Disagree = 1, Disagree = 2, Unsure = 3, Agree = 4, Strongly Agree = 5

1. I generally find it stimulating to spend an evening talking with people from another culture.

2. I feel an obligation to speak out when I see our government doing something I consider wrong.

3. The United States is enriched by the fact that it is comprised of many people from different cultures and countries

4. Really, there is nothing I can do about the problems of the world.

5. The needs of the United States must continue to be our highest priority in negotiating with other countries

6. I often think about the kind world we are creating for future generations.

7. When I hear that thousands of people are starving in an African country, I feel very frustrated.

8. Americans can learn something of value from all different cultures.

9. Generally, an individual’s actions are too small to have a significant effect on the ecosystem.
10. Americans should be permitted to pursue the standard of living they can afford if it only has a slight negative impact on the environment.

11. I think of myself, not only as a citizen of my country, but also as a citizen of the world.

12. When I see the condition some people in the world live under, I feel a responsibility to do something about it.

13. I enjoy trying to understand people’s behavior in the context of their culture.

14. My opinions about national policies are based on how those policies might affect the rest of the world as well as the United States.

15. It is very important to me to choose a career in which I can have a positive effect on the quality of life for future generations.

16. America values are probably the best.

17. In the long run, America will probably benefit from the fact that the world is becoming more interconnected.

18. The fact that a flood can kill 50,000 people in Bangladesh is very depressing to me.

19. It is important that American universities and colleges provide programs designed to promote understanding among students of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds.

20. I think my behavior can impact people in other countries.
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>The present distribution of the world’s wealth and resources should be maintained because it promotes survival of the fittest.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>I feel a strong kinship with the worldwide human family.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>I feel very concerned about the lives of people who live in politically repressive regimes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>It is important that we educate people to understand the impact that current policies might have on future generations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>It is not really important to me to consider myself as a member of the global community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>I sometimes try to imagine how a person who is always hungry must feel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>I have very little in common with people in underdeveloped nations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>I am able to affect what happens on a global level by what I do in my own community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>I sometimes feel irritated with people from other countries because they don’t understand how we do things here.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Americans have a moral obligation to share their wealth with the less fortunate people of the world.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCORING KEY: Reverse score items: 4, 5, 9, 10, 16, 21, 25, 27, 29

SCORING: *Range of scores 30 – 150
*Sum all responses
*Higher scores indicate a higher level of global-mindedness

ITEMS REFLECTING THEORETICAL DIMENSIONS

RESPONSIBILITY: 2, 7, 12, 18, 23, 26, 30

CULTURAL PLURALISM: 1, 3, 8, 13, 14, 19, 24, 27

EFFICACY: 4, 9, 15, 20, 28

GLOBALCENTRISM: 5, 10, 16, 21, 29

INTERCONNECTEDNESS: 6, 11, 17, 22, 25
Complete this section if you were enrolled in FSU International Programs in the SPRING 2005 semester. Please select the ONE best answer that represents your agreement with a particular response.

HOST CULTURE CONTACT QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Please indicate the FSU Study Center that you attended in spring 2005?
   ____ London
   ____ Spain
   ____ Italy
   ____ Panama

2. Did the host country use English as their primary language?
   ___ yes
   ___ no

3. If the host language was not English, did you speak to locals in the host language?
   ___ yes
   ___ no

4. Did the study abroad program create opportunities to interact with local people?
   ___ often
   ___ sometimes
   ___ rarely
   ___ never

5. How often did you interact with local people in the course of a week?
   ___ everyday
   ___ three to five times/week
   ___ once or twice/week
   ___ I never interacted with the local people

6. How many hours did you spend talking to local people in the course of a day?
   ___ More than 8 hrs
   ___ 5-8 hrs
   ___ 2-5 hrs
   ___ 1 hr. or less

7. How many hours did you spend listening to local news broadcast in the course of a week (radio or TV)?
   ___ 10 or more hrs
   ___ 5-10 hrs
   ___ 1-5 hrs
   ___ 1hr or less

8. How many times did you read a local newspaper or magazine during the course of a week?
   ___ five or more times/week
9. Do you know people from the host country that you currently interact with on a regular basis?
   ___ yes
   ___ no

10. If you answered yes to Question 9, in what way do you interact (check all that apply)?
    ___ mail
    ___ email
    ___ in person
    ___ phone

11. Did you attend any cultural events such as plays, films, art exhibitions, dance or musical performances or lectures of general appeal while in-country, sponsored by the program or host country?
    ___ often
    ___ sometimes
    ___ rarely
    ___ never

12. Did you do any of the following activities while in the host country? (check all that apply)
    ___ Shop for groceries
    ___ Bank
    ___ Post office
    ___ Take a taxi or public transportation

13. Did you ever stay with a member of the host country at any point in your study abroad program?
    ___ yes
    ___ no

14. If you answered yes to Question 13, how long was your stay?
    ___ more than a week
    ___ 5-7 days
    ___ 3-5 days
    ___ less than 3 days
APPENDIX E

List of Other Colleges and Universities Attended by Students Enrolled in International Programs, Spring 2005
List of other colleges and universities attended by students enrolled in International Programs, spring 2005

1. University of Miami
2. University of Florida
3. University of Maryland system
4. Clemson University
5. University of West Florida
6. Boston University
7. Washington & Lee University
8. New College of Florida
9. University of Southern California
10. University of Colorado System
11. Auburn University
12. Indiana University System
13. University of Central Florida
14. University of Miami
15. Pennsylvania State University System
16. University of Michigan System
17. Bates College
18. Gordon College
19. Roger Williams University
20. University of Illinois System
21. Catawba College
22. Florida Atlantic University
23. Lemoyne College
24. American University
25. Liberty University
26. University of Massachusetts System
27. University of California System
28. Duke University
29. Florida Gulf Coast University
APPENDIX F

Letters of Consent
Dear Student:

As a student about to study abroad, we are interested in your views. I am conducting a research study to examine the effects of internationally – related study on the development of global-mindedness in students. This email links you to the survey. It only takes a few minutes to complete. I am a graduate student under the direction of Professor Robert Schwartz in the College of Education and the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at Florida State University.

Please click on the link below and it will take you to the survey. By entering your password and completing the survey, you are agreeing to participate in the study. I will be happy to share the results upon completion of the study.

Survey Link:  http://websurvey.coss.fsu.edu/perseus/intstud.htm

Your Password:

If you have any questions, please call my major professor, Dr. Schwartz at (850) 644-6777 or send me an email at pam3453@fsu.edu.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. If you choose not participate or to withdraw from the study at any time, there will be no penalty, (it will not affect your grade). The results of the study may be published, but only group responses will be reported. Information obtained during the course of the study will remain confidential, to the extent allowed by law. Your participation is appreciated. Thank you again for your assistance.

Patricia Golay, Doctoral Candidate
Florida State University
Dear Student:

As a social science student at FSU, we are interested in your views. I am conducting a research study to examine the global-mindedness of students. This email links you to the survey. It only takes a few minutes to complete. I am graduate student under the direction of Professor Robert Schwartz in the College of Education and the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at Florida State University.

Please click on the link below and it will take you to the survey. By entering your password and completing the survey, you are agreeing to participate in the study. I will be happy to share the results upon completion of the study.

**Survey Link:** [http://websurvey.coss.fsu.edu/perseus/instud.htm](http://websurvey.coss.fsu.edu/perseus/instud.htm)

**Your Password:**

If you have any questions, please call my major professor, Dr. Schwartz at (850) 644-6777 or send me an email at pam3453@fsu.edu.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. If you choose not participate or to withdraw from the study at any time, there will be no penalty, (it will not affect your grade). The results of the study may be published, but only group responses will be reported. Information obtained during the course of the study will remain confidential, to the extent allowed by law. Your participation is appreciated. Thank you again for your assistance.

Patricia Golay, Doctoral Candidate
Florida State University
Dear Student:

As a student who has studied abroad, we are again interested in your views. I am concluding my research study to examine the effects of internationally – related study on the development of global-mindedness in students. This email links you to the post-test survey. It only takes a few minutes to complete. I am a graduate student under the direction of Professor Robert Schwartz in the College of Education and the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at Florida State University.

Please click on the link below and it will take you to the survey. By entering your password and completing the survey, you are agreeing to participate in the study. I will be happy to share the results upon completion of the study.

**Survey Link:** [http://websurvey.coss.fsu.edu/perseus/intstud.htm](http://websurvey.coss.fsu.edu/perseus/intstud.htm)

**Your Password:**

If you have any questions, please call my major professor, Dr. Schwartz at (850) 644-6777 or send me an email at pam3453@fsu.edu.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. If you choose not participate or to withdraw from the study at any time, there will be no penalty, (it will not affect your grade). The results of the study may be published, but only group responses will be reported. Information obtained during the course of the study will remain confidential, to the extent allowed by law. Your participation is appreciated. Thank you again for your assistance.

Patricia Golay, Doctoral Candidate
Florida State University
Dear Student:

As a social science student during spring semester 2005 at FSU, we are again interested in your views. I am concluding my research study to examine the global-mindedness of students. This email links you to the post-test survey. It only takes a few minutes to complete. I am graduate student under the direction of Professor Robert Schwartz in the College of Education and the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at Florida State University.

Please click on the link below and it will take you to the survey. By entering your password and completing the survey, you are agreeing to participate in the study. I will be happy to share the results upon completion of the study.

Survey Link: http://websurvey.coss.fsu.edu/perseus/instud.htm

Your Password:

If you have any questions, please call my major professor, Dr. Schwartz at (850) 644-6777 or send me an email at pam3453@fsu.edu.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. If you choose not participate or to withdraw from the study at any time, there will be no penalty, (it will not affect your grade). The results of the study may be published, but only group responses will be reported. Information obtained during the course of the study will remain confidential, to the extent allowed by law. Your participation is appreciated. Thank you again for your assistance.

Patricia Golay, Doctoral Candidate
Florida State University
APPENDIX G

Permission to Conduct Research Letter For International Programs
June 28, 2004

Dr. Jim Pitts
Florida State University
International Programs
A5500 University Center
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2420

Dear Dr. Pitts,

I am seeking permission from the Office of International Programs to conduct dissertation research. My research plan includes pre-post testing of students enrolled in the London, Florence, the Republic of Panama, and Valencia and possibly additional programs to increase sample size as needed. I also plan to conduct semi-structured interviews with selected participants upon return from their respective study abroad locations.

In accordance with established University policy, I will obtain consent from the Human Subjects Committee to conduct research. I would then like to be assigned a resource person from your office that can facilitate the collection of data and provide other relevant information as needed for the administration of the survey instrument such as email and street addresses. I plan to initially conduct a web-based survey and use a mail-based survey to follow up with non-respondents. I will also provide the IP resource person with a research timeline that will enable them to assist me without interference in their regularly assigned duties. I would like to begin my survey activities at the beginning of the spring 2005 semester and conduct interviews no later than the beginning of summer.

Upon completion of my research and the final dissertation product, the dissertation will be submitted electronically and available for your perusal.

I am requesting your approval for permission to conduct dissertation research as outlined above.

__________________________________
Approved     Date

__________________________________
Denied     Date
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