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Abstract

Internationalization has become widely recognized as a critical element of higher education, and study abroad is considered one of the most common methods to achieve it. Yet, despite the perceived value of study abroad for both students and faculty, institutions struggle with committing resources to such opportunities as well as assessing the true impact of these learning experiences. This study evaluated the Global Business Minor (GBM) program at William & Mary (W&M), the first program in the nation to allow students to earn a minor in a single summer through an innovative hybrid learning approach that involved one week at W&M, three weeks of online learning and eight weeks at University College Dublin in Ireland. This evaluation sought to provide insights to administrators regarding the facilitating conditions and barriers for the GBM as well as how the program contributed to the intercultural competence and professional development of students and faculty. This study involved in-depth interviews and document analyses to include student reflections on LinkedIn. The findings revealed the GBM contributed to the intercultural competence of students and faculty through an increased understanding of cultural awareness, diversity, and perspective. The program also contributed to the professional development of students through career awareness and building competencies related to communication and teamwork, as well as the professional development of faculty through the enrichment of curriculum and enhancement of teaching skills. Recommendations included dedicating resources to ensure sustainable and immersive learning programs, establishing clear program objectives with intentional assessments, and incentivizing faculty efforts to teach abroad in support of W&M’s mission to develop compassionate global citizens.
AN EVALUATION OF A GLOBAL BUSINESS MINOR PROGRAM ON THE
INTERCULTURAL COMPETENCE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF
STUDENTS AND FACULTY
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

In a hypercompetitive marketplace, study abroad has become a popular method for college students to gain the intercultural competence required to succeed in a dynamic global environment (Altbach, 2016). From a national economic perspective, study abroad “fits into the consumer ethos as a means of earning more money and enjoying the American standard of living” (Bolen, 2001, p. 187). Research has shown that study abroad results in valuable intercultural experiences (Deardorff, 2011) as well as practical skills to support academic and career success (Association of American Colleges & Universities, n.d.).

The common value proposition of study abroad programs is to provide learners with an understanding of how diverse cultural perspectives can lead to innovative solutions to complex challenges in a globalized economy (Ungar, 2016). Most often, learners in study abroad programs are considered the student participants; however, faculty are also impacted through learning opportunities while teaching in study abroad programs (Womble, De'Armond, & Babb, 2014). Yet, despite the perceived value of study abroad for both students and faculty, institutions struggle with committing financial and human capital resources to such opportunities as well as assessing the true impact of these learning experiences. To help fill this gap in the literature, an evaluation of the Global Business Minor (GBM) program at William & Mary (W&M) sought to provide data insights to administrators on the value of the GBM relative to the intercultural
competence and professional development of students and faculty as well as the academic and administrative resources required to support the delivery of a such a program.

The following sections define the internationalization of higher education and how study abroad serves as one method of supporting internationalization in American colleges and universities. The concept of internationalization is also examined specifically at W&M and the Raymond A. Mason School of Business (subsequently referred to as the “School of Business”). Then, the GBM at W&M is introduced as the study abroad program that served as the subject of this evaluation. The program was examined through the academic planning framework of Lattuca and Stark (2009) and a logic model of the GBM is presented. This chapter concludes with an overview of the selected evaluation model to analyze the context, inputs, processes, and products (Stufflebeam & Coryn, 2014) of the program from which the evaluation questions for this study were derived.

**Internationalization of Higher Education**

The concept of internationalization in higher education is not easily defined. Since the late 1980s, different institutions have used the term “internationalization” to reflect different activities (Knight, 2004). For many, the mobility of students and faculty (through programs such as study abroad) is the primary focus of internationalization (Altbach, 2016). For others, internationalization means the inclusion of a global perspective in the curriculum (Raby, 2007) or partnerships with institutions in other parts of the world (Brewer, 2010; Sutton, Egginton, & Favela, 2012). However, Knight (2004) contends that for internationalization to be truly understood, it must be viewed from both the institutional level and national level.
At the institutional level, internationalization is often the realm of a single program or department in a college or university (Eddy et al., 2013), rather than a coordinated effort across the institution that receives visible support from senior leadership. Stohl (2007) argued that a critical challenge for developing and sustaining internationalization in higher education is the engagement of faculty. “If we think of internationalization as how faculty and students learn about, learn from, and learn with others, we suggest that internationalization has value in and of itself” (Stohl, 2007, p. 369). Further, Hudzik (2011) noted that institutions need to practice comprehensive internationalization, defined as, “a commitment, confirmed through action, to infuse international and comparative perspectives throughout the teaching, research, and service missions of higher education” (p. 10). Inherent in this definition is the recognition of internationalization as an institutional strategy rather than simply an operational tactic. Building upon the need for internationalization to be recognized as a strategic imperative, the term “intelligent internationalization” has recently been conceived to refer to a program that “advocates for high quality professional and academic preparation among those working in this field” (de Wit, 2020, p. 189). In effect, how colleges and universities intentionally leverage internationalization efforts across campus impacts internal stakeholders to include students, faculty, staff, administrators, and external stakeholders in the local, state, and national markets.

At the national level, the concept of internationalization becomes even more complex, as a broad range of U.S. government entities and societal forces have a direct impact on colleges and universities through constraints related to policies and resources. Although the U.S. is often considered a world leader in higher education, there is
growing concern the U.S. is falling behind relative to internationalization (Altbach, 2016; Green, 2014). “Many have characterized U.S. higher education as a latecomer to contemporary internationalization, with the implication that other higher education systems (e.g., European) were much earlier adherents and practitioners” (Hudzik, 2011, p. 13). U.S. institutions often view internationalization more superficially as a relationship between nations, rather than more deeply as a relationship between cultures (de Wit, 2013). As Sutton et al. (2012) note, “Internationalization is as much a process of institutions reaching beyond their own boundaries as it is of accumulating resources within their walls” (p. 148). To better understand the national influence on internationalization and higher education, it is first necessary to define comprehensive internationalization and the elements of this model.

A model for comprehensive internationalization. The American Council on Education (ACE), through its Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement (CIGE), has established a model for comprehensive internationalization based on six pillars: articulated institutional commitment; administrative leadership, structure, and staffing; curriculum, co-curriculum, and learning outcomes; faculty policies and practices; student mobility; and, collaboration and partnerships (Peterson & Helms, 2013). Of specific interest to the GBM program are the pillars of curriculum and faculty practices. The curriculum pillar involves course content and pedagogy to include how, “courses foster experiential learning that enables students to apply and use what they are learning” (ACE, n.d., p. 4). The faculty practices pillar considers how the institution promotes faculty engagement in internationalization to include opportunities to travel
abroad for teaching and research (ACE, n.d.). The curriculum and faculty elements of the
GBM are reviewed further in the Program Theory section.

The ACE CIGE conducts a comprehensive survey every five years to examine the
state of internationalization at American colleges and universities. The most recent
survey, conducted in 2016, revealed that less than half (49%) of the responding
institutions have mission statements that specifically refer to internationalization or
related activities (Helms & Brajkovic, 2017). The Association of International Education
Administrators also reported a declining emphasis on internationalization in strategic
plans, with institutions reporting it as a high priority falling from 60% in 2012 to 47% in
2017 (Fischer, 2019). In addition, the ACE CIGE survey revealed that “only about one in
10 [institutions] specify international engagement as a consideration in promotion and
tenure decisions” (Helms & Brajkovic, 2017, p. vii). If faculty engagement is deemed
critical to the success of internationalization (Eddy et al., 2013; Stohl, 2007), then
institutions need to strengthen how they formally recognize the international efforts of
their faculty as well.

**Internationalization at W&M.** As previously mentioned, the first pillar in the
ACE CIGE model is an articulated institutional commitment to internationalization
(ACE, n.d.). W&M was an early proponent of study abroad, launching its first program
in 1924. To formalize and centralize study abroad programs across campus, the Reves
Center for International Studies was established in 1989. The mission of the Center is to
support “the internationalization of learning, teaching, research and community
involvement at the university” (William & Mary, 2018, para. 2). Over the years, the
Center has become recognized as one of the finest in the nation, and former Secretary of
State Madeleine Albright declared the Center as, “the best undergraduate program in international studies in our country” (Shatz, 2017, para. 15). An institutional commitment to internationalization at W&M, as evidenced by the work of the Reves Center, serves as the context for the GBM program.

In November 2019, the Institute of International Education announced W&M had achieved the highest percentage of undergraduates participating in study abroad programs compared to any other public university in the U.S. During the 2017-2018 academic year, 840 W&M undergraduate students studied abroad for academic credit, constituting 57.7% of the undergraduate student population (Hoving, 2019). Stephen Hanson, vice provost for international affairs and director of the Reves Center for International Studies, explained that,

“This success [of sending students abroad] reflects many factors, including the introduction of our new undergraduate COLL Curriculum within which study abroad is explicitly promoted, the great support of W&M faculty across every department and discipline, the hard work and vision of the Reves Center staff and of course the deep global engagement of W&M students themselves. (Hoving, 2018, para. 5)

This focus on internationalization is further emphasized in the new vision, mission, and values of the institution. W&M’s mission now explicitly states that, “We cultivate creative thinkers, principled leaders, and compassionate global citizens equipped for lives of meaning and distinction” (William & Mary, 2020, para. 2). Programs such as the GBM provide innovative opportunities for W&M to internationalize the institution and operationalize this renewed mission.

Internationalization at the School of Business. W&M’s School of Business is accredited by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB),
which requires a commitment to corporate social responsibility issues to include globalization, sustainability, and diversity. It is expected that accredited schools will foster sensitivity towards a greater understanding of cultural differences and global perspectives. In addition, the accreditation standards emphasize the importance of faculty engaging in the world beyond their own institutions and home countries (AACSB, 2020).

The School of Business has a stated mission “to serve the Commonwealth, the nation, and the global community both by offering high-quality educational programs at the undergraduate, graduate, and professional levels and by creating and communicating new knowledge” (Raymond A. Mason School of Business, 2020a, para. 1). However, the school mission differs from the institutional mission in that it takes a rather extrinsic student approach to internationalization (i.e., students serve the global community) versus the institution’s intrinsic student approach to internationalization (i.e., development of students as global citizens).

There have been various efforts in the School of Business during the past several years to take a more intentional approach to internationalization. From 2008-2013, the undergraduate program offered a study abroad experience in the summer for business school students in partnership with Corvinus University in Budapest, Hungary. In 2015, a Global Ad Hoc Committee delivered an internal report that proclaimed the need to clarify the strategic role of cross-cultural and international experiences in the School. The Committee noted that “gaining a stronger cross-cultural awareness and global mindset is critical to our student’s education and success in today’s competitive environment. However, there were no direct actions taken as a result of the report to
develop a strategic and integrated vision for internationalization across the School. In 2018, another internal report was developed by two senior faculty members that outlined a possible global vision for the School. The guiding principles for operationalizing this vision included students becoming globally aware, globally experienced, and globally engaged. Although this vision was not formally adopted by the School administration, it highlights the importance that faculty placed on internationalization in the School of Business and the foundation upon which the GBM was established.

**Background of Study Abroad in the United States**

The Institute of International Education (2018), established after World War I, was one of the first organizations to advocate for international exchange to instill a greater understanding across cultures and serves as a conduit for facilitating collaboration between students, scholars and institutions. Its founders believed that “we could not achieve lasting peace without greater understanding between nations – and that international education exchange formed the strongest basis for fostering such understanding” (Institute of International Education, 2018, para. 3). With support from the Institute of International Education, the University of Delaware (2018) established the first study abroad program in the U.S. in 1923. As mentioned previously, W&M joined this early push towards internationalization by launching its first study abroad program in 1924 (“Announce courses and plans,” 1924). Thus, internationalization efforts and the legacy of study abroad is strong at W&M.

By the 1930s, international exchange programs became more popular as a method for diversifying the curriculum as well as building additional sources of funding for institutions (Schwarz, 2007). The perceived value of these programs also expanded to
include a positive impact on student development (Schwarz, 2007). During his tenure as president of Smith College, the historic women’s institution, Allen Neilson penned a letter to parents in 1934 about the importance of study abroad and proclaimed, “In my opinion it is in practically every case the most valuable year spent in College” (as referenced in Schwarz, 2007, para. 20). Decades later, Chickering and Braskamp (2009) reinforced the value of study abroad by asserting that, “developing and internalizing a global perspective is an essential part of a holistic development paradigm—well-grounded in sound student development theory” (para. 1). The shared sentiments between these two references indicate an enduring value placed on the study abroad experience and its contribution to holistic student development.

Study abroad in the U.S. has also been bolstered through the support of senior government leaders (Bolen, 2001). In 1946, Senator J. William Fulbright proposed a program for U.S. citizens to go abroad and for non-U.S. citizens to visit the U.S. to conduct research, study and teach. The Fulbright Program is now considered the signature international educational exchange program sponsored by the U.S. Department of State’s Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (“Fulbright history,” n.d.). Since its inception, the Fulbright Program has been a prominent contributor to campus internationalization, with more than 370,000 individuals having participated in a Fulbright exchange (Hoffa & DePaul, 2010).

More recently, in 2009, the Obama administration touted a plan to send 100,000 American students to China in the “100,000 Strong Initiative” and First Lady Michelle Obama declared study abroad as a “key component of this administration’s foreign policy” (Fischer, 2011, para. 1). This venture was initially met with skepticism relative
to anticipated challenges with logistics and funding. At the time, only 13,000 American students were studying in China each year. However, as part of this initiative, 400 colleges committed to doubling the number of students sent to China by 2014 (Fischer, 2011). Even though the program seemed to have an audacious goal, it proved attainable with more than 100,000 American students studying abroad in China during 2014. To sustain its success, the program evolved into an independent nonprofit organization now operating as the US-China Strong Foundation (n.d.).

**Current state of study abroad programs in the United States.** The Forum on Education Abroad (2011) defines a study abroad program as, “An education abroad enrollment option designed to result in academic credit” (p. 13). In the most recent ACE internationalization survey, the decision was made to shift from the term “study abroad” to “education abroad.” ACE defines education abroad as, “service learning, internships, research experiences, and other non-classroom-based activities that take students to other countries and contribute to their learning and development” (Helms & Brajkovic, 2017, p. 3). Since the GBM program reflects the traditional concept of “study abroad,” that term was used rather than the comprehensive term of “education abroad” in this paper.

The Forum on Education Abroad (2011) notes that a broad range of study abroad programming exists, to include travel excursions (during which students visit different countries), language instruction (where the primary focus is immersion in a language) and theme programs (focused on a particular subject, such as global business). The duration of such programs can involve short-term (lasting 8 weeks or less), a quarter (9-11 weeks), a semester (12-17 weeks), or a year (generally 26-45 weeks). Over 90% of
U.S. colleges and universities currently offer study abroad programs (Twombly, Salisbury, Tumanut, & Klute, 2012).

Short-term study abroad options have proliferated since the 1990s, as they are typically a more affordable and flexible option to the traditional semester abroad programs (Core, 2017). For students who lack resources relative to time and money, “short-term programs may be viewed as crucial for achieving broad and more egalitarian access to study abroad” (Tarrant, Rubin, & Stoner, 2014, p. 142). There were 332,727 American students pursuing study abroad in 2017, which was an increase of 2.3% from the previous year. However, the total number of American undergraduate students participating in a study abroad program during their academic career is merely 10% (Institute of International Education, 2018).

Program Description

Students at W&M have various alternatives for study abroad through the Reves Center and the University’s liberal arts curriculum (Hoving, 2019). However, there are nominal opportunities for students or faculty to have international education experiences focused on business. Thus, the GBM program was a unique initiative for W&M undergraduate students to earn 15 credits towards the fulfillment of a minor through a hybrid learning approach during the summer. The GBM program involved study for one week at W&M, three weeks of engagement through online learning prior to traveling abroad, and eight weeks at University College Dublin (UCD) in Ireland. Thus, based on the aforementioned definitions from The Forum on Education Abroad (2011), the GBM would be considered a summer semester program. However, since students only spent eight weeks in the host country, one could also argue that the GBM program offered the
benefits of a short-term study abroad to include greater flexibility for learners to pursue other interests during the traditional academic year.

Students enrolled in the GBM program were required to have a non-business major. The summer curriculum for the minor included coursework in global business, international finance, international marketing, international management, and special topics focused on design thinking. Courses were taught by W&M full-time faculty with the exception of the Global Business Immersion course, which was taught by a UCD faculty member. A Principles of Accounting course was also required to earn the minor designation on the student’s transcript; students were encouraged to enroll in that course prior to the start of the summer GBM program.

On a personal note, I was one of three W&M faculty members who submitted the formal proposal to launch the GBM program. Upon unanimous approval of the program by the School of Business faculty in September 2016, I volunteered to serve as faculty director for the GBM (with no additional compensation). In this role, I was responsible for overseeing the academic curriculum as well as supporting the faculty members who were teaching in the program. A “Researcher as Instrument Statement” is included in Appendix A that outlines my personal background and perspectives related to the GBM.

In 2017, the inaugural year of the program, the GBM attracted 35 students, making it the second largest study abroad program at W&M. Similar success was achieved in 2018, with 31 students completing the GBM experience. However, as examined further in Appendix A, several changes occurred within the School between 2017–2018 that seemed to have a negative impact on the program. Our Associate Dean, who had championed the program, left the institution in the spring of 2017 to become
Dean of another nationally ranked school of business. In addition, enrollment declined significantly in the School of Business during that time, which meant greater efforts had to be directed towards stabilizing the traditional major and minor programs. There were also growing opportunities for non-business majors to engage with the School of Business through student associations, the Entrepreneurship Center, and a new Innovation & Entrepreneurship Minor program (Raymond A. Mason School of Business, 2020b). These environmental conditions seemingly contributed to a significant decline in applicants to the GBM and led to the program not being offered during the summer of 2019 and being placed “on hiatus” for the summer of 2020.

The following sections examine the sociocultural context and foundational elements of the GBM using the program theory of Lattuca and Stark (2009). A logic model was constructed that depicts the path from program creation to implementation to the expected outcomes for participants. Finally, a program evaluation model is presented and the significance of the study is outlined to underscore the need for this analysis.

Program Theory

Lattuca and Stark (2009) recommend framing academic programs relative to the sociocultural context and suggest eight elements that are applicable to all levels of curriculum: purpose, content, sequence, learners, instructional processes, instructional resources, evaluation, and adjustment. It is helpful to use this framework to analyze the various components of the GBM program.

Purpose. Lattuca and Stark (2009) use the term “purpose” to reflect the knowledge, skills and attitudes that will be learned in a given curriculum. The initial impetus for the development of the GBM program was student demand for business
education at W&M had exceeded capacity for enrollment in the School of Business. Students desiring to major or minor in business can only apply for admission to the School upon completion of core curriculum requirements after their sophomore year. In 2015, fewer than 60% of student applicants were accepted in either the major or minor programs in the School of Business. Thus, the Associate Dean proposed the launch of a summer program that would meet the needs of students wanting to study business without the capacity constraints experienced during the traditional academic semesters. The Associate Dean also viewed this program as an opportunity to internationalize the curriculum and experiment with a hybrid approach to education to include online learning as well as traditional classroom experiences.

The primary objective of the GBM, as stated in the program proposal, was to provide business acumen to liberal arts majors at W&M in order to diversify their practical knowledge and critical thinking skills as well as support self-discovery in the context of an international business environment. A secondary objective was to provide learners an understanding of how diverse cultural perspectives can lead to creative solutions for complex challenges in a globalized economy. These objectives aligned with the Association of American Colleges & Universities (n.d.) Liberal Education and America’s Promise initiative, which recognizes global learning as a “high impact” practice with study abroad having a statistically significant impact on personal and practical learning for students.

The GBM was also viewed as an opportunity for students to fulfill the requirements of the College curriculum (COLL). In particular, COLL 300 courses at W&M emphasize the importance of connecting theory to practice in an international
context; these courses been the motivation for many students to engage in a global or cross-cultural experience at W&M (William & Mary, 2019a). Since the GBM was offered through W&M’s Reves Center for International Studies, the courses in the program automatically fulfilled the COLL 300 requirement.

**Content.** The content of a curriculum involves the selected subject matter that will be used to develop specific knowledge, skills and attitudes (Lattuca & Stark, 2009). Faculty and administrators across the School of Business were consulted to determine which courses would comprise the content areas of the GBM program. Since all undergraduate business students take Principles of Accounting as the foundational course in the School, GBM students were required to take that course as well, preferably prior to their summer abroad. The remaining courses were completed in a hybrid learning approach, as described in the next section. In addition to accounting, students were required to take courses in global business, international finance, international marketing, international management, and special topics. The majority of the courses were delivered by full-time W&M faculty members, with the exception of the global business course, which was delivered by a faculty member from UCD.

**Sequence.** Lattuca and Stark (2009) use the term “sequence” to represent how the academic content is arranged to facilitate learning. Based upon an Internet search in 2019, the GBM program appeared to be the only one of its kind in the U.S. that allowed students to earn 15 credits towards fulfilling a minor designation during a single summer. Although other colleges and universities offer Summer Business Institutes in the U.S., there is seemingly no other program that offers a GBM through a hybrid approach and
study abroad. Thus, the nature of the program as a minor required an intentional focus on the alignment and sequencing of courses.

The sequence of the program began with an orientation session held in mid-April to introduce students to faculty and provide the basics of how to prepare for the summer experience. Typically, W&M study abroad programs through the Reves Center require a one-credit preparation course prior to the summer abroad. However, the GBM program was the first study abroad experience at W&M to offer several weeks of online education prior to arrival in the host country to provide greater integration of learning opportunities and flexibility for both students and faculty. The GBM program involved study for one week at W&M, three weeks of engagement through online learning prior to traveling abroad, and eight weeks at UCD in Ireland. The initial program experience began at W&M during the third week of May. The first day of the program included an overview of the curriculum and team-building exercises; each of the following four days was dedicated to the four courses taught by W&M faculty (i.e., international finance, international marketing, special topics and international management). The GBM also included a fifth course, Global Business Immersion, that was introduced in Ireland and taught by a UCD faculty member.

The next three weeks of the program involved online learning with readings and assignments to prepare learners for their experience in Ireland. Since the online learning section of the program was asynchronous, it involved the delivery of the four courses simultaneously, with intersecting content. However, the faculty made an intentional effort to stagger deliverable due dates, so students had a clear understanding that finance assignments were due on Monday, marketing assignments were due on Tuesday, special
topic assignments were due on Wednesday and management assignments were due on Thursday. It was expected that requiring students to organize and prioritize various deliverables would simulate a real-world business experience.

The final eight weeks of the program, starting in mid-June, were delivered at UCD with two-week sessions dedicated to each W&M course (international finance, international marketing, special topics and international management, delivered in that respective order during summer 2018). In addition, one day during each of the eight weeks was dedicated to the global business course taught by a UCD faculty member.

Learners. This element of the framework addresses how the curriculum meets the needs of a specific group of learners (Lattuca & Stark, 2009). As previously mentioned, W&M has the highest percentage of undergraduate students participating in study abroad programs compared to any other public university in the U.S. During the 2017-2018 academic year, 840 W&M undergraduate students studied abroad for academic credit, constituting 57.7% of the undergraduate student population (Hoving, 2019). Similar to most study abroad programs at W&M, participants in the GBM program were selected based on a submitted application and a minimum 3.0 GPA. GBM students included a broad range of arts and science majors and represented several states. There was no second-language requirement for the GBM program, which opened enrollment to a greater number of students. In 2017, 43% of students received scholarships for the GBM program, and all participants self-reported that their financial needs were met. What remains unknown is the number of students who self-selected out of this study abroad program due to personal resource constraints.
Since the majority of GBM student participants were rising sophomores and juniors, most of these students had not determined a specific career path and were open to learning about new opportunities. However, since W&M students are required to declare a major by sophomore year, many of the GBM participants had already selected majors to include Anthropology, Biology, Economics, English Literature, Government, History, International Relations, Materials Science, Neuroscience, Physics, Psychology and Public Policy. For these learners, it was hoped that a GBM would increase not only their knowledge, but also their confidence to pursue challenging internships in the summers after completion of the program and build successful careers upon graduation.

For purposes of this study, learners also included the W&M faculty teaching in the program. Interestingly, the School of Business has a small number of faculty members who have taught overseas compared to similar institutions of higher education. The faculty members selected to teach in the GBM program were determined through a competitive application process and included individuals that held both tenure and clinical (non-tenure) roles. There were three W&M faculty members who taught in the summer of 2017 and three different W&M faculty members who taught in the summer of 2018 (and I taught the international marketing course both summers). The selected faculty were award-winning educators, each with more than 10 years of teaching experience. Six of the seven faculty members (including me) had previously taught overseas, with four of the faculty members having taught in the previous School of Business study abroad program in Budapest.

Instructional processes. Latucca and Stark (2009) relate instructional processes to the activities that influence student learning. In the case of the GBM, it was expected
that faculty would be attracted to the program because it allowed them to be innovative in the development of instructional processes, to include online learning as well as international teaching. The hybrid format of the program, which involved three weeks of online learning prior to the host country experience, could impact both the teaching and learning processes. This hybrid format could also potentially influence the faculty that applied to teach in the program. The intent of leveraging educational technologies (Edwards & Teekens, 2012; Kelly, 2010) through the online section of the program was to allow students and faculty greater flexibility, as well as lower opportunity costs (i.e., decreased concern about the loss of potential gains from alternative options when choosing this option), during the learning process.

The instructional processes included an intentional requirement of experiential learning to meet the program objectives. Faculty integrated experiential learning in their classes to include guest lectures, comprehensive projects based on the Irish marketplace and excursions across Dublin as well as Belfast, Galway, and other regions of Ireland. Not only did these excursions enable students to learn more about Irish culture and appreciate diversity within the country, but it also allowed students to reflect on what they were learning in the program and how they might apply these lessons learned to their own lives and careers.

During the first year of the program, students were assigned to a five-person cohort team that remained the same for each course. The teams were purposively selected by the GBM faculty to ensure diversity across gender, major, and class year. The reasoning behind developing an assigned cohort structure was to simulate the experience of working in a business team with a diversity of perspectives. This cohort
team structure was initially adopted for the second year of the program as well. However, one of the GBM students returned to the U.S. midway through their time in Ireland and the cohort structure had to be dissolved, with randomized teams assigned for each of the remaining weeks in the summer session.

**Instructional resources.** Lattuca and Stark (2009) define instructional resources as both materials and settings that are involved in the learning process. An important aspect of our role as academics is not to simply impart knowledge, but also to design learning environments that support the acquisition and application of knowledge (Adams & Felder, 2008). In the case of the GBM program, the setting involved a living-learning environment for students and faculty in Ireland. Living-learning programs are typically “residential housing programs that incorporate academic-based themes and build community through common learning” (Bower & Inkelas, 2010, para. 4). Since this environment was deemed critical to the student experience, a dedicated W&M Program Director (a former W&M graduate student) was on-site for the duration of the eight weeks in Ireland for both the 2017 and 2018 programs. This individual was responsible for ensuring a positive living experience at UCD as well as coordinating social activities to include local dinners and cultural events.

At UCD, students, faculty and the Program Director lived in a residential hall area that was a quick five-minute walk to the business school and allowed for significant engagement opportunities both inside and outside of the classroom. UCD has the largest urban campus in Europe and is ranked in the top 1% of educational institutions worldwide (University College Dublin, n.d.). UCD also offers extensive resources through the Summer at UCD (University College Dublin, n.d.) office that supports study
abroad programs from institutions across the world to include offering a myriad of cultural and social experiences.

In addition to the instructional resources at UCD, the GBM program included a week of classes at W&M in the School of Business as well as online learning using Blackboard, a resource that was available to students throughout the duration of the summer. At W&M, study abroad experiences are facilitated through the Reves Center Global Education Office, which provided both administrative support to the GBM program as well as student and faculty guidance regarding passport requirements, transportation, travel budgets, and personal conduct.

**Evaluation and adjustment.** As Lattuca and Stark (2009) explain, “In the academic plan terminology, evaluation involves considerations of the suitability of all of the plan elements” (p. 11), not simply those elements related to the assessment of the instructional process. Unfortunately, the GBM was created so quickly that a comprehensive evaluation of program objectives through backward design (Harvard Business Publishing, 2019) or another assessment approach was neither considered nor established. However, the evaluation of certain program elements did occur at both the course level and program level. Professors evaluated student deliverables in each of the five courses. Students also completed a standard W&M survey evaluation at the end of each course. At the GBM program level, students completed a survey about their program experience after the first week of the program at W&M in 2017 and 2018 and after the conclusion of the program at UCD in 2018. At the institution level, the Reves Center surveyed the 2018 GBM students to gain feedback after their international experiences. To date, there has not been a single individual who has reviewed the course,
program and institutional assessments to determine how the GBM is being perceived by faculty and students. This evaluation study was intended to fill this gap.

**Logic Model**

A logic model that depicts the path from GBM program creation to implementation to the expected outcomes for participants is outlined in Appendix B. The inputs of the program consisted of funding, facilities, technology, human capital and prior experiences of participants. The activities included W&M systems, student advancement through the academic model, experiential learning, and evaluation. The outputs of the program involved factors such as the number of participants, course deliverables, site visits and student assessments. The outcomes of the program can be viewed from a short-term, intermediate and long-term perspective. Short-term outcomes, prior to departing for the host country, included building a sense of community with W&M students and faculty. Intermediate outcomes, expected during the experience in the host country, included skills that cultivate an understanding of global business from the Irish perspective. After the conclusion of the GBM program, expected long-term outcomes included increased intercultural competence and professional development.

**Overview of the Evaluation Approach**

This study was aligned with the pragmatic paradigm and the Use Branch of program evaluation that focuses on collecting data useful to stakeholders (Mertens & Wilson, 2012). The evaluation was formative in nature to determine possible areas of improvement to the program relative to delivering experiences that build intercultural competence and professional development skills of students and faculty. The selected evaluation model was used to analyze the context, inputs, processes, and products
(Stufflebeam & Coryn, 2014) of the program. This section concludes with an overview of the proposed evaluation questions for this study.

**Program evaluation model.** There are four major branches of program evaluation: Methods, Use, Values, and Social Justice (Mertens & Wilson, 2012). The Methods Branch emphasizes quantitative designs and data. This approach is considered postpositivist and views the evaluator as an objective neutral party. The Use Branch relies on mixed methods data that is determined useful by stakeholders. This approach is considered pragmatic and views the evaluator as a social relations manager to facilitate the use of programs. The Values Branch identifies multiple values and perspectives through the use of qualitative tools. This approach is considered constructivist and views the evaluator as a communicator who engages in meaningful dialogue. The Social Justice Branch leverages mixed methods data that assumes the viewpoint of marginalized groups. This approach is considered transformative and views the evaluator as a relationship builder who is focused on human rights.

This study was aligned with the Use Branch of program evaluation, which advocates a participatory process for collecting data deemed meaningful by the stakeholders. The Use Branch is grounded in the philosophical perspective that the methodology used, and the data collected, should reflect the rationale underpinning the study (Mertens & Wilson, 2012). This evaluation model was considered appropriate for the GBM because it is responsive in nature and allows for changes in the program to be made based on the data gathered and the needs of participants.

**Purpose of the evaluation.** The approach to this evaluation was formative in nature to determine areas in need of improvement in the GBM and to assess program
effectiveness. Specifically, this evaluation sought to understand the program’s perceived contributions to intercultural competence and professional development for students and faculty since these were important elements of the program objectives. Consideration was given to content, sequence, instructional processes, and instructional resources relative to their role in the intercultural competence and professional development skills of students and faculty.

As previously noted, there was a significant decline in applicants during the proposed third year of the GBM program. Thus, student and faculty participants in the first two years of the program were interviewed to better understand their experiences in the program and whether the GBM met the intended objectives. These insights were then shared with administrators to consider what changes could be made to develop a sustainable program moving forward.

Focus of the evaluation. Daniel Stufflebeam, a recognized theorist associated with the Use Branch of program evaluation (Mertens & Wilson, 2012), developed an evaluation model that focuses on the program’s context, inputs, processes, and products (CIPP; Stufflebeam & Coryn, 2014). The basis of the CIPP model is to learn by doing through a continuous improvement effort to ensure effectiveness and efficiency.

The context evaluation seeks to “assess needs, problems, assets, and opportunities, plus relevant contextual conditions and dynamics” (Stufflebeam & Coryn, 2014, p. 312). In formative evaluation, understanding context is critical for determining objectives and identifying possible improvements.

The input evaluation outlines the critical resources needed for the program and allows for the evaluation of alternatives relative to the design and delivery of the
program. In formative evaluations, decision makers use input evaluation for selecting a program strategy as well as determining the program plans and budgets.

The process evaluation examines how the program is being implemented and assesses how the program is performing. This feedback can be especially useful in making formative evaluation decisions about how to modify or improve the program. In addition, potential adopters of similar programs may use insights from the process evaluation to guide the adaptation and application of the approach to their own organizations.

The product evaluation involves an analysis of the costs and outcomes of the program and considers the merit of the program relative to its objectives. This evaluation examines both intended and unintended outcomes as well as short-term and long-term impact. Product evaluations should not only be conducted upon completing the program, but also during the program to provide interim feedback and additional support and resources if necessary to achieve expected outcomes.

Stufflebeam and Coryn (2014) outline several important questions to consider across each of the CIPP elements when conducting a formative program evaluation, such as this study of the GBM. At the context level, the fundamental question should be what are the highest priorities for W&M and the School of Business? To meet these needs, what goals should be pursued?

Assuming that internationalization, as well as intercultural competence and professional development of students and faculty, are high priority needs for W&M and the School of Business, then potential inputs to the GBM program should be evaluated. In effect, what are the most promising approaches to meet the internationalization needs
of students and faculty? How do these approaches compare with respect to value and cost? How can the most promising program be effectively designed, funded, staffed and delivered? What are possible barriers to implementation (Stufflebeam & Coryn, 2014)?

The process evaluation questions should consider whether the GBM program is worth continuing in the future. Was the program offered in 2017 and 2018 on time and on budget? Are there opportunities to improve the design and/or implementation of the program? The product evaluation questions should also consider what indicators of success are being observed and achieved. Are there side effects (positive or negative) for students and faculty emerging as a result of the GBM program? Were the program’s achievements relative to intercultural competence and professional development (for both students and faculty) worth the investment? Were there implementation factors that could be modified to sustain success (Stufflebeam & Coryn, 2014)?

**Problem Statement**

Internationalization on college campuses has become widely recognized as a critical element of higher education (Proctor & Rumbley, 2018). Thus, the inherent problem, and opportunity, is how to deliver internationalization in a manner that is both cost-effective and impactful on students, faculty, the School of Business and the institution of W&M. One of the most common methods to achieve internationalization of the college curriculum is through study abroad (Altbach, 2016). In the past, it was typical for students to engage in study abroad for a traditional academic semester, whereby students would attend existing curriculum programs at foreign institutions (Brewer, 2010). More recently, new forms of study abroad have been developed that allow students to have international experiences for a shorter duration, which means less
expense and opportunity costs than those associated with a full semester abroad (Core, 2017).

This evaluation study examined the GBM program that was offered at W&M in the summers of 2017 and 2018. Specifically, this study examined the expectations and perceived experiences of student and faculty participants to determine the impact of the GBM program on their intercultural competence and professional development.

**Evaluation Questions**

The general categories of evaluation questions for this study are:

1. What are the perceived facilitating conditions and barriers to developing intercultural competence and professional development through a GBM program for students and faculty?
2. How do students perceive the GBM program contributed to their intercultural competence and professional development?
3. How do faculty perceive the GBM program contributed to their intercultural competence and professional development?

The concepts of intercultural competence and professional development are examined to a greater extent in the next chapter to facilitate the development of operational definitions to support the evaluation methods.

**Significance of the Study**

This evaluation analyzed the effectiveness of the design and delivery of the GBM and the impact of this program on the intercultural competence and professional development of students and faculty at W&M. Although this study could have examined either students or faculty, the existing literature is limited on the impact of study abroad
as a single phenomenon upon both of these groups and this evaluation sought to further that body of knowledge. Since this study was aligned with the pragmatic paradigm and the Use Branch of program evaluation, the findings are intended to be useful to various stakeholders to include the School of Business, W&M, and the field of higher education.

When assessing the significance of this study, it is helpful to consider the practice of systems thinking. As educators, we need to understand the system in which we operate to enable us to lead from a whole system perspective. Peter Senge (2000) asserted that institutions can build their own capacity to find creative solutions to educational challenges through systems thinking. Senge based this premise on The Fifth Discipline learning orientation that involves cultivating a shared vision, creating shared mental models, practicing systems thinking, developing personal mastery, and engaging in team learning. Senge (2000) referred to schools as “nested systems of activity” (p. 11) to include the classroom (i.e., School of Business), institution (i.e., W&M) and learning community (i.e., field of higher education). The following sections expand upon the significance of this study to each of these stakeholders.

**School of Business.** The competitive nature of the marketplace (Jaschik, 2019) demands that the School of Business develop innovative programs such as the GBM. As of 2019, there were no other study abroad programs in the U.S. that allowed students to earn 15 credits towards fulfilling a minor designation during a summer semester through a hybrid approach of campus, online and host country learning experiences. The GBM was also the first program in the School of Business developed specifically for non-business majors, thus reaching a market that might not have been engaged otherwise. In addition, the GBM program could spur interest for students to complete a one-year
graduate program in the School of Business; the GBM not only introduces students to the practice of business but also allows them to complete a full semester of coursework, so a student could earn both an undergraduate degree and graduate degree within 4 years depending on how many advanced placement credits they had upon admission to W&M.

Nationally, business schools have been criticized as being woefully behind in the internationalization of faculty, students, and curriculum (AACSB, 2016). Thus, the GBM could spur internationalization as well as support AACSB accreditation standards in the School of Business. Although there has been an effort by individual faculty in the School of Business to integrate international concepts in the curriculum, there are currently no study abroad experiences specific to business with the exception of the Executive MBA program. In addition, the School provides nominal opportunities for faculty to have international education experiences. Therefore, this evaluation could significantly impact the School by revealing how to internationalize the curriculum and strengthen the engagement of students and faculty in this regard.

William & Mary. Since W&M seeks to “cultivate creative thinkers, principled leaders, and compassionate global citizens equipped for lives of meaning and distinction” (William & Mary, 2020, para. 2), this study could provide insights on how to internationalize the institution and operationalize this mission. W&M is also exploring how to strengthen academic program offerings in the summer months (William & Mary, 2019c) and this study could help inform those efforts. In addition, this evaluation could benefit the Reves Center’s understanding of how students perceive their study abroad experiences and how to better promote the value of these experiences to students.
**Higher education.** As previously mentioned, ACE (n.d.) has established a model for comprehensive internationalization that emphasizes the pillars of curriculum and faculty practices. Thus, this study could contribute to the literature on programs that foster experiential learning in the curriculum. This evaluation could also provide insight on the value of faculty engagement in internationalization through teaching abroad. In addition, the findings of this study could also be shared at higher education conferences and in publications such as *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad.*

**Summary**

This chapter introduced the concept of internationalization in higher education and how study abroad has served as one method of supporting internationalization in American colleges and universities. The GBM at W&M, which was the topic of this program evaluation, was examined through the academic planning framework of Lattuca and Stark (2009), and a logic model of the GBM was presented to reflect the intended outcomes of the program. Then, possible evaluation questions were considered relative to the context, inputs, processes and products (Stufflebeam & Coryn, 2014) of the program that will be used to support this study.

The next chapter delves deeper into a review of the literature to analyze the impact of study abroad on students, faculty and institutions. In particular, the concepts of intercultural competence and professional development relative to study abroad are reviewed to develop constructs around these terms that can be examined in the evaluation methods for this study.
CHAPTER 2: IMPACT OF STUDY ABROAD ON STUDENTS AND FACULTY

Internationalization should not necessarily be a goal unto itself, but rather a method for accomplishing other institutional goals such as the advancement of intercultural competence and professional development for both students and faculty. Study abroad serves as one method of supporting internationalization in American colleges and universities and is the focus of this evaluation of the GBM program at W&M. Prior to analyzing the specific experiences of students and faculty in the GBM, it is important to examine how intercultural competence and professional development are defined in the literature to establish working definitions for purposes of the study. In addition, this chapter will consider the value, and challenges, of study abroad for students and faculty. These insights will be leveraged to determine whether building intercultural competence through study abroad is viewed as contributing to the professional development of students and faculty in the GBM through a formal program evaluation, as examined in Chapter 3.

Intercultural Competence

In an increasingly connected and diverse world, it is becoming vital for individuals to understand the values of others as well as how to respond appropriately (Bauer-Wolf, 2018). Thus, intercultural competence development in students and faculty should no longer be considered simply a possibility but rather a necessity in higher education. As a result of the growing emphasis on intercultural competence, there is also
a growing number of terms, definitions and frameworks related to this concept
(Arasaratnam, 2016; Deardorff, 2006; Griffith, Wolfeld, Armon, Rios, & Liu, 2016).

In seminal research, Deardorff (2006) conducted a Delphi study with 24
intercultural scholars to determine how intercultural competence should be defined. The
results of this research found that most scholars preferred “a more general definition of
the construct as opposed to specific, delineated components as to exactly what constitutes
intercultural knowledge” (Deardorff, 2006, p. 247). Deardorff (2006) noted that the
majority of the surveyed scholars were from the U.S., which could result in a distinctly
Western perspective.

For purposes of this program evaluation, the definition of intercultural
competence will be based on the research of Deardorff (2011). The foundation for
intercultural competence involves understanding an individual’s attitudes regarding
respect, openness and curiosity towards other cultures (Deardorff, 2011). Building upon
this foundation, a study abroad experience can contribute to an individual’s knowledge of
cultural self-awareness. However, more important than simply the *acquisition* of
knowledge of cultural awareness is the *application* of this knowledge (Doyle, 2019).
Thus, the definition of intercultural competence that I had developed for this program
evaluation was, “the development of cultural awareness through experiential learning that
results in a demonstrated ability to listen, observe, and interpret different cultures; and to
analyze, evaluate, and relate to others with diverse backgrounds and experiences.”

Understanding how students and faculty apply their intercultural knowledge as a
result of the GBM program will be examined in this evaluation study. As Deardorff
(2011) noted, “Intercultural competence development is an ongoing process, and it
becomes important for individuals to be given opportunities to reflect on and assess the development of their own intercultural competence over time” (p. 68). The students and faculty interviewed for this study completed the program two to three years ago; thus, these individuals have had time to further reflect upon the value of the GBM experience relative to intercultural competence and professional development.

Various tools exist to support the assessment of intercultural competence to include the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI, 2019), the Global Perspective Inventory (GPI; Research Institute for Studies in Education, 2017), and the Test to Measure Intercultural Competence (TMIC; Schnabel, Kelava, & Van de Vijver, 2016). Although none of these survey instruments were deployed by the GBM program, it is important to consider the potential value of these tools for purposes of measuring intercultural competence. Such tools help to examine the baseline of an individual’s intercultural competence so that additional concepts and frameworks can be provided when needed to ensure that learning occurs before, during, and after the study abroad experience.

The IDI is a self-reported survey instrument offered by Hammer Holdings, Inc. that measures intercultural competence, or the “capability to shift cultural perspective and appropriately adapt behavior to cultural differences and commonalities” (IDI, 2019, para. 1). The survey is typically completed online as a pre- and post-test survey and includes 50 items; customized questions can also be added to the instrument. The IDI categorizes the questions in terms of cross-cultural goals, challenges when facing cultural differences, critical intercultural incidents, and ways to navigate cultural differences. The purpose of the IDI is to increase self-awareness of cross-cultural goals and challenges as
well as to encourage self-improvement related to these goals and challenges (IDI, 2019; West, 2015). This tool is further referenced in the section on the Impact of Study Abroad on Students.

The GPI is a self-reported instrument typically delivered as a pre- and post-test survey that measures how students think and view themselves in relation to others from different cultures, backgrounds, and value systems. The GPI recognizes the importance of holistic human development and encompasses two theoretical perspectives: cultural development and intercultural communication. Analysis of the cultural development perspective occurs through survey scales that consider cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal dimensions. The intercultural communication perspective is analyzed through survey scales that consider cognitive, affective, and behavioral dimensions (Research Institute for Studies in Education, 2017). The purpose of the GPI is to provide evidence of changes in global perspective at a variety of stages, including before and after a study abroad program, with the intention of guiding conversations related to student learning, program improvement and institutional effectiveness (Braskamp, Braskamp, & Engberg, 2014; West, 2015).

The standard TMIC is a compositional model that contains 75 self-reported items and 17 situational judgment items that seek to operationalize 17 facets of intercultural competence (Wolff & Borzikowsky, 2018). A short form of the TMIC (known as TMIC-S) was also developed to simply focus on six facets of intercultural competence to include sensitivity in communication, learning/information seeking, socializing, self-management/goal-setting, creating synergies/mediation of interests, and self-
knowledge/cultural identity reflection (Schnabel et al., 2016; Wolff & Borzikowsky, 2018).

These assessment tools share common elements relative to the self-reported nature of the survey questions and a comprehensive framework for measuring the development of competencies over time. By nature of their design, these instruments track individuals’ perceptions of their own attitudes but fail to demonstrate the degree to which students might have actually exercised these attitudes during or after the study abroad experience (Salisbury, 2015). In other words, these instruments measure perceived impact but fail to account for student performance, which should be linked to program outcomes.

Deardorff (2006) affirmed that there are limitations to using standardized surveys as the sole instrument for assessing the true impact of learning associated with intercultural competence as a result of a study abroad program. Recommended assessment methods are “primarily qualitative in nature, including the use of interviews, observation, and case studies, as well as the possible use of standardized competency instruments” (Deardorff, 2006, p. 258). Thus, even though the GBM did not utilize standardized competency instruments, there is still value in attempting to understand how intercultural competence was developed and applied by students and faculty in the GBM program through interviews and document analysis.

Since intercultural competence involves the ability to listen, observe and interpret as well as analyze, evaluate, and relate to others with diverse backgrounds and experiences, this process could also be considered a professional development
experience. As such, professional development is defined further for both students and faculty in the next section.

**Professional Development**

Similar to the various concepts related to intercultural competence, a broad range of terms are associated with professional development to include career development (Dwyer, 2004). Myriad channels exist for professional development experiences to include training offered by employers or programs that are external to the organization, which can be pursued independently by individuals. In the case of career development, these activities “may include skill training, performance feedback and coaching, planned job rotation, mentoring, and continuing education” (Cummings & Worley, 2005, p. 418). Career development tends to be viewed as a more specific form of professional development, as it follows closely from career planning and includes organizational practices that help employees implement those plans (Cummings & Worley, 2005). In addition to the different terms associated with professional development, the concept can have different meanings for different audiences. Thus, for purposes of this study, definitions of professional development were developed for the student audience as well as the faculty audience.

**Professional development for students.** Professional development for students involves the choice of career, the awareness of how a student’s intended profession may be viewed and practiced, and the acquisition of attitudes and cross-cultural skills that help a student become an effective professional (Ingraham & Peterson, 2004). Thus, professional development for students is more than simply preparing for a particular career path, but rather building skills that can be applicable to a broad range of
opportunities. Employers are increasingly emphasizing the need for collaboration, communication, critical thinking, and teamwork skills in students (Business Wire, 2016; Pasquerella, 2019). Therefore, it is appropriate to consider how the GBM program contributed to the development of such skills in students.

At W&M, students are assisted in their professional development efforts through the resources of the Cohen Career Center (2019). Services offered by the Center include individual advising and workshops on topics such as networking and interviewing. In addition, the Center provides access to online job search databases and sponsors career fairs. Students can also find professional development support through engagement with faculty and involvement with student associations.

**Professional development for faculty.** Professional development for faculty is the process of maturing and evolving as a professional in the field. This arc of development often includes continuing education to learn and advance skills (Business Wire, 2016). However, professional development can also involve professional reflection and a willingness to address one’s own needs (Ducheny, Alletzhauser, Crandell, & Schneider, 1997). The professional development market for the U.S. higher education segment is expected to exceed $2.5 billion by 2020 (Business Wire, 2016). This market has evolved over the years to include a diverse portfolio of products and services delivered in traditional face-to-face as well as online modes.

Unlike K-12 educators in the U.S. who typically have state-mandated continuing education requirements (Teach Tomorrow, 2019), post-secondary educators tend to be personally motivated to seek professional development opportunities. For tenure-track faculty, professional development can be viewed as an especially important requirement
to support research, teaching, and service. Paechter (1996) noted that, “professional development needs not only to be ongoing for the individual, in the sense of that person's development as a professional, but also to be understood in the sense of developing the profession” (p. 352). Thus, one could potentially argue that professional development in the context of a study abroad program not only allows faculty to develop intercultural competence for example, but also allows them to apply such knowledge to diversity and inclusion efforts when returning to their campus community.

Boyer (1990) explained there are multiple types of faculty scholarship to include the scholarship of discovery, scholarship of integration, scholarship of application and scholarship of teaching. The scholarship of teaching could be especially relevant to internationalization as faculty teaching abroad can discover new perspectives through overseas experiences. As a result of internationalization, there is an increasing demand for “the integration of international, global, intercultural and comparative perspectives into the teaching and learning process and program content” (Knight, 2012, p. 20). The scholarship of integration can also be supported through new networks that faculty develop during teaching abroad. Collaboration with peers who have diverse perspectives often serves to reinvigorate faculty (Pifer, 2010) and allows faculty to re-engage in the learning process (Eddy & Garza Mitchell, 2012).

The faculty at W&M receive professional development support at the institutional level through various resources to include the Studio for Teaching & Learning Innovation (William & Mary, 2019d), which offers communities of practice, structured learning experiences (both face-to-face and online), and academic innovation projects. W&M also provides research support to faculty and students through the Office of Sponsored
Programs (William & Mary, 2019b). Since W&M’s School of Business is accredited through the AACSB, it is required that the “school’s strategic plan identifies realistic financial strategies to provide, sustain, and continuously improve all aspects of quality business education, including…faculty professional development” (AACSB, 2020, pp. 13-14). As such, the School of Business provides each faculty member with a $1500 professional development annual fund to meet their individual needs. In addition, the School offers learning sessions around topics such as online course development and effective research practices.

Now that the concepts of intercultural competence and professional development have been examined, the remainder of this literature review focuses on the impact of study abroad on students and faculty. In particular, it considers the perceived value and challenges of pursuing a study abroad experience, with special emphasis given to intercultural competence and professional development. These insights were used to develop interview questions, which is discussed further in Chapter 3.

**The Case for Study Abroad**

Historically, the case for study abroad has been supported with four (often intersecting) arguments that are “commonly known as: the curricular argument, the cross-cultural argument, the career enhancement argument, and the development argument” (Hoffa & DePaul, 2010, p. 8). In addition, study abroad and internationalization have increasing importance relative to research and education for economic development (de Wit, 2020). Although it is important to consider the value of study abroad relative to curricular, economic, and personal development, this program evaluation will only focus on the cross-cultural and career enhancement arguments.
The cross-cultural argument for study abroad directly aligns with the intercultural competence focus of this evaluation. The primary value derived from study abroad is that these experiences provide U.S. students “with a unique opportunity to understand a foreign culture more deeply through immersion” (Hoffa & DePaul, 2010, p. 9). However, a concern with the cross-cultural argument is that study abroad may appeal more to students in the humanities and social sciences who have a disciplinary alignment to value cross-cultural experiences. What remains unknown is how students in a business curriculum approach study abroad and how they perceive changes to their intercultural competence. In addition, formal study abroad programs are often developed with mechanisms that may serve to limit true cross-cultural experiences such as the need for English language offerings or modern amenities for housing (Hoffa & DePaul, 2010).

The career enhancement argument of Hoffa and DePaul (2010) is directly aligned with the professional development focus of this evaluation. This particular argument contends that, “study abroad bolsters professional preparation by building future workplace skills of value to employers that operate, inevitably, in the global marketplace” (p. 10). Although anecdotal evidence may exist regarding the positive effects of study abroad on the professional development of students and faculty, there is a lack of statistical evidence regarding the actual value that an employer places upon such experience (Hoffa & DePaul, 2010). This study is also limited by the fact that it is qualitative (not quantitative) in nature, and therefore statistical evidence will not be collected. However, since two to three years have passed since the study participants completed the program, the hope is that qualitative insights can be gained into the
perceived long-term value of the intercultural competence and professional development skills gained through the GBM experience.

Impact of Study Abroad on Students

Over 90% of U.S. colleges and universities currently offer study abroad programs (Twombly et al., 2012). The high percentage of W&M undergraduates participating in study abroad for academic credit (57.7% in the 2017-2018 academic year) highlights the commitment of the university and students to learning in other cultural settings. As noted previously, W&M had the highest percentage of undergraduates participating in study abroad programs compared to any other public university in the U.S. (Hoving, 2019).

Students at W&M, and across the nation, find value in various aspects of study abroad to include intercultural competence skills and professional development, as previously defined. However, there are also potential challenges inherent with study abroad to include the associated costs and perceived complexities involved with participating in such programs, which will now be examined in greater detail.

Value of intercultural competence through study abroad. As noted throughout this chapter, several studies have found that positive outcomes from study abroad participation include enhancing one’s intercultural competence and the ability to understand other cultures (Bandyopadhyay & Bandyopadhyay, 2015; Costello, 2015). Through study abroad, students learn to adapt to diverse environments and circumstances, and ultimately become more open-minded and self-aware (Dewaele & Wei, 2013; McKinley, 2014). In particular, study abroad forces students to question their own self-reference criterion and prior beliefs, which fosters knowledge growth and global awareness (Fine & McNamara, 2011; Stearns, 2009; Vera Lopez, 2013).
Research has indicated that students can develop a global citizenship perspective after only four weeks of study abroad (Tarrant et al., 2014), and the benefits of study abroad can increase with the duration of the experience (Engle & Engle, 2004; Medina-Lopez-Portillo, 2004). However, more recent research using the IDI assessment (Hammer, 2012; Terzuolo, 2018) revealed that longer durations of study abroad resulted in students achieving only slightly higher levels of intercultural competence. Hammer (2012) argued that developmental interviewing and meta-reflection should be adopted to more accurately understand a student’s actual experience gains in intercultural competence, in addition to the IDI assessment.

**Value of professional development through study abroad.** Study abroad has been shown to strengthen a student’s leadership skills, problem-solving skills, ability to cope with ambiguous situations, and open-mindedness (Black & Duhon, 2006; Ingraham & Peterson, 2004; Lindsey, 2005). Other research has revealed that study abroad increased confidence in decision-making abilities (Farris, 2012; Taverney, 2016) as well as enhanced creativity, communication skills and social network development (Tamilla & Ledgerwood, 2018). However, the congruence of the study abroad experience with the students’ planned career path is an important consideration when deciding to pursue such programs (Norris & Gillespie, 2009).

As the current job market becomes increasingly competitive due to globalization, the value inherent in study abroad has evolved into an opportunity to gain the intercultural acumen required for engaging in a dynamic marketplace (Altbach, 2016; Ungar, 2016). A recent study conducted by the National Association of Colleges and Employers (Bauer-Wolf, 2018) noted that employers had far less confidence in the
preparedness of students to enter the workforce than the surveyed students. In particular, the global and intercultural fluency of students was one of the lowest ranked factors in the survey, as 20.7% of employers rated recent graduates as “proficient” in this category. However, even students recognized their limitations in this area, as only 34.9% considered themselves proficient in global and intercultural fluency, which was the lowest ranked factor on the survey (Bauer-Wolf, 2018).

Students who study abroad gain “a unique set of skills that distinguish them as leaders who have the understanding to navigate effectively, humanely and positively across different cultures” (McMillan & Opem, 2002, para. 9). The American Institute for Foreign Study found that “the top transferable skills reported by employers overlap considerably with the skills that help define intercultural competence, for example: flexibility, open-mindedness, empathy” (Hubbard, Rexeisen, & Watson, 2018, p. 7). In a longitudinal study of the Institute’s Study Abroad alumni, 58% of respondents believed that study abroad supported the development of professional skills and intercultural competencies, which contributed to obtaining their first job after graduation and 86% reported that study abroad contributed to their ability to adapt in diverse work environments (Hubbard et al., 2018). Understanding how students perceive the GBM aided in their professional development can provide additional insight regarding the value of the program.

**Challenges with study abroad.** The most cited reason that prohibits students from study abroad is the perceived cost of such programs (Kamdar & Lewis, 2015; Tamilla & Ledgerwood, 2018); this concern can be especially prominent at public institutions, which many students choose to attend because of lower costs compared to
private institutions (Ungar, 2016). The financial constraints faced by students and their families are a major reason for the increased popularity of short-term study abroad programs (Mills, Deviney, & Ball, 2010). However, Kamdar and Lewis (2015) cautioned that simply exposing students to international opportunities is not enough for meaningful learning outcomes.

Students also have to consider the opportunity costs (i.e., the loss of potential gains from alternative options) when choosing to study abroad. Often, these opportunity costs involve a loss of time with family and friends. De Jong, Schnusenberg, and Goel (2010) found that more than half of the participants in their research identified family as an important consideration in the decision to study abroad. Most students take parental suggestions and opinions seriously because of a combination of factors resulting from respect, financial control, trust, and experience (McKinley, 2014). However, when parents are not college educated, they might have potentially different views regarding the value of study abroad.

The perceived complexity of enrolling in a study abroad program is also likely to be an influential factor in student participation. Students will be discouraged from study abroad if they see the process as too complicated relative to application materials and travel documentation (Spiering & Erikson, 2006). In addition, it can be a challenge for students such as athletes and STEM majors to meet their sports obligations or academic program requirements, respectively, if they are required to commit to an entire academic semester for study abroad (Smith & Mitry, 2008; Vera Lopez, 2013).

Goldstein and Keller (2015) noted that students might also be concerned about the ramifications of culture shock, which can have a serious impact on the study abroad
experience and cause issues related to stress management, social support, identity confusion, and prejudice. In addition, students often do not understand the value, usefulness or relevancy of intercultural competence and global awareness (Relyea Cocchiara, & Studdard, 2008). As such, students might decide that internships are a better alternative to study abroad (Vera Lopez, 2013). Thus, a challenge for programs similar to the GBM is to ensure that students understand the relevance of intercultural competence in both their personal and professional lives.

Finally, students may choose not to participate in study abroad programs because they are uncertain of whether they will receive a positive return on their investment (Relyea et al., 2008). Students are more likely to form favorable attitudes toward study abroad if they perceive that these programs provide benefits and opportunities in career development (Wang, Peyvandi, & Moghaddam, 2009). Quraeshi, Luqmani, and Veeck (2012) found that business students listed a lack of information as a barrier to participation in study abroad. These students felt they did not know enough about the programs (including faculty backgrounds, curriculum, and planned itineraries) to justify pursuing a study abroad experience.

**Impact of Teaching Abroad on Faculty**

The extent that collegiate faculty have taught overseas, through programs such as study abroad, has not been widely researched compared to student engagement in study abroad. The U.S. Department of State sponsors annual research on study abroad through the Open Doors (2019) initiative, a comprehensive data resource that surveys international students and scholars studying or teaching at institutions of higher education in the U.S. The Open Doors project also analyzes U.S. students studying abroad for
academic credit at their home institutions; however, it does not capture any data on U.S. faculty teaching abroad. It is also difficult to determine how many U.S. institutions sponsor their own study abroad programs (such as the Reves Center at W&M) to encourage their faculty to teach abroad versus simply sending students to existing overseas programs.

As previously discussed, faculty involvement is crucial to the success of internationalization efforts for colleges and universities (Eddy et al., 2013; Stohl, 2007). Faculty members often have a broad range of their own experiences abroad, as a student, for personal travel, or research purposes. However, if faculty “do not have opportunities to acquire international knowledge and skills, or lack incentives to take advantage of such opportunities, their ability to help students acquire the same knowledge and skills will undoubtedly suffer” (Peterson & Helms, 2013, p. 32). Thus, the following review of the literature considers how faculty derive value in various aspects of study abroad including intercultural competence skills and professional development. In addition, the potential challenges of faculty engaging in teaching abroad, such as associated costs and lack of institutional incentives, is examined in greater detail.

**Value of intercultural competence through teaching abroad.** The concept of faculty intercultural competence has not been well-researched to date. Even though the intercultural competence of faculty may occur vicariously (by observing, listening, and experiencing) through study abroad, faculty are undeniably changed with a broadening of perspectives (Festervand & Tillery, 2001). “For educational leaders whose goal it is to transform their schools into pluralistic, inclusive environments, they must first be willing to look deeply into their own tacit assumptions about the diverse students with whom
they work” (Fine & McNamara, 2011, p. 256). Even though the research is limited, there is evidence that faculty engaging in teaching abroad gain an enhanced understanding and awareness of global issues and, upon return to their home institutions, these faculty integrated more global content into their classes to support internationalization efforts (Miglietti, 2015).

**Value of professional development through teaching abroad.** The value of teaching abroad as a professional development experience for faculty may differ depending on the stage of the faculty member’s career and their disciplinary home. For early career faculty, participating in teaching abroad might expand their research opportunities into international markets. For senior faculty, participating in teaching abroad might contribute to intellectual growth and cognitive repositioning (Festervand & Tillery, 2001). Certain disciplines, such as science, technology, engineering, and math (often abbreviated as STEM) have naturally strong international underpinnings. However, in all career stages, teaching abroad can provide diverse perspectives, and valuable content, to share with students and peers in the U.S.

Faculty-led study abroad programs benefit instructors not only by increasing their intercultural competence, but also by strengthening their communication skills with students. Study abroad classes tend to be smaller than those held on campus, which allows for greater interaction between faculty and students both inside and outside of the traditional classroom. Watts (2015) found that the close connection between faculty and students during study abroad programs results in faculty developing a better understanding of today’s college students and their needs.
The value of teaching abroad for business faculty can be especially important, as the current global marketplace demands they have greater exposure to the international business environment. For purposes of AACSB accreditation, business faculty and administrators are charged with a professional development responsibility in addition to an international responsibility (Festervand & Tillery, 2001). Relationships between faculty and international colleagues often form the basis for broader, enterprise-level global engagement, such as strategic partnerships and other collaborations with institutions abroad. Ultimately, promoting the value of teaching abroad as a professional development experience for faculty can serve as a powerful recruiting tool for the academic department and institution (Watts, 2015).

**Challenges with teaching abroad.** Similar to students, faculty are often concerned about the costs associated with teaching in a study abroad experience. Even scholars selected to teach and/or conduct research for the prestigious Fulbright program typically receive stipends that do not fully cover their expenses abroad. “Faculty often incur additional personal expenses from the unique nature of the Fulbright Scholar Award, whose stipends can be slightly lower than base salary, housing costs, costs of partner/family airfare, child education, etc.” (Purdue University, 2017, para. 3). In addition, delivering a successful international course requires faculty to commit significant time to curriculum development (Watts, 2015). Faculty may also feel they need training to be able to effectively teach international courses (Boone, 2019; Vera Lopez, 2013).

Since comprehensive internationalization is still relatively rare in higher education, there are few incentives for faculty to participate in teaching abroad (Eddy et
al., 2013). If faculty dedicate their time and resources to teach abroad, it is often viewed as less time spent on research and other institutional priorities, which can be especially challenging for pre-tenure faculty. However, a comprehensive approach to internalization would argue that teaching abroad and research do not need to be mutually exclusive; rather faculty could be incentivized to develop and share their research in the global marketplace, contributing to the international impact and branding efforts of the institution as well (Eddy et al., 2013).

Summary

This chapter examined the role of intercultural competence and professional development relative to study abroad experiences for both students and faculty. In addition, it considered the challenges that students and faculty encounter when determining whether to participate in such experiences. There is a lack of research that specifically examines how intercultural competence contributes to professional development in the context of study abroad. This study was intended to fill that gap in the literature by examining whether building intercultural competence through a study abroad program is viewed as contributing to the professional development of students and faculty.
CHAPTER 3: METHODS

This chapter outlines the evaluation methods for this study on the perceptions of intercultural competence and professional development that students and faculty gained through a GBM program. The CIPP model provides the framework for the evaluation design and data collection methods, which include in-depth interviews, a focus group, and document analysis. The process for selecting study participants and examining the collected data is outlined in this chapter. The chapter concludes with a discussion on the delimitations, limitations, and assumptions related to this evaluation.

The GBM program had two main objectives, as stated in the program proposal. The first objective was to provide business acumen to liberal arts majors at W&M in order to diversify their practical knowledge and critical thinking skills as well as support self-discovery in the context of an international business environment. The second objective was to provide learners an understanding of how diverse cultural perspectives can lead to creative solutions for complex challenges in a globalized economy. Although the stated program objectives in the GBM proposal were centered upon students, the School of Business Associate Dean and faculty steering committee believed the GBM program would have significant value to faculty as well. The proposal specifically noted, This program provides several benefits to the College of William & Mary and the Raymond A. Mason School of Business…[including the] opportunity for internationalization [because] this program will give Mason faculty members the opportunity to acquire a global experience.
However, the program objectives were not developed with specific assessments in mind and no formal evaluation had been undertaken to determine whether the program objectives were achieved until this study.

**Overview of Research Methods**

As discussed in the literature review, intercultural competence is not easily defined or measured (Deardorff, 2011). Therefore, the use of qualitative research methods such as interviews and focus groups to examine this concept will provide deeper insights than quantitative research methods such as surveys that seek to measure how particular variables impact outcomes (Engle, 2013; Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2007).

Savicki, Brewer, and Whalen (2015) defined qualitative research as,

> a systematic process that is dependent on understanding how to ask quality questions, gather appropriate artifacts, and carefully interpret gathered data.

> When done properly, qualitative research methods can be useful tools to gain rich and nuanced understandings of the complex issues in education abroad. (p. 104)

In this program evaluation, qualitative methods were used to better understand not only whether intercultural competence was acquired, but also how intercultural competence was developed during the GBM program and applied after the study abroad experience. The qualitative methods selected for this study is defined further in the Data Sources section.

As noted in Chapter 1, this study employed a pragmatic paradigm and the Use Branch approach to program evaluation (Mertens & Wilson, 2012). The participatory nature of the Use Branch means that stakeholders often have an existing relationship with the evaluator (Mertens & Wilson, 2012). As noted in the program overview, I served as
the founding faculty director of the program as well as professor of the marketing course in both 2017 and 2018 (see Appendix A). Although my familiarity with the program and the participants might be viewed as a positive attribute for this evaluation, it could also be considered a limitation, which is addressed later in this chapter. Table 1 outlines the program evaluation questions as well as the data sources and intended data analysis.
Table 1

_program Evaluation Questions, Data Sources, and Data Analysis_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| What are the perceived facilitating conditions and barriers to developing intercultural competence and professional development through a GBM program for students and faculty? | Student Interviews  
Student Focus Group  
Faculty Interviews  
W&M and School of Business Websites  
Student Course Evaluations and Program Evaluations from the School of Business and W&M Reves Center | Inductive analysis of individual interviews, focus group and documents using a coding scheme to find insights and themes of student and faculty perceptions of internationalization at W&M |
| How do students perceive the GBM program contributed to their intercultural competence and professional development? | Student Interviews  
Student Focus Group  
Student reflective posts on LinkedIn  
Student Course Evaluations and Program Evaluations from the School of Business and W&M Reves Center | Inductive analysis of individual interviews, focus group and documents using a coding scheme to find insights and themes of student perceptions of intercultural competence and professional development through the GBM program |
| How do faculty perceive the GBM program contributed to their intercultural competence and professional development? | Faculty Interviews | Inductive analysis of individual interviews using a coding scheme to find insights and themes of faculty perceptions of intercultural competence and professional development through the GBM program |

Note. GBM = Global Business Minor; W&M = William & Mary.

Population and Study Participants

The W&M GBM program consisted of 35 undergraduate students in 2017 and 31 undergraduate students in 2018 for a total population of 66 students who engaged in the program. In addition, four W&M faculty members and one UCD faculty member taught
in the program each year and I taught in the program both years, for a total of nine faculty members who engaged in the program. This section will outline the characteristics of the target population and review how the participants were selected for this study.

**GBM student population.** Table 2 provides an overview of the GBM student demographics in 2017 and 2018.

Table 2

*GBM Student Demographics in 2017 and 2018*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Male (%)</th>
<th>Female (%)</th>
<th>In-State (%)</th>
<th>Out-of-State (%)</th>
<th>2018 (%)</th>
<th>2019 (%)</th>
<th>2020 (%)</th>
<th>2021 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>16 (52%)</td>
<td>15 (48%)</td>
<td>14 (45%)</td>
<td>17 (55%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>16 (46%)</td>
<td>19 (54%)</td>
<td>13 (37%)</td>
<td>22 (63%)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

W&M is a public university that maintains an overall balance of 65% in-state and 35% out-of-state students in its undergraduate population (William & Mary, 2019a). However, this ratio was not maintained in the GBM student participants. In 2017, the GBM participants reflected 37% in-state and 63% out-of-state, with 10 states and one other country represented. In 2018, the GBM participants reflected 45% in-state and 55% out-of-state, with 10 states represented. These numbers also did not reflect the typical composition of other W&M study abroad programs. According to M. Knapp (personal communication, December 2, 2019), special programs advisor at the W&M Reves Center, institutional study abroad participants (not including language programs) in 2018 were 64% in-state vs. 36% out-of-state and in 2017 were 63% in-state and 37% out-of-state. A potential contributing factor is the associated cost for the summer
program (including housing, classes, and excursions) was actually less than the cost of a traditional semester program for out-of-state students, making the GBM more attractive for these out-of-state students.

Since the GBM was developed specifically for non-business majors at W&M, a broad range of majors was represented in the program (as well as several students who had not yet declared a major). In 2017, there were 14 majors represented (Computer Science, Data Science, Economics, English, Government, History, International Relations, Latin Studies, Materials Science, Philosophy, Physics, Political Science, Public Policy, and Psychology). In 2018, there were 16 majors represented (Anthropology, Biology, Civic Communications, Computer Science, Economics, English, German, Government, History, International Relations, Linguistics, Math, Neuroscience, Public Policy, Psychology and Theatre).

**GBM faculty population.** The W&M faculty that participated in the GBM program were determined through a competitive application process and selected by the Associate Dean and Assistant Dean based on proposed course pedagogy and previous teaching experiences. Every faculty member selected for the program had an earned doctorate and was an award-winning educator with at least 10 years of teaching experience. All but one of the faculty members had previously taught overseas. Two of were clinical faculty members, meaning these individuals were full-time, non-tenure track faculty focused on teaching rather than research responsibilities at W&M.

There were four W&M faculty members (including me) and one faculty member from UCD that taught in the program during 2017 and 2018, for a total of 9 different faculty members (I was the only faculty member who taught in the program both years).
The two UCD faculty members were selected based on personal recommendations given to a senior School of Business faculty member. Although the UCD faculty members were significant contributors to the curriculum, they were not interviewed for purposes of this study due to their affiliation with a different institution and potential international variances in their backgrounds relative to the concepts of intercultural competence and professional development.

**Selected participants.** The study consisted of three groups: W&M faculty interview participants, graduated student interview participants, and current student focus group participants. The faculty interview participants included the entire population of W&M faculty that taught in the GBM program (six faculty members, not including me) in 2017 and 2018. The student interview participants included six students (three students from 2017 and three students from 2018) that have graduated from W&M. The student focus group participants included four students (two students from 2017 and two students from 2018) that completed the GBM after their freshman year and have not yet graduated from W&M. A purposive selection was used to determine the student participants to ensure a cross-representation of genders, state residences, and majors to provide a diversity of perspectives. The selected participants very closely reflected the ratios presented in Table 2. Participants included 5 males and 5 females, 30% were in-state residents and 10 majors were represented. The student participants were contacted through their W&M email address; see Appendix C for the email request for study participation.
Data Sources

The data sources for this study were: (1) W&M student interviews and faculty interviews; (2) a student focus group, and; (3) various program documents, as outlined in the sections that follow.

Interviews. The purpose of the student and faculty interviews was to gain an understanding of how participants perceived the GBM program contributed to intercultural competence and professional development. “By formulating questions which acknowledge the difficulty in adapting to cultural differences, and placing emphasis on what the program hoped to achieve, we glean a sense of the student’s lived experience while reinforcing intercultural respect and understanding” (Engle, 2013, p. 115). The evaluation questions were structured (Savicki et al., 2015) and specifically ordered to allow individuals to initially share their motivations for wanting to participate in the GBM and then to share what GBM program experiences (at W&M, online or at UCD) were most helpful relative to intercultural competence and professional development. The study definitions of intercultural competence and professional development were presented in the interview guide that was shared with participants in advance of the interviews and focus group. See Appendix D for the faculty interview guide and Appendix E for the student interview guide.

Focus group. The focus group consisted of four students who completed the GBM program but are still students at W&M. Focus groups have been found to be an effective method for helping researchers understand how students develop interculturality during study abroad (Winke, 2017). The focus group questions were the same as the
student interview questions (see Appendix E) and the use of this data source helped to triangulate student insights.

**Document sources.** The document sources that were analyzed included the W&M and School of Business web sites relative to their mission as well as their efforts to support internationalization. The student course evaluations were requested directly from the W&M faculty that delivered the specific course; five out of six faculty provided access to these documents. In addition, the following student program evaluations were reviewed: (1) 2017 and 2018 post-residence week survey, (2) 2018 post-program survey from the School of Business, and (3) 2018 post-program survey from the Reves Center. Other internal documentation that was examined included the program proposal, internal planning spreadsheets and my personal notes from a faculty debrief meeting after the 2018 program. Finally, each GBM participant was required to develop a reflective LinkedIn post (Galan & Khodabandehloo, 2016) during the program and these posts were used as a form of triangulation for student insights as well.

**Data Collection**

The data collection process involved six faculty and six student interviews; each interview was scheduled for 60 minutes and conducted/recorded via Zoom during the week of January 27, 2020. The focus group with four current students was scheduled for 90 minutes and conducted/recorded via Zoom on February 7, 2020. The participants were given the interview guides (Appendix D and Appendix E) in advance, to reflect upon their experiences prior to the interview or focus group. These interview guides also contained the study definitions of intercultural competence and professional development. The interview questions were specifically designed and ordered to reflect
the elements of the CIPP model and to respond to the evaluation questions in this research, as outlined in Table 3.

Table 3

*Connections Between the CIPP Model and Interview Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIPP Component</th>
<th>Interview Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context: outlines relevant contextual conditions and dynamics</td>
<td>How is internationalization considered as a priority at W&amp;M? How is internationalization considered as a priority in the School of Business?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input: highlights the critical resources needed for the program to deliver on its objectives</td>
<td>What is the perceived value of study abroad, and specifically the GBM program, for students and faculty? What was the most pivotal or defining moment in the program for students and faculty?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process: examines how the program is being implemented and how the program is performing</td>
<td>What opportunities exist to improve the design and/or implementation of the program?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product: considers the merit of the program relative to its objectives</td>
<td>What specific experiences – at W&amp;M, online or at UCD – were most helpful in developing intercultural competence? How did the GBM program contribute to building specific skills or perspectives that proved valuable to professional development? How has the knowledge gained from the program been helpful for thinking interculturally in professional roles?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* CIPP = Context, Input, Process, Product model; W&M = William & Mary; GBM = Global Business Minor; UCD = University College Dublin.
Data Analysis

The audio recordings of the Zoom interviews and focus group were transcribed and edited to ensure the interview text was captured accurately. Once the transcriptions were completed, then the process of inductive coding (Yi, 2018) and compiling themes was undertaken using the software tool MAXQDA. This tool allowed for the student interview and focus group transcripts to be analyzed independently from the faculty transcripts, while also enabling analysis of themes across all of the collected data. In addition, data from the document analysis was examined through MAXQDA. Utilizing more than one type of analysis, that is data analysis triangulation, promotes rigor in qualitative research (Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2007).

The data analysis focused on the three levels of outcomes outlined in the Logic Model (Appendix B). The short-term outcomes (prior to departure to UCD) sought to establish a knowledge base for students relative to course learning objectives, instill an understanding of the importance of teamwork across diverse groups and build a sense of community across students and faculty. The intermediate outcomes (on-site at UCD) sought to enable students to cultivate an understanding of global business and for students and faculty to improve their intercultural competence skills. The long-term outcomes (post-program for students and faculty) sought to ensure the GBM program led to increased intercultural competence and professional development as well as furthered the W&M commitment to internationalization and its mission to develop global citizens.

Delimitations, Limitations, and Assumptions

This section outlines the boundaries of this study relative to the selected population and the focus of the evaluation. Then, I address the limitations that exist in
the context of this study, including my role as faculty director of the GBM program. Finally, I describe the assumptions that were carried into the execution of this study.

**Delimitations.** The population for this study was W&M students and faculty involved in the GBM program during the summers of 2017 and 2018. Although this study could have examined either students or faculty, I sought to include both students and faculty as the body of literature is limited on the impact of study abroad as a single phenomenon inclusive of both of these groups. The focus of this evaluation was specifically built around the concepts of intercultural competence and professional development, which were important expected outcomes relative to the study abroad experience.

**Limitations.** This study was limited to an innovative study abroad program at a single institution, which means the findings might not be generalizable to different educational programs at other institutions. In addition, this study was limited to the evaluation of a single study abroad program specific to global business. Therefore, student outcomes relative to intercultural competence and professional development could be the result of the global business curriculum and not simply the study abroad experience.

As faculty director of the program and professor of the marketing course (see Appendix A), I had prior relationships with the students and faculty involved with the GBM. Thus, study participants might have been uncomfortable with being entirely honest or forthcoming during the interview and focus group processes. Since students and faculty were self-reporting the value of their experiences, there is potential bias that their experiences were not actually valued in a similar manner by others. In addition,
nearly two to three years have passed since participants completed the program, so recollection of experiences might not be accurate.

**Assumptions.** Throughout the GBM program, it was assumed that students and faculty played an active role in the learning process. An additional assumption was that participants would be open to discussing their program experiences as well as their perceptions of the value of these experiences. This study also assumed that students and faculty would provide honest and authentic responses to the evaluation questions.

**Ethical Considerations**

This study was designed to adhere to the Program Evaluation Standards of utility, feasibility, propriety, accuracy, and accountability (Yarbrough, Shula, Hopson, & Caruthers, 2010). Utility reflects the meaning and value of this study relative to the needs of stakeholders, in this case the students, faculty and administration of W&M. The proposed evaluation methods, as outlined in this chapter, are determined to be feasible so the study can be completed in an effective and efficient manner. The propriety of the study reflects adherence to the highest research ethics and practices, and every effort was made to ensure an accurate representation of the program. In addition, a concerted focus on the triangulation of sources was used to strengthen the trustworthiness of the data. Finally, I assume responsibility and accountability, under the advisement of my dissertation committee, for the development and publication of this evaluation.

This study was examined and approved by W&M’s Institutional Review Board and the Protection of Human Subjects Committee and all participants were asked to sign an informed consent document (Appendix F).
Summary

This evaluation study involved in-depth interviews, a focus group, and document analysis to examine how students and faculty derived meaning relative to intercultural competence and professional development from the GBM program. The CIPP model served as the framework for this study and structured questions were developed to allow for coding of themes across data sources. However, there are certain delimitations, limitations, and assumptions that need to be considered relative to this research, to include my role as faculty director of the GBM program. Finally, this study has been structured to adhere to recognized program evaluation standards and was approved by the W&M Institutional Review Board.
CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS

The purpose of this evaluation study was to evaluate the GBM program by gathering data through individual interviews with faculty and students who have graduated, conducting a focus group session with current students, and examining various documents to understand the influence of the GBM program on students and faculty at W&M. This overview of the findings aligns to each of the three evaluation questions guiding this study. The first evaluation question examined the perceived facilitating conditions and barriers to intercultural competence and professional development evident in the GBM program. The second evaluation question considered how students perceived the GBM program contributed to their intercultural competence and professional development. The third evaluation question considered how faculty perceived the GBM program contributed to their intercultural competence and professional development.

Facilitating Conditions and Barriers

The findings revealed various facilitating conditions and barriers with the potential to influence levels of intercultural competence and professional development occurring for students and faculty in the GBM program. The analysis for this evaluation question examined two specific factors of influence. The first factor of influence centered around perceptions of internationalization at W&M and in the School of Business. Based on the literature review, it was assumed that an emphasis on
internationalization provided a critical facilitating condition for success of the GBM program (ACE, n.d.; Hudzik, 2011).

The second factor of influence for this evaluation question involved the processes involved with achieving the short-term, intermediate, and long-term outcomes for the program (see the Logic Model in Appendix B). Expected short-term outcomes, prior to departing for the host country, included building a sense of community with W&M students and faculty. Expected intermediate outcomes, during the experience at UCD, included cultivating an understanding of global business within the Irish community. Expected long-term outcomes, including increased intercultural competence and professional development, are addressed when analyzing the second and third evaluation questions for this study.

**Internationalization at W&M.** Both students and faculty believed that internationalization was considered an important attribute of the W&M experience. Six of the 10 students interviewed correlated internationalization to the strong study abroad reputation of W&M. One student commented that study abroad is “almost an expectation coming into W&M.” Four students mentioned the COLL requirements and learning about different cultures as a liberal arts student. In particular, COLL 300 courses at W&M emphasize the importance of connecting theory to practice and have been the motivation for many students to engage in a global or cross-cultural experience at W&M (William & Mary, 2019a). A student reinforced the ways in which the COLL curriculum is perceived by students stating, “Internationalization through the emphasis on COLL 300 is a central pillar to William & Mary's curriculum.” It is also important to recall that W&M has engaged in study abroad since the concept was first introduced in higher
education and, in 2019, W&M was the leading public university in the U.S. for the
highest percentage of students engaging in international experiences (Hoving, 2019).

Faculty also had a positive, but more muted, belief that internationalization was
prioritized at W&M. The presence of the Reves Center as a centralized resource for
internationalization efforts at W&M was specifically mentioned by five of the six faculty
members interviewed. In addition, faculty highlighted the COLL curriculum and study
abroad emphasis for students. However, four faculty members mentioned concerns about
the institutional prioritization on internationalization being driven primarily from the
perspective of arts and sciences, and not the School of Business. As one faculty member
shared,

As a university, we take pride in the percentage of our students that study abroad.
And, we have a COLL 300 program to support internationalization. However, I
think we [the School of Business] are relying too much on the Reves Center and
other programs to make internationalization part of the William & Mary
experience. I don’t see internationalization happening at the course or program
level.

It was apparent from the interviews that faculty perceived the Reves Center as vital to the
success of the GBM program. However, as discussed in the next section, faculty
members seemed disappointed the School of Business had not taken a more active role in
delivering upon its mission to serve the global community.

**Internationalization in the School of Business.** Most of the students
interviewed had a limited appreciation of internationalization in the School of Business
beyond the GBM and previous study abroad programs; faculty seemed to believe that the
students’ limited appreciation was actually the result of a lack of emphasis on internationalization in the School of Business. Despite faculty perceptions of a lack of focus on international efforts at the school level, five of the six faculty members expressed a personal commitment to internationalization. One faculty member exclaimed, "I'm a huge fan of internationalization. It makes a big difference for students. For me it's a priority, as a person, parent, and professor.” The sixth faculty member, who did not explicitly state a personal commitment to internationalization, was still positive about the overall impact of the program on students and faculty members. This was also the most junior faculty member in the GBM program, who had never taught abroad before and who had a really difficult flight experience to Ireland, which could have affected their perspective on the value of internationalization and this study abroad experience.

The faculty clearly did not feel as though their commitment to internationalization was shared by administrators in the School of Business. One faculty member commented,

the reality is, as far as administrative support, the attention and resources are elsewhere. And I believe [the GBM and other study abroad programs in the School of Business] have not continued because of lack of attention, not lack of interest.

The School seems to be willing to support the development of program proposals such as the GBM; however, because internationalization is not prioritized in the School and there is a lack of administrative support, these programs have never been sustainable beyond a few years.
The data suggest that students and faculty believe a facilitating condition for the GBM program is the prioritization of internationalization at W&M, which is specifically evident through the Reves Center and the COLL curriculum versus specific support from the School of Business. Thus, a significant barrier for the GBM program, especially from the perspective of the faculty, is a perceived lack of prioritization of internationalization in the School of Business. This barrier is examined further in the Discussion of Findings section in Chapter 5.

The following sections examine what facilitating conditions and barriers contributed to the short-term and intermediate GBM outcomes outlined in the Logic Model (Appendix B). Addressing the expected long-term outcomes, including increased intercultural competence and professional development, occurs in the analysis of the remaining two evaluation questions for this study.

**Analysis of short-term outcomes of the GBM.** Achieving the short-term outcomes of the GBM were the expected target for the first week of the program at W&M and the three weeks of online learning, prior to departure for Ireland. Specifically, these outcomes sought to: (1) build community with W&M students and faculty; (2) establish a knowledge base for students relative to course learning objectives and international travel that create context for the UCD experience; (3) establish a knowledge base for faculty relative to program learning objectives and international travel that create context for the UCD experience; (4) introduce students and faculty to intercultural competence and communication skills to empower them to engage with others in a dynamic global environment; and (5) instill in students an understanding of the importance of team work across diverse groups. Following is an examination of each of
these outcomes relative to findings from the interviews and focus group, as well as information from document analyses of the 2017 and 2018 student surveys completed after the first week of the residence program at W&M.

**Build community.** Findings from the student interviews and focus group revealed the first week of the program at W&M provided a solid foundation for building community among and across students and faculty. During this time, students were introduced to their cohort teams and each day of the on-campus week was dedicated to one of the four W&M courses and meeting the respective faculty members. In the second year of the GBM, the W&M residence week began with the simulation exercise, BaFa' BaFa' (Simulation Training Systems, 2017), which involved students assuming a cultural role and becoming personally aware of the issues around cultural differences. From a logistics perspective, a barrier for several of the out-of-state students emerged due to the difficulties of needing to leave campus after the end of the spring semester, only to return one week later for the start of the GBM program at W&M. Then, students needed to leave campus again to return home for three weeks of online learning prior to traveling to Ireland.

Students stayed in a residence hall together to introduce them to the living-learning environment aspect of the program while at W&M and students consistently highlighted the importance of getting to know the other participants during this time. However, a few students commented they would have liked even greater opportunities for engagement with peers during that first week of the program at W&M. For example, one student noted, “It would have been nice to get to know some of my classmates during that time, because I still don’t feel like I know my peers in this program as well as I’d
like.” Students suggested more activities to encourage student interaction, like icebreakers. A few students commented about wanting to learn more about the backgrounds of faculty members during the W&M residence week as well.

**Establish a knowledge base for students.** As outlined in the Sequence section of Chapter 1, the format of the GBM program was an innovative hybrid learning approach, which was quite different from the structure of a traditional 15-week academic semester in a classroom or the typical five-week W&M summer study abroad programs. The challenge with such a novel approach is that learners might feel overwhelmed with the accelerated pace of learning. Therefore, the first week of the program at W&M sought to allow the faculty members to introduce their course objectives and give students an understanding of course expectations; based on the findings of the evaluation, this objective was achieved.

However, a few students voiced concerns about challenges with the structure of the learning experience. One student commented,

I thought the week in Williamsburg, just having one day with each of the professors, felt like it was lost in the wind. Especially for those professors that were not teaching until later in the program in Ireland. I had sort of forgotten what we had discussed and learned during those days. It seemed so disjointed.

The lack of connection from the intensive course coverage during the first week of the program and the in-country course time created gaps for students and challenges with curriculum continuity for faculty.

Students also found it difficult to figure out the various deliverables that were due throughout the three weeks of online sessions because different platforms (such as
Blackboard, G(oogle) Suite and McGraw-Hill Connect) were required to upload and submit assignments. There was an integrated approach to the online learning sessions, whereby all four courses were offered during the three-week period; however, when students arrived in Ireland, they compartmentalized their studies and focused on only one course every two weeks. Thus, students commented that it was difficult to get into a rhythm with their studies. Still, the overall student reaction to the three weeks of online learning tended to be positive. One student noted, “The online sessions really helped provide context on the subject matter. Otherwise, it’s a big burden on professors to figure out how to cover all of the content in their two weeks [in Ireland].” Several students also valued the opportunity to spend time in their hometowns prior to traveling abroad.

Students felt as though the travel and logistics session from the Reves Center was helpful in preparing them for international travel. However, students did not necessarily believe they had gained an orientation for Dublin. In particular, a few students managed to get lost when traveling from the airport to UCD’s campus. To make matters worse, most students did not have international calling plans on their mobile phones. Since students did not receive their local phones until arriving at UCD, this caused significant stress for approximately 20% of participants both years as they attempted to navigate travel logistics.

Establish a knowledge base for faculty. Five of the six faculty mentioned that one of the primary reasons they applied to teach in the GBM was the opportunity to work with their peers to develop an innovative program. “I appreciated this was going to be a different experience with students and other faculty that was going to build community.
That has really proven to be the case.” Although faculty were not necessarily focused on learning further about their disciplines through the GBM, they were definitely interested in other learning experiences as a result of the program. In particular, several faculty mentioned the value of learning how to develop a hybrid curriculum through this program. As one faculty member noted,

Learning has dimensions beyond just interacting with other cultures. It has dimensions on problem solving. When you learn that your way might not be the only way to see things, then you start applying that in all areas of your life. Thus, learning opportunities for faculty were evident not only in the cultural aspects of the program, but also in the curriculum development process of the program.

During the first year of the GBM, the selected faculty (four in total, including me) held frequent development meetings to establish a common base relative to program learning objectives and to ensure an integrated curriculum. However, during the second year of the program these meetings did not occur as often and there seemed to be less of an integrated approach to the curriculum as a result. One of the faculty members involved in the second year explained,

There were challenges. I had expected or hoped that students would be doing work throughout the summer. And what I found was that it seemed they could only focus on a single class at a time [once they arrived in Ireland]. Overall, I think we did a fairly good job designing the program, but I would say we have to think through the residence week and what we expect them to do during the online sessions and the potential deliverables.
The lack of curriculum integration with the faculty, especially in the second year, presented challenges to both faculty and students. Based on document analysis, the Program Directors attested that faculty acted independently with their curriculum decisions at times and did not always consider the impact their actions had on the students and the overall program experience.

Faculty also had complications relative to international travel and logistics. Since the flight and certain other expenses were covered by W&M (which is a public institution), there were strict processes that needed to be followed relative to arrival and departure in Ireland. In addition, faculty lived in a single suite of rooms in the UCD residence hall with the students, so travel schedules needed to be synchronized to allow for appropriate faculty accommodations. Unfortunately, a few faculty members had differing expectations of what was possible for themselves and their families relative to accommodations, which caused challenges not only for the faculty member but also for the W&M Program Director who was coordinating on site logistics during the eight weeks at UCD. In addition, faculty members were affected by travel logistics and flight cancellations during both years of the program. In these instances, the narrow travel window meant these faculty were only able to arrive in Ireland the day before they were scheduled to teach, which did not allow them significant time to become acclimated to the environment.

**Introduce intercultural competence and communication skills.** Although intercultural competence was an important outcome of the program, a definition of this concept was never formally introduced to the students or faculty. Thus, it is not a surprise that neither students nor faculty ever mentioned this specific concept unless
prompted in the interviews and focus group. This lack of awareness of what is meant by intercultural competence presents a potential barrier to its development that would need to be addressed in future offerings of the program.

Communication skills were stressed to students throughout the residence week especially during the BaFa' BaFa' cultural simulation as well as the introduction to the International Marketing course. In addition, during the residence week, a luncheon was held for students with the School of Business Executive Partners, who were senior professionals that had lived or worked overseas during their careers. Students explained this event provided them an opportunity to “have intuitive and informative conversations with real world professionals to get a sense of global business.” This luncheon was the first opportunity for most of the students in the GBM program to network with senior executives. A few students commented that this exercise empowered them to feel comfortable communicating with senior professionals throughout the program and they recognized the importance of this skill to their career development.

**Instill importance of teamwork in students.** Many of the students shared they had not previously worked in team projects at W&M. Thus, students found the first week of the program extremely helpful to “outline expectations for the summer and how we can work effectively as a team.” In particular, students derived value in understanding, “the four stages of team building: forming, storming, norming, performing” and appreciated that, “we had to learn a new team dynamic; it forced us not to become comfortable with just our own practices.” Another student commented the teams were, “instrumental in not only learning academically but also learning what it's like in the business world to be in constant contact with people who work with you.” This
orientation to team work, and the establishment of team contracts, formed the foundation for what many students considered one of the most valuable experiences in the program, which is discussed further in the Impact of the GBM Program on the Professional Development of Students section.

**Summary of short-term outcomes.** The evaluation suggests that a sense of community was established at the start of the program through the residence week. Facilitating conditions for establishing community included exercises that required the engagement of students and faculty as well as the BaFa' BaFa' simulation. The most frequently mentioned barrier for achieving community from out-of-state students involved travel logistics, that is, having to travel to their hometown after the end of the spring semester, returning to campus for one week, and having to travel back to their hometown prior to flying to Ireland.

Students believed that a knowledge base was effectively developed relative to course learning objectives and international travel. Facilitating conditions for developing this knowledge included all four faculty members introducing their courses during the first week of the program at W&M and continuing these courses during three weeks of online sessions. A potential barrier to achieving this objective was that the hybrid approach felt disjointed at times. In addition, international travel logistics were more complicated than expected for several students and a few of the faculty, which disrupted the learning process and exacerbated culture shock in a few instances.

Faculty also believed that a knowledge base was effectively developed relative to program learning objectives and international travel. Development meetings to discuss the program objectives and to ensure an integrated curriculum were a critical facilitating
condition during the first year. Barriers to achieving this outcome included a lack of understanding of program expectations and travel logistics. Such barriers were most likely the result of the newness of the GBM; insights gained relative to these barriers could be addressed in future offerings of the program.

The short-term outcome of introducing students and faculty to the concept of intercultural competence was not achieved. Although intercultural competence was recognized as an implicit objective of the program in the GBM proposal, there was no explicit statement to students or faculty regarding the intention to develop intercultural competence through this program. However, the important fundamentals of communication skills were effectively shared with students through course exercises and a professional luncheon with Executive Partners.

The final short-term outcome was also achieved and involved instilling in students an understanding of teamwork across diverse groups. Facilitating conditions for this outcome included an introduction to the stages of team building and the formation of student cohort teams (intended to be the same team throughout the program). This outcome on teamwork was especially important and is discussed further in the Impact of the GBM Program on the Professional Development of Students section.

**Analysis of intermediate outcomes of the GBM.** The intermediate outcomes of the GBM aligned with the eight weeks the group was at UCD. Specifically, these outcomes intended for: (1) students to gain knowledge of finance, management, marketing and special topics in the context of international business that contribute to professional development; (2) faculty to gain greater knowledge of their respective discipline (finance, management, marketing or special topics) in the context of
international business that contributes to professional development; (3) students to cultivate an understanding of global business from the host community perspective; and (4) students and faculty to represent W&M positively to UCD and the Irish community. Each of these outcomes is examined relative to findings from the interviews and focus group as well as document analyses.

**Student knowledge in the context of international business.** The student knowledge in the context of international business was expected to be derived from the five courses in the program (international finance, international marketing, special topics in design thinking and international management taught by W&M professors, as well as a global business course taught by a UCD professor) and experiential learning opportunities. The program at UCD began with an orientation that introduced students to the campus and the Summer at UCD office. In addition, there was a walking tour of Dublin that provided an historical overview and highlighted significant landmarks in the city. Several students noted that a facilitating condition for achieving this outcome was the “Leap” card that allowed for unlimited travel on Dublin Bus and Commuter Rail services that ensured quick and easy access to explore the region. Students took advantage of this transportation to travel on their own and as a group, especially to Dublin City Centre during the few free weekends when excursions were not planned.

Overall, the course evaluations revealed that students felt very positive towards the curriculum and the W&M faculty during both years of the program (feedback on the global business course taught by the UCD professors is discussed in the Student Understanding of Irish Business Perspectives section). Facilitating conditions included positive relationships with faculty and the perceived knowledge of their respective
discipline. One student noted that courses allowed for “the development of a mindset that is even applicable outside of business.” Another student attested that, “I will remember the lessons and mindset long after I have forgotten the facts from most of my other courses.” Students seemed happily surprised that the practices and processes of business could be applicable to any discipline.

Students also appreciated the peer learning opportunities. As one student commented, “The interactive exercises were a great way to get the class involved in the discussion and provided a new way of learning.” In addition, students valued the positive and collaborative class environment. One student shared that, “I have never been in a class that opened up so quickly and had as much comfortable participation.” The living-learning environment of the GBM program undoubtedly assisted with the quick sense of community that was developed amongst the students and faculty.

Students noted that a few barriers existed to optimizing this knowledge outcome. Several of the students found the finance course to be especially difficult since they had not taken Principles of Accounting (the required foundational course to earn the GBM) prior to the start of the summer courses. In addition, the accelerated nature of the program (with 15 credits over 12 weeks) was stressful at times. Students also expressed at one point they were working across three different team projects and it was challenging to find the time to dedicate to each of the teams. Still, based on the overall findings of this program evaluation, this knowledge outcome seems to have been achieved.

**Faculty knowledge in the context of international business.** Faculty had not necessarily considered their own knowledge development of international business as a possible outcome of the GBM program. However, when prompted during the interviews,
every faculty member attested they had learned something about the context of
international business in Ireland.

   It was very apparent to me that Ireland has a different work life balance, or at
least a different way of handling it. They have much cleaner lines between
professional and personal over there than we do. It was interesting as it felt like a
different way of living.

Faculty wished to have furthered their knowledge of international business in Ireland
even further, through a greater number of experiential learning opportunities. The W&M
faculty members were hopeful the Summer at UCD office could provide local contacts to
facilitate a network of professionals and business visits across Dublin. Although the
Summer at UCD staff was able to provide support in several areas, the office was more
aligned with cultural and social opportunities rather than business opportunities, so those
professional contacts and learning experiences were limited.

Still, the faculty members believed there was value in the knowledge gained from
the GBM program. “You learn things through interacting with people in that format
[study abroad] that you don’t necessarily learn through interacting with the same people
in a traditional class format.” W&M faculty members overlapped in the UCD faculty
suite every other weekend during course transitions (as one faculty member arrived prior
to the departure of another faculty member), which allowed them a unique opportunity to
engage with each other and share their expectations and experiences with the program.

During the second year, the UCD professor (who was teaching the Global Business
Immersion course) would spend the night before her class in the W&M faculty suite,
which resulted in a very positive exchange of knowledge between the W&M faculty
member and UCD faculty member. Overall, faculty appreciated the opportunity to be immersed in a new culture, a new college community, and a new school of business.

**Student understanding of Irish business perspectives.** There was consensus across all data sources that students achieved a greater understanding of Irish business perspectives as a result of the GBM program. According to one student, the courses “forced us to interact with locals in Dublin and helped us to get to know our surroundings.” In addition, several students commented that, “the guest lectures and travel excursions had the greatest positive impact on my understanding because it brought the concepts we were learning in class to real world applications.” Students seemed especially influenced by their visit to Northern Ireland. As one student reflected in the focus group, “We’re looking at the lasting legacy of the troubles. We’re listening to the tour guide talk and it’s not something she talks about with distance. It’s something that’s very relevant and something you can still see.” However, students also believed there could have been even greater integration between the curriculum and the Irish business environment, especially in the Global Business Immersion course. Feedback from students during both years of the program expressed disappointment that there were far greater lectures than immersive experiences as part of the Global Business Immersion course curriculum.

The GBM was structured to include one special topics course each year. It just so happened that during both years of the program the topic of design thinking was selected for the special topics course. As a result of the subject matter, this particular course was ultimately the most experiential (especially relative to Irish business perspectives) and students had an overwhelmingly positive response to it.
The part of design thinking that resonated with me most was how the process can be applied to so many different things in life. Design thinking, and the mindset that comes with it, can be used in other academic projects, and even in your life path.

It was obvious from the student feedback that the most impactful facilitating condition for learning about Irish business perspectives was the delivery of experiential learning opportunities. In the special topics course, students were asked to interview and gain consumer insights from local Dubliners. In the marketing course, students were required to develop a marketing strategy to either import a business concept to Ireland or export a business concept from Ireland to another country. However, students also found the highly structured program to be too intense at times, with classes from 9 am to 5 pm during the week and excursions most weekends. One student lamented, “I felt like I didn't get to see as much as I would have hoped solely because on the weekends we just had so much work.” Several students expressed similar sentiments and wished there would have been greater time allocated for personal exploration of Ireland.

It was expected that the course taught by the UCD professor would be the most immersive of the course offerings. In fact, the course was formally titled, “Global Business Immersion,” so even the name implied it would be an immersive experience. During the first year, the class was offered every Friday during the eight weeks at UCD, with the hope that students would reflect upon their experiences in Ireland at the end of every week. However, the reality was that students tended to be already checked-out of their learning mindset by Friday. Unfortunately, the content and lecture-based nature of the course during the first year was also not very engaging for the students. The lack of
active learning in the course resulted in a lack of true immersion in the Irish market environment. Changes were made during the second year to include a new professor who taught on Mondays rather than Fridays. There was also a greater effort to bring in guest speakers to the class. However, the class still did not achieve a level of engagement with the Irish culture that students considered to be “immersive,” as the course name implied.

Overall, the student feedback for the Global Business Immersion course during the second year was far more positive than the first year. One student commented, “I’ve had non-American professors before but being in Ireland and learning about Irish business by somebody who had a completely different perspective was such an interesting experience that I hadn't expected to get.” Another student echoed this sentiment and said, “It was fascinating to see the impact of the global recession through the lens of Ireland.” Students also seemed to move beyond a basic understanding of the financial impact of the recession to a greater appreciation of the cultural impact. One student questioned, “How do you reconcile the corporate tax rate and attracting international business with the fact that fewer people are speaking the Irish language?” This acknowledgement reveals that students were not only understanding the practices of Irish business, but also the implications of business on the culture of a country.

**Representing W&M positively to UCD and the Irish community.** The Summer at UCD office proved to be a strong facilitating condition for building a partnership between W&M and UCD. In addition to supporting housing and classroom needs, this office provided complimentary social programming that included high tea, cinema screenings, and Irish language lessons that allowed students and faculty to positively engage with UCD and the Irish community. The Summer at UCD office served as
engaging ambassadors for Ireland, and students and faculty specifically noted how much they appreciated the relationships developed with the UCD staff. However, there was definitely a desire from both students and faculty to engage even further with UCD and the Irish community. As one faculty member noted, “I think we need to do more to get them [students] interacting. You do not want to go from your bubble at home and then just get transplanted into another country and never really leave the bubble.”

Interestingly, this comment seems to support the findings in the previous section that students wished there would have been greater time allocated for personal exploration of Ireland.

At the start of the GBM, program administrators emphasized the expected behavior of students and the need to respect the laws within UCD and Ireland. However, during both years, the program confronted serious student conduct issues and struggled with how to effectively communicate the critical nature of student actions during study abroad. During the first year, the involved student was very remorseful for their actions. As such the student was allowed to remain in the program, with the full support of their peers, although they were forced to live off-campus. The second year, the involved student struggled to understand the gravity of the situation and left Ireland midway into their time there. In addition to these serious student concerns, faculty observed several instances when students were very self-absorbed rather than self-aware and missed opportunities to engage positively with the Irish community.

**Summary of intermediate outcomes.** The evaluation suggests that students successfully gained a knowledge of finance, management, marketing, and design thinking in the context of international business during the GBM. Facilitating conditions for this
outcome included an engaging orientation program at UCD and access to transportation to allow for an immersive experience. In addition, students valued their positive relationships with faculty and experiential learning opportunities. Barriers to students achieving this outcome included the accelerated nature of the program, not having taken Principles of Accounting prior to the start of the summer program, working across multiple courses/team projects and being self-absorbed rather than self-aware at times.

Faculty also seemed to gain greater knowledge in the context of international business. However, faculty believed they could have furthered their understanding of international business in Ireland through greater immersive learning experiences and an expanded network of local contacts.

There was consensus across all data sources that students achieved a greater understanding of Irish business perspectives as a result of the GBM program. Facilitating conditions included guest lectures and excursions as well as experiential learning opportunities through course concepts such as design thinking. Barriers to achieving this outcome included the structure of the UCD global business course, which was not as immersive as expected, as well as the lack of time for students to explore Ireland on their own.

Overall, students and faculty represented W&M positively to UCD and the Irish community. An important facilitating condition for achieving this outcome was the support of the Summer at UCD office. However, there was definitely a desire from both students and faculty to engage even further with UCD and the Irish community. In addition, there were challenges with student behavior during each year of the program; as
a result, during the second year, a student departed Ireland before the conclusion of the program.

The facilitating conditions and barriers to intercultural competence and professional development in the GBM program provide important context for the remainder of this evaluation. It should also be noted that internal document analysis revealed the GBM program was significantly profitable in both 2017 and 2018. The following sections address the research questions regarding how students and faculty perceived intercultural competence and professional development were evident as a result of the GBM program.

**Impact of the GBM Program on the Intercultural Competence of Students**

Students were asked during the interviews and focus group specifically about experiences that contributed to their intercultural competence. These insights were triangulated with the LinkedIn reflective posts that students were required to develop as part of the International Marketing course in the program. The prompt for the LinkedIn assignment was to share aspects of the GBM education that would help market the program to future participants; however, many students chose to share very personal reflections in this forum. During the first year of the GBM, the LinkedIn posts were published by students at the end of the program in Ireland. During the second year of the GBM, these posts were published by students at the end of the fourth week (the midpoint) of the program in Ireland.

Nearly two to three years have passed since completion of the program, which has provided students time to reflect on the value of these experiences and engage in retroactive sensemaking. In the case of the LinkedIn posts, there has also been ample
opportunity for students to remove these posts from their LinkedIn profiles. However, for the 2017 program, 27 posts were still available, which represented 77% of student participants. For the 2018 program, 21 posts were still available, which represented 67% of student participants. This could be an indicator of the continued value that students place on these experiences.

The MAXQDA2020 software allowed for the LinkedIn posts (which were saved and imported as PDF files) to be analyzed with the interview and focus group scripts (which were imported as DOC files). The lexical search function allowed for key concepts to be examined across all of these data sources. Overall, there were 56 (of 66 total students) represented through the interviews, focus group, and LinkedIn posts (if a student participated in an interview or focus group as well as the LinkedIn post, they were not double counted). The software also allowed for the frequency of keywords to be analyzed across all of these data sources.

The definition of intercultural competence that I established for this study was the “development of cultural awareness through experiential learning that results in a demonstrated ability to listen, observe and interpret as well as analyze, evaluate and relate to others with diverse backgrounds and experiences.” The findings revealed that the GBM program contributed to the students’ intercultural competence through an increased understanding of cultural awareness, perspective, and diversity.

Cultural awareness. Across the various sources, the terms “culture” and “cultural” were mentioned by 30 unique students (including all of the student interviewees) a total of 154 times. Thus, most students who discussed culture actually cited it multiple times in their responses, which could reflect a deeper understanding of
the concept than simply mentioning it once. One student noted, “in this globalized society, it's more of a requirement rather than an option to understand different cultures and different backgrounds.” Students seemed to appreciate that cultural awareness was an attribute that would serve them well in their academic and professional pursuits.

Ireland is not necessarily viewed as a significant cultural diversion relative to the U.S. especially since English is spoken in both countries. However, for many students who had not previously traveled beyond the U.S. on their own, Ireland was indeed a compelling cultural experience. One student reflected that,

I think intercultural competence actually sneaks up on you and shows you that even people who have a similar cultural background technically have incredibly diverse ways not only of approaching their environment, but also really diverse behavioral patterns, especially the way that business is conducted.

Students did not believe that the learning outcomes involved with such an immersive experience in the GBM would be possible in a COLL 300 course on global business held on campus at W&M. As one student explained, “Being in Ireland was very beneficial. Understanding little things like stores in Ireland close before 6 pm. There was real value in living this new routine and understanding how life affects people in other ways.” Another student concluded that, “The way to true understanding is a fully immersive experience. I can read all I want about Irish culture, but until I get there, smell it, taste it, and I feel it, I don't know it.” Although students were certainly interested in learning about the discipline of global business, they seemed far more interested in learning about the destination of Ireland in the GBM program.
**Perspective.** A critical aspect of developing intercultural competence is gaining perspective through a demonstrated ability to listen, observe and interpret, as noted in the definition of intercultural competence for this study. As a result of the program, students indicated they learned to effectively work in a different culture. One student surmised, “Part of business is appreciating how individuals have overcome challenges and leveraged opportunities. And that is often dictated by the environment, which is dictated by history.” Several students also commented on the importance of understanding the history of Ireland and learning from cultural stories. One student shared that, If you are going to work in an international environment, you have to be able to understand the stories and perspectives of people around you. You need to have a level of empathy to have that intercultural awareness. It's not just getting to know the country on face value, but getting to know the soul of it.

The concept of empathy, which was a fundamental element of the design thinking course during both years of the program, was evident in other student comments as well. One student noted that, “Our group didn’t become a team until we knew each other well enough to empathize and act as one unit.” Empathy learned in the classroom translated to being open to new perspectives in the Irish community as well. As one student attested, Some of the most interesting conversations and insightful perspectives arose organically, simply as a product of living in the city. The people of Dublin are incredibly open and willing (even excited) to talk with foreigners about their lives and experiences, and it is from them that I have been most fascinated and learned the most.
Again, a critical factor for developing intercultural competence seemed to be that students were given the time and space for organic and immersive experiences in Ireland.

Several students recognized a fundamental shift in perspective from the start of the GBM to the conclusion of the program. One student noted, “the biggest difference that you could see from students in the beginning of the program versus the end of the program was they were starting to really think more from a non-U.S. centric perspective.” Another student concluded,

I was amazed to see my tolerance for the unexpected grow as time went on. I realized that I've become too comfortable with the structure of college and home. The real world is very different and requires you to be flexible and have an open perspective.

Students seemed to appreciate this openness to new perspectives was not only important for intercultural competence, but also for professional development purposes.

**Diversity.** As a result of the program, many students learned how to relate to others with diverse backgrounds and experiences. One student explained that “getting to know people from another culture gives you more of an open mind and willingness to see things from people's perspectives that are different from yours.” Students also recognized a connection between having empathy and valuing diversity. “This program fosters an empathetic mindset and pushes all of its students to be active global citizens, open to and respectful of diversity.” For most GBM students, diversity meant appreciating not only differences across culture, but also differences of thought.

The challenge of working in teams with various backgrounds, across different majors and hometowns, significantly contributed to the learning experience and
intercultural competence of students. This openness to diversity also proved to be valuable to the professional development of students, which is examined further in the next section. Students seemed to appreciate that the intercultural competence skills gained through the program were skills that would serve them well from both a personal and professional perspective. One student concluded, “I now want to live bravely and embrace the moments to pause and listen and observe. I seek to see things from someone else’s view and appreciate the diversity of thinking around me.”

**Impact of the GBM Program on the Professional Development of Students**

During the interviews and the focus group, students were asked about experiences that might have contributed to professional development. In addition, the LinkedIn profiles of the 2017 GBM students were examined to determine their current professional roles (the majority of 2018 GBM students are still enrolled at W&M). Of the 35 students in the 2017 GBM program, 21 are currently working and 17 (of the 21 students) are in business-oriented roles, 6 students are in graduate school, and 8 students are still completing their undergraduate education at W&M. The GBM program also acted as an impetus for one student from the 2017 program and two students from the 2018 program to complete a one-year Master of Science Business Analytics degree in the School of Business.

The definition of professional development for students used in this study “involves the choice of career, the awareness of how a student’s intended profession may be viewed and practiced, and the acquisition of attitudes and cross-cultural skills that help a student become an effective professional.” The findings revealed that the GBM
program contributed to the students’ professional development through career awareness as well as building skills related to communication and teamwork.

**Career awareness.** Considering the GBM program was established specifically for non-business majors, it is interesting that 80% of the students currently working from the 2017 GBM program are pursuing business-related careers. Many of the GBM courses and projects allowed students to explore markets and industries that were new to them. As a result of the design thinking courses, several students became involved with the launch of “Tribe Innovation” when they returned to W&M. Tribe Innovation (n.d.) is a student-run business that “utilizes the design thinking process to inspire individual creativity, solve relevant challenges in our community, and gain professional experience by working with clients on campus and in our surrounding community” (para. 1). Four students specifically shared that their experiences in design thinking led to career opportunities upon graduation. A few students are also now working in financial services even though they had never considered that career path prior to the GBM program.

**Communication skills.** Across all data sources, students consistently emphasized the value of communication skills gained in the GBM program. One student shared that,

I actually landed my internship between my sophomore and junior year because of this program. When I interviewed, they looked at my resume and the opening question from my interviewer was, “Tell me about Ireland and how you communicated in a different culture?” And the interviewer loved the fact that I was in an environment where people pushed me to really go outside my comfort zone and do things that I never considered.
Several students have since pursued careers that require them to communicate with clients from different backgrounds and cultures. One graduate explained that,

Before I was in the program, I would have gone and done business the way that I was used to doing it, because that's what I've been taught. Now, I recognize there are different approaches to doing business, and I'm more open to those things.

Another graduate admitted, “Something I hadn’t considered before was the slight cultural differences and how the same actions in different cultures can be viewed in different ways.” Once again, there seemed to be a powerful intersection between the value of intercultural competence and professional development.

Even though many students pursued the GBM after their freshman or sophomore year, the lessons on communication remained with them as they started their career search during their senior year. One recent graduate commented,

When I was approaching my career, I was thinking about the same things as I was during the GBM program. I appreciated that the program emphasized being a strong communicator and being able to listen and work with other people. Those are skills you can bring into any industry and that are very valuable in business.

Every one of the interviewed students found their communication skills to be powerful tools, whether working in small entrepreneurial environments or global corporations. One graduate noted,

In my current communications role, I have to understand where clients are coming from and approach them with empathy. Thinking not how to spin their story my way, but how to make it truthful to them and reflective of their voice.
Students indicated the communication skills they developed during the GBM allowed them to quickly contribute to the success of their organizations.

**Teamwork.** Nearly every single student in the GBM program, across the interviews, focus group, and LinkedIn posts, stressed that the teamwork experience was vital to their professional development. One student commented, “The benefits of working in a team are unparalleled today. If you can work well in a team and an interviewer recognizes that, you are getting the job. Everything is a team now.” Another student noted, “In my future career, I think that solving problems on a world stage cannot be done by just one person; it must be done by a team.” For many of the GBM students, this program was their first introduction to working with self-directed teams across multiple projects for several months and these skills provided a solid foundation for their careers.

For purposes of the GBM, students were assigned to a cohort team of four to five members with whom they were expected to work throughout the program. For most students, this cohort structure proved to be an invaluable learning experience. One student noted, “maintaining the same group throughout the GBM was instrumental in not only learning academically but also learning what it's like in the business world to be in constant contact with people who work with you.” Unfortunately, during the second year of the program, one of the students had to return to the U.S. midway through their time in Ireland. Thus, the cohort structure had to be changed, which turned out to be difficult for many of the students who had already bonded with their teams. When asked about this specific experience, one of the students on the team with the departed student still promoted the virtues of the cohort approach:
I had a really tough experience with my team. But, in the end, it was a positive experience. I had an internship the following summer and had a terrible team and I was equipped with the skills to deal with it.

Thus, even students who encountered difficult team experiences found value in learning how to effectively address challenging team dynamics.

One might argue that teamwork can be learned in other places during an undergraduate career and therefore it is not necessary to study abroad to gain such experience. However, students made convincing arguments for the value of learning about teamwork in a distant land where you did not have the comfort or security of family and friends. One student reflected in a LinkedIn post,

As a result of the GBM, I am just now realizing how group projects should function. I realize this sounds like a lesson I did not have to learn in Ireland. However, given the structure of this unique program, I do not think I could have learned what it means to work in a cohesive and effective team anywhere else.

Several recent graduates also noted that the intense teaming approach of the GBM gave them confidence in their abilities for career success upon graduation. One student shared,

I don't know my coworkers yet. But when I arrive at work, there’s going to be an established culture. There is going to be something in place that I’m going to have to work with. And the cohort-based teams in the GBM program mimic these experiences. In effect, these are the people in your team, and you have to figure it out. That is the real world.

Again, most students in the GBM had not previously experienced team-oriented projects in other classes at W&M. However, the nature of business is collaborative and team-
oriented, so these were critical skills for the students to gain as a result of the GBM program.

**Impact of the GBM Program on the Intercultural Competence of Faculty**

Faculty were asked specifically about experiences that might have contributed to their own intercultural competence during the interviews. Once again, the study definition of intercultural competence was the “development of cultural awareness through experiential learning that results in a demonstrated ability to listen, observe and interpret as well as analyze, evaluate and relate to others with diverse backgrounds and experiences.” Similar to the student findings, the faculty interviews revealed that the GBM program contributed to the intercultural competence of the participating faculty members through an increased understanding of cultural awareness and diversity.

However, unlike the students, faculty did not seem to have significantly changed their perspectives as a result of the GBM program. Five of the six faculty had previously taught abroad (and one had traveled to Ireland), so most of the faculty had a solid understanding of the need to engage in the GBM program with an empathetic perspective and open mindset. One faculty member commented that, “The broader your perspective, the greater the likelihood that it improves your teaching or your ability to at least understand what's going on in the heads of the people you're teaching.” Overall, faculty members were very aware of the importance of traveling and teaching abroad to gain greater intercultural competence. As one faculty member asserted, “We're not going to achieve true intercultural competence by simply staying in Williamsburg.”

**Cultural awareness.** Across the six faculty interviews, the terms “culture” and “cultural” were mentioned a total of 96 times (for comparison purposes, these terms were
mentioned by 30 unique students a total of 154 times). Interestingly, one of the faculty members noted their development of intercultural competence was directly correlated to student development of intercultural competence. “Since I’m with the students almost all day, for me to get more out of it I think of it as us doing it together.” Several of the faculty mentioned the living-learning environment provided a unique and valuable opportunity to live and learn with students, both inside and outside of the classroom.

Similar to students, the faculty recognized the value of an immersive experience in Ireland contributing to their cultural awareness, specifically business site visits and travel to places such as Belfast. As one faculty member explained,

Reading and understanding are important tools, but you can't really get the experience of interacting with another culture unless you're in another culture and talking to people, trying to figure them out, trying to figure out why these two things that you thought always went together don't go together here. There's just a whole other dimension of meeting people from another culture.

As mentioned previously, faculty believed cultural awareness could have been strengthened further with additional opportunities to network with local professionals. Three of the faculty members who had taught in Budapest noted there had been greater opportunities with that particular program to be immersed in the community and culture.

Due to the structure of the GBM, faculty did not have the same amount of time in Ireland as the students. However, four of the faculty were joined by family members to explore the Irish culture before or after their teaching commitment in the program. One faculty member commented, “I wanted to expose my family to another culture. It’s very important for them to understand that we don't have only our culture through which to see
the world.” Most other W&M study abroad experiences through the Reves Center do not allow family to accompany faculty. As such, one faculty member commented that,

I realize some people might argue that family will detract from the faculty. But if our goal is to make more and more faculty have greater intercultural competence, then we need to do what we can to make sure they have these experiences.

Even though faculty mentioned cultural concepts in their interviews on an individual basis far more often than students, they did not necessarily reflect on their own cultural awareness to a greater extent than students. In fact, there were several times during the interviews that I had to remind the faculty members to share how the GBM personally affected them, rather than continuing to share how the program affected the intercultural competence of their students. It was obvious from the faculty responses that they valued cultural awareness; however, perhaps due to the lack of an intentional focus on learning outcomes for faculty, it was a challenge for a few of them to articulate how the GBM program impacted their intercultural competence.

**Diversity.** Faculty members had a very favorable response regarding the opportunities to relate to others with diverse backgrounds and experiences as a result of this program. As one faculty member commented, “When faculty do things different than what they’ve done in the past, it tends to be that interesting things happen and they tend to be a positive experience.” Prior to the GBM program, these faculty members had taught classes on a consistent basis solely to business majors. As one faculty member stated, “[The GBM] was aimed at a completely different group of students that we might not otherwise see.” Thus, the diversity of the student backgrounds forced faculty to think differently about how to effectively teach business concepts.
Similar to the student perspective, the GBM faculty believed that diversity meant appreciating not only differences across culture, but also differences of thought. A few faculty members had the opportunity to explore diversity through experiential learning in their courses. One faculty member commented that after students, “talked to local employees, they realized they had a very different way of thinking about work and thinking about work-life balance, and how they thought about a business being successful.” Faculty members also appreciated the opportunity to gain diversity in the stories and examples they could share upon their return to W&M.

Faculty members believed the GBM program not only contributed to furthering their experiences with diversity but also served to support W&M’s focus on diversity and inclusion. Yet, faculty found it troubling that the professors involved with the GBM program were primarily the faculty members in the School that had previously taught abroad, so there was nominal diversity in the faculty members who were gaining value from these experiences. One faculty member questioned, “How do we become a truly global school when we do not internationalize the faculty?”

**Impact of the GBM Program on the Professional Development of Faculty**

The study definition that I established for the professional development of faculty is “the process of maturing and evolving as a professional in their respective discipline. This arc of development often includes continuing education to learn and advance skills as well as professional reflection and a willingness to address one’s own needs.”

Whereas the GBM program contributed to the professional development of students through increased career awareness and team work, the professional development of faculty focused on the enrichment of curriculum and enhancement of teaching skills.
**Enrichment of curriculum.** Most of the faculty believed there was significant value in gaining international experiences that could be shared in future teaching efforts. Faculty appreciated the various examples and stories collected during the GBM program that could provide context for curriculum development as well as inspiration for experiential learning. As one faculty member expressed,

I have a lot of blinders on and to get some appreciation for those blinders, I don’t know anything like international travel that’s more helpful. You come back changed, even if it's for the fifth or sixth time, you come back changed. Maybe not as much as you were changed by that first time. But you come back a little bit broader, probably a little bit humbler, and with a perspective you didn't have before. Especially as we move into a world that is truly global, how do we teach about global business if we have never been anywhere?

The faculty involved with the GBM program tended to be senior faculty and all of them had more than 10 years of teaching experience. Thus, there was a certain level of career maturity evident in the faculty responses and they seemed to have an appreciation of their own biases. They also understood the importance of having cultural experiences that could bring greater depth to their courses. As one faculty member commented, “If we don't model intercultural competence with our students, why should they take it seriously?”

Faculty also felt the GBM program forced them to be less myopic and U.S. centric in their approach, both with curriculum and students. One faculty member reflected,
One of the things I gained from Dublin was a sense of how dynamic the world is when I was overseas. Part of that being urban, part of it is being overseas, but there’s a lot going on in Europe and history is still happening. I think we look at Europe and think that it’s old country and things have stabilized there and haven’t changed, and we all change here in the U.S. I don’t know if it is a matter of thinking more interculturally, it might be indirectly, but it’s given me a different perspective than I would get simply sitting in my office in Williamsburg.

A few of the faculty commented that as a result of the GBM experience they reframed how to teach in graduate programs as well. Of note, there is a higher percentage of international students in graduate programs than undergraduate programs at W&M. One faculty member concluded, “I came back from the GBM program knowing that I am a better professional. As a result, I will be a better professor. I will be able to relate with the international students better than I was before.” Being in a dynamic cultural environment allowed these teachers to become students of the world and gain a greater appreciation of how to connect with individuals that have diverse backgrounds and experiences.

Enhancement of teaching skills. Several of the faculty mentioned there was significant value in teaching in a diverse cultural environment as well as teaching in a hybrid format. One of the faculty members commented,

It was a different teaching context, which made it challenging in a good way. It’s easy for me to help students design an interview guide for other William & Mary students on campus when they can approach it in the same language with the same view of the world. But I’ve pushed students over the last few years to try to
do projects that were not campus based, and the GBM program was ideal for this approach.

For a few of the faculty members, the GBM was their first opportunity to experiment with a hybrid approach to teaching. The intentional ordering of the courses in the GBM program meant that faculty were gaining skills relative to the sequencing that is evident in the Lattuca and Stark (2009) planning model. A design thinking mindset, which is actively practiced in the School of Business, helped to build the possibilities of the GBM and could complement a backward design of curriculum and intentional assessments in future iterations of the program.

One faculty member even declared learning how to teach online in a hybrid format as the pivotal point in the program for them. “When I was thinking about what was pivotal for me and what skills I acquired, it was that I can now teach online and lead an effective hybrid course.” Another faculty member asserted that developing hybrid skills is not only important for teaching effectiveness but also for career security.

We need to be building a lot more competency among our faculty in doing hybrid education because that's the future. This traditional model of sitting in a classroom forever, it’s dying. If you’re going to have a career as a business professor, you better figure this out because you may not have a job.

For faculty, the learning gained from teaching in a hybrid format has consequences for how they might engage in on-campus teaching and how they view curriculum development. As of the final editing of this dissertation in March 2020, the impact of COVID-19 has caused a national crisis in higher education that has never been seen before (Redden, 2020). Institutions across the U.S. are being forced to close campuses
and deliver classes through online platforms. Thus, the enhancement of teaching skills to include online learning for faculty has become a national imperative.

**Summary of Findings**

This chapter examined insights gained from interviews, a focus group, and document analyses regarding the impact of the GBM program on students and faculty at W&M. The findings addressed each of the primary evaluation questions: (1) the perceived facilitating conditions and barriers to intercultural competence and professional development evident in the GBM program; (2) how students perceived the GBM program contributed to their intercultural competence and professional development; and (3) how faculty perceived the GBM program contributed to their intercultural competence and professional development.

The evaluation found that students and faculty believe a facilitating condition for the GBM program is the prioritization of internationalization at W&M, which is specifically evident through the Reves Center and the COLL curriculum. However, a significant barrier for the GBM program, especially from the perspective of the faculty, is a perceived lack of prioritization of internationalization in the School of Business.

Based on the findings of the evaluation, most of the short-term outcomes of the program were met to include building community with W&M students and faculty, establishing a knowledge base for students relative to course learning objectives and international travel that create context for the UCD experience, establishing a knowledge base for faculty relative to program learning objectives and international travel that create context for the UCD experience, and instilling in students an understanding of the importance of team work across diverse groups. However, the expected short-term
outcome of introducing students and faculty to intercultural competence and communication skills in a dynamic global environment was not met.

The evaluation revealed varying degrees of success in achieving the intermediate outcomes of the GBM. Those outcomes that were met included students gaining knowledge of finance, management, marketing, and design thinking in the context of international business as well as faculty gaining greater knowledge of their respective discipline (finance, management, marketing, or design thinking) in the context of international business. Those outcomes that could have been improved included students cultivating an understanding of global business from an Irish perspective as well as students and faculty representing W&M positively to UCD and the Irish community.

The long-term outcomes of the GBM program included intercultural competence and professional development skills that could be applied in the daily lives of students and faculty. Table 4 reflects the strength of the findings related to intercultural competence and professional development for students and faculty.
Table 4

*Frequency of Findings for Students and Faculty*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Students (n = 10)</th>
<th>Faculty (n = 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intercultural Competence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Awareness</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Awareness</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Skills</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Enrichment</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement of Teaching Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I found that the GBM program contributed to the long-term objective of strengthening students’ intercultural competence through an increased understanding of cultural awareness, perspective and diversity. The GBM program also contributed to the students’ professional development through career awareness as well as building skills related to communication and team work.

In addition, the study found that the GBM program contributed to the long-term objective of strengthening faculty intercultural competence through an increased understanding of cultural awareness and diversity. The GBM program also contributed to the professional development of faculty through the enrichment of curriculum and enhancement of teaching skills.
CHAPTER 5: RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter begins with a brief overview of the study and the purpose of this program evaluation. The evaluation findings are discussed and insights related to the literature review are examined. Then, the implications for policy and practice are considered and recommendations are shared. The chapter concludes with suggestions for future research to build upon the findings of this evaluation.

Overview of the Study

Research has shown that study abroad results in valuable intercultural experiences (Deardorff, 2011) as well as practical skills to support academic and career success (Association of American Colleges & Universities, n.d.). Most often, learners in study abroad programs are considered the student participants; however, faculty are also impacted through learning opportunities during teaching abroad (Womble et al., 2014). Yet, despite the perceived value of study abroad programs for both students and faculty, institutions struggle with committing resources to internationalization as well as assessing the true impact of these learning experiences. To help fill this gap in the literature, I evaluated the GBM program at W&M to provide data insights to administrators on the impact of the GBM on the intercultural competence and professional development of students and faculty. In addition, these insights can provide guidance on the academic and administrative resources required to support the delivery of such a program.

Students at W&M have a multitude of venues for global experiences through the Reves Center study abroad programs and the liberal arts COLL curriculum (Hoving,
However, there are nominal opportunities for students or faculty to have international education experiences focused solely on business content. The GBM program used an innovative hybrid approach to deliver five courses on international finance, international management, international marketing, special topics on design thinking, and global business during the summers of 2017 and 2018. The program involved one week at W&M, three weeks of online learning prior to traveling abroad, and eight weeks at UCD in Ireland.

Unfortunately, the GBM was created so quickly that although program objectives were developed for purposes of the formal program proposal, the assessment of these objectives was neither considered nor established. Still, the evaluation of certain program attributes did occur at both the course level and program level through standard course surveys and program satisfaction surveys. Therefore, this evaluation provides the first attempt at a comprehensive review of course, program, and institutional documents related to the GBM. Additionally, the study sought to understand the perceptions of students and faculty regarding how the program contributed to their intercultural competence and professional development. A total of 10 students as well as the six W&M faculty members who taught in the GBM were interviewed for this study.

This program evaluation was formative in nature and sought to determine possible areas of improvement for delivering experiences that build intercultural competence and professional development skills of students and faculty. Since this study was aligned with the pragmatic paradigm and the Use Branch of program evaluation (Mertens & Wilson, 2012), the findings should be useful to various stakeholders including the School of Business and W&M.
The evaluation questions for this study were:

1. What are the perceived facilitating conditions and barriers to developing intercultural competence and professional development through a GBM program for students and faculty?

2. How do students perceive the GBM program contributed to their intercultural competence and professional development?

3. How do faculty perceive the GBM program contributed to their intercultural competence and professional development?

Discussion of Findings

The following sections review the findings for each evaluation question and examines how these findings relate to insights from the literature review.

**Facilitating conditions and barriers.** I found that most of the short-term and intermediate outcomes of the program were achieved. Facilitating conditions to achieving these outcomes included GBM curriculum development meetings with faculty, engaging orientation programs, establishing community through collaborative exercises, fostering teamwork through a cohort-based approach, and experiential learning. Barriers to achieving these outcomes included complex logistics involved with an accelerated hybrid program, lack of intention relative to the assessment of intercultural competence, and an experience that was not fully immersive with the Irish business community and culture.

However, the most important facilitating condition for the GBM program seemed to be the prioritization of internationalization at the institution and school levels. Students and faculty believed that internationalization was indeed prioritized at W&M.
Yet, at the School of Business there was a perceived lack of prioritization of internationalization, especially from the perspective of the faculty. As stated previously, the ACE CIGE model recognizes that an articulated institutional commitment is critical for internationalization (ACE, n.d.). At W&M, internationalization is evident to students and faculty through the Reves Center and its study abroad programs as well as the COLL curriculum. Despite the overarching support of internationalization at the university level, faculty perceived the GBM program was treated more as an opportunistic tactic and one-off experience versus a committed strategy in the School of Business. Even though the faculty interviews and document analyses revealed multiple efforts to establish a vision for internationalization in the School of Business over the past decade, this objective remains elusive.

Understanding this context at W&M forms the foundation for using the CIPP evaluation model (Stufflebeam & Coryn, 2014) and is especially important for the GBM program. In this case, internationalization has been recognized as a fundamental element of the new W&M mission, which states, “We cultivate creative thinkers, principled leaders, and compassionate global citizens equipped for lives of meaning and distinction” (William & Mary, 2020, para. 2). The strong institutional emphasis on internationalization supports the objectives of the GBM and avoids a potential barrier.

The School of Business has a stated mission “to serve the Commonwealth, the nation, and the global community both by offering high-quality educational programs at the undergraduate, graduate, and professional levels and by creating and communicating new knowledge” (Raymond A. Mason School of Business, 2020a, para. 1). However, based on this evaluation, the School has no dedicated resources to develop sustainable
programs in support of internationalization. As outlined in the Logic Model (Appendix B), resources are needed to support the inputs of the program including human capital, facilities, and technology. In addition, since the School of Business is accredited by AACSB, there is an expected commitment to corporate social responsibility issues including globalization, sustainability and diversity. The School of Business could also realize this commitment through the development of COLL 300 courses; however, no COLL 300 business-oriented courses have been created to date, in part due to the challenge of developing such courses to meet W&M COLL standards.

As noted in Chapter 1, colleges can be viewed as “nested systems of activity” (Senge, 2000, p. 11) to include the classroom (i.e., School of Business), institution (i.e., W&M), and learning community (i.e., field of higher education). In effect, positive (or negative) activities in one of these entities can have a positive (or negative) impact on the other entities. In the case of W&M, the institution’s emphasis on students becoming “compassionate global citizens” (William & Mary, 2020) complements the need for students in School of Business to be able to work in global contexts. The GBM students brought analytical and critical thinking skills gained through their liberal arts background to the program. As students gained business acumen through the GBM, they began to appreciate how to solve complex problems through design thinking and a diversity of perspectives. The emphasis the GBM program placed on teamwork allowed students to build upon their independent knowledge and gain a greater appreciation of the value of collaborative efforts. Based on this program evaluation, the GBM proved to be a valuable learning experience for both students and faculty, who were able to share these experiences with others at W&M upon their return to campus.


**Student perceptions of the GBM program.** Students attested to the value of the GBM program in building intercultural competence through increased cultural awareness, perspective and appreciation of diversity. In addition, the GBM experience directly contributed to the students’ professional development and career success through its emphasis on communication skills and teamwork.

**Intercultural competence.** A primary value derived from study abroad is that these experiences provide students “with a unique opportunity to understand a foreign culture more deeply through immersion” (Hoffa & DePaul, 2010, p. 9). In an increasingly connected and diverse world, it is vital for students to appreciate the values of others as well as how to respond appropriately (Bauer-Wolf, 2018). From the start of the GBM program, through orientation sessions at W&M and UCD, there was an informal emphasis on developing this intercultural competence through experiential learning. Based on the post-orientation surveys of both experiences at W&M and UCD, students found these sessions to be engaging and effective introductions to the program. However, a formalized approach to articulate and assess intercultural competence would benefit both students and faculty, as well as the School of Business and W&M, with understanding learning outcomes.

The instructional processes in the GBM involved intentional experiential learning including guest lectures, comprehensive projects based on the Irish marketplace, and excursions across Dublin as well as Belfast, Galway, and other regions of Ireland. Not only did these excursions inspire students to learn more about Irish culture and the diversity within the country, but it also allowed them to reflect on what they were
learning in the program and how these lessons learned could be applied to their own lives and careers. As one student shared,

Exploring Ireland launched a lot of the critical reflection and intersections that I started going through in my later years of college and that I continue today. Thinking about what I actually want for my life and career. It’s only after the fact, these two years later, that I’m realizing these seeds were planted in the program.

The structure of the GBM in Ireland enabled students to immediately apply cultural insights through experiential learning projects in various courses, therefore enhancing the value of intercultural competence derived from this study abroad program (Doyle, 2019). However, students also felt as though the GBM experience could have been even more immersive with the Irish business community and culture.

This evaluation provided an opportunity to not only conduct a comprehensive analysis of course surveys and other program documents, but also to connect with a subset of students a few years later to reflect on the value of the GBM in their lives after graduation. As Deardorff (2011) noted, “Intercultural competence development is an ongoing process, and it becomes important for individuals to be given opportunities to reflect on and assess the development of their own intercultural competence over time” (p. 68). It was evident, especially in the LinkedIn reflective posts, that the GBM gave students the opportunity to learn about, and adapt to, diverse environments and circumstances, which ultimately led them to become more open-minded and self-aware (Dewaele & Wei, 2013; McKinley, 2014). In particular, the GBM program forced students to question their own self-reference criterion and prior beliefs, especially
through course concepts on design thinking, which fostered knowledge growth and global awareness (Fine & McNamara, 2011; Stearns, 2009; Vera Lopez, 2013).

The literature review pointed out that study abroad programs with English language instruction and modern amenities for housing, such as the GBM, could serve to limit the depth of cross-cultural experiences (Hoffa & DePaul, 2010). Although that might be true, this program evaluation found several students selected the GBM based on the specific destination of Ireland for various reasons including perceived safety of the environment and less risk of culture shock (Goldstein & Keller, 2015). One student commented,

Ireland is a really ingenious choice for this program specifically because it is English speaking and something that feels to a person looking for a study abroad experience like it would be closest to America. And attracting the type of people who would think that, and then showing them that is truly not the case, is brilliant. Even though the cross-cultural experiences in Ireland might not be as intense as India for example, there is value in Ireland as a destination if such a location encourages study abroad for students who might not have done it otherwise.

Professional development. The program evaluation revealed the GBM had a very positive impact on the professional development of students. Every student interviewed for this study commented that the global mindset and skills developed as a result of the program contributed to them being selected for summer internships, admitted to graduate school programs or hired for competitive career opportunities. Of the 21 students in the 2017 GBM program that pursued careers after graduation, 80% are working in business-
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related fields, which is an interesting outcome since the design of the GBM program focused on non-business majors.

In addition to preparing for a particular career path, professional development for students involved building competencies such as communication skills and teamwork through the GBM program. These particular program outcomes align with insights from the literature review that, “Employers are increasingly emphasizing the need for improvement in critical thinking, communication, teamwork, collaboration, and problem-solving skills in students” (Business Wire, 2016, para. 6). From the very start of the program, there was an intentional focus on building community and establishing collaborative teams. As one student noted,

I never had such extensive group work until this program. And we collaborated in a way that reflected real life. I also appreciated hearing ideas from my teammates, even when I thought I had a really great idea. They’d say something that was a much better idea and it made me think about other perspectives and forced me not to be in my own mind the whole time.

The team-oriented approach to the GBM curriculum resulted in students gaining practical experience with group dynamics, which they brought back to campus and employed through initiatives such as the launch of Tribe Innovation (n.d.).

The intercultural competence skills that students gained in the GBM program could also be viewed as contributing to professional development. The American Institute for Foreign Study found that “the top transferable skills reported by employers overlap considerably with the skills that help define intercultural competence, for example: flexibility, open-mindedness, empathy” (Hubbard et al., 2018, p. 7). As one
student explained, “My sense of empathy developed not only through empathizing with peers, but also with people of the Irish culture.” This sentiment aligns with research that study abroad participants gain “a unique set of skills that distinguish them as leaders who have the understanding to navigate effectively, humanely and positively across different cultures” (McMillan & Opem, 2002, para. 9). Based on the program evaluation findings, the GBM helped students develop empathy through design thinking and inspired them to be open to different perspectives.

**Faculty perceptions of the GBM program.** Faculty did not necessarily pursue participation in the GBM to gain value for themselves but rather to share their knowledge with students. However, upon reflection in this study, all of the faculty participants believed the GBM contributed to their own intercultural competence and professional development. Specifically, faculty gained an increased understanding of cultural awareness and diversity. In addition, the GBM contributed to the professional development of faculty through the enrichment of curriculum and enhancement of teaching skills. Since five of the six faculty had favorable teaching abroad experiences in the past, the faculty were primed to be positive about the GBM program as well.

**Intercultural competence.** Faculty believed their cultural awareness was most enriched though immersive experiences in Ireland to include business site visits and travel to places such as Belfast. Only one faculty member in the GBM program had previously traveled to Ireland. These cultural experiences support the AACSB (2020) accreditation standards for the School of Business that faculty need to engage in the world beyond their own institutions and home countries. The living-learning environment at UCD also fostered a close connection between faculty and students in
Ireland, which resulted in faculty developing a better understanding of W&M students and their needs (Watts, 2015). However, similar to student feedback, the faculty believed the GBM program could have been even more immersive with the Irish business community and culture.

The engagement of faculty is a critical success factor for developing and sustaining internationalization (Stohl, 2007) as well as disseminating intercultural competence across institutions of higher education. Faculty noted that an important facilitating condition for their engagement with the GBM program was being able to share this cultural experience with their families. Not only were faculty members able to learn from the cultural experiences of their families, but they were also able to share their profession more intimately with them. As one faculty member explained,

A pivotal moment for me in the program was having my young daughters sit in the classroom. That's the only time they've ever done that and seeing me as a professional and interacting with students was a really neat moment that I won’t forget with them.

Several faculty members made similar comments about the importance of the GBM being a family experience, especially since the program was offered during the summer months when faculty tend to travel with their children.

All of the faculty members appreciated the diversity of experiences gained through the GBM program as well as cultural examples that could be brought back to W&M. Even the most senior faculty members found that the GBM contributed to their intellectual growth (Festervand & Tillery, 2001), especially with regards to cultural awareness and diversity. The GBM was a unique opportunity to engage with students
who were non-business majors and teach individuals with perspectives that differed from typical students in the School of Business. Faculty did not cite any significant differences between the quality of performance of the GBM students compared to the traditional business students. As Fine and McNamara (2011) explained, “For educational leaders whose goal it is to transform their schools into pluralistic, inclusive environments, they must first be willing to look deeply into their own tacit assumptions about the diverse students with whom they work” (p. 256). As previously mentioned, there was a certain level of career maturity evident in the faculty responses and they seemed to have an appreciation of the need to challenge their own biases and assumptions through their involvement with the GBM program.

Even though the study findings revealed that faculty members valued the cultural experiences gained through the GBM, it was a challenge for a few of them to articulate at times how the program specifically impacted their intercultural competence. This could have been due to the lack of intentional learning outcomes for faculty at the start of the program. However, most of the faculty members were steadfast in their belief that the GBM was a positive investment for them relative to intercultural competence and professional development. Faculty also believed that programs similar to the GBM were vital for the School of Business to fulfill its mission. One faculty member attested,

> If I had to vote for a Global Business Minor or not, I would have a strong “Yes” vote. To require students at William & Mary to meet COLL 300 requirements and for the business school not to provide anything is wrong. We need to be held to the standard of keeping with the rest of William & Mary.
There was a continuous theme throughout the faculty interviews that more needs to be done in the School of Business relative to internationalization, for the good of the students, faculty, and institution.

**Professional development.** This program evaluation found that the GBM contributed to the professional development of faculty through the enrichment of curriculum and enhancement of teaching skills. Prior to the launch of the program in 2017, and to a lesser extent in 2018, various faculty meetings were held to discuss the integration of curriculum across the five courses. This focus on curriculum is aligned with the ACE (n.d.) CIGE model for comprehensive internationalization. The curriculum pillar in this model involves course content and pedagogy to include how, “courses foster experiential learning that enables students to apply and use what they are learning” (ACE, n.d., p. 4). Faculty commented that the GBM program not only provided them with opportunities to pursue experiential learning with students, but also to gain diversity in the stories and examples they could share upon their return to W&M (Miglietti, 2015). One faculty member explained that,

I'm able to bring into the classroom the stories that I have collected from these experiences that are going to be different from the experiences of students or faculty who haven't traveled there. These experiences are salient, relevant, and interesting in a way that if it was just a story about something that happened at W&M it wouldn't be.

Although internationalization can be achieved through various offerings including COLL 300 courses at W&M, several faculty members specifically mentioned they participated in the GBM to be immersed in the Irish business community and culture. The
scholarship of teaching is especially relevant to internationalization and study abroad as faculty discover new perspectives in their teaching and research through overseas experiences (Boyer, 1990). As a result of internationalization, there is an increasing demand for “the integration of international, global, intercultural and comparative perspectives into the teaching and learning process and program content” (Knight, 2012, p. 20).

However, there is a lack of incentive for faculty to engage in teaching abroad in the School of Business. One faculty member noted that previous study abroad experiences in the School had been referred to as “boondoggles.” Another faculty member joined a previous study abroad program in which the professor was having trouble removing the boondoggle perception and shared, “I was able to see just how incredibly valuable an experience it was for all those students; it was transformative.” Thus, this faculty member attested to the educational value of a study abroad experience for both students and faculty, and countered it was certainly not a “boondoggle.” For the majority of GBM faculty that had previously taught abroad prior to this program, there was no doubt the GBM helped reinforce the value of study abroad for both students and faculty.

W&M does not have a specific statement in the promotion and tenure guidelines that recognizes a faculty member’s international efforts. However, W&M is not unique in its lack of support or incentivization for faculty to teach abroad. A recent ACE CIGE survey revealed that “only about one in 10 [institutions] specify international engagement as a consideration in promotion and tenure decisions” (Helms & Brajkovic, 2017, p. vii).
If faculty are not motivated to have experiences that help improve their world view, it will be difficult for them to truly support students in their development as global citizens.

**Implications for Policy and Practice**

The GBM contributed to the School of Business by becoming the first program developed specifically for non-business majors, thus reaching a market that might not have been engaged otherwise. The program also contributed to the internationalization efforts of the School, enhanced the diversity of the curriculum, and supported AACSB accreditation standards. In addition, based on the evaluation findings, the GBM program led to three students completing a one-year graduate program in the School of Business. Internal document analyses also revealed the program earned a significant profit in 2017 and 2018 to include covering all of the expenses related to the Program Director and faculty members. One could argue there were even greater benefits beyond the profitability on the balance sheet to include professional development of faculty as well as students who are prepared to be compassionate global citizens.

Even though this program evaluation determined there was significant value in the GBM to the School of Business, W&M, and to the field of higher education, the fact remains that this program was only offered in 2017 and 2018. However, insights gained from this program evaluation could be applied to future curriculum efforts to ensure that the mission of W&M, as well as the mission of the School of Business, is fulfilled by both students and faculty. Following are three recommendations to be considered:

1. Commit resources to internationalization to develop sustainable and immersive learning programs in the School of Business.

2. Ensure programs have clear objectives and intentional assessments.
3. Support and recognize faculty efforts to create experiential learning and to teach abroad.

**Recommendation 1: Resource commitment.** As previously discussed, both W&M and the School of Business have mission statements that emphasize the need to develop global citizens and serve the global community. If internationalization is truly a priority for both the institution and the School, then resources need to be committed to internationalization to develop sustainable and immersive learning programs in the School of Business.

It is important to note that this recommendation is focused on “immersive” and not simply “experiential learning” opportunities. The COLL curriculum at W&M requires all students to earn three credits at the COLL 300 level, which is intended to ensure students have the opportunity to deepen their connections with the world around them. It is assumed that certain W&M students do not have the time or resources to study abroad and therefore need other experiential learning opportunities to meet the COLL 300 requirement. However, this program evaluation found that both students and faculty consistently believed the GBM program would not provide the same value proposition if it were offered during a traditional W&M semester in Williamsburg, VA. One faculty member cautioned,

Some of the things that we are doing with COLL 300 are watered down so much that I think it's practically worthless. I personally think that we're not delivering the COLL objectives as they were originally intended. And the more we can give our students true international experiences, whether it's two weeks in Southeast Asia or a full Global Business Minor, we need to do it.
Every student who was interviewed had a similar perspective regarding the value of an immersive global experience through study abroad. As one student attested,

> There was great value just to be in Dublin and hear the daily news about the potential impact Brexit could have on the business landscape of the city. But being immersed in this environment also made me think about how it could change the actual soul of Ireland.

It may be more convenient and less costly to focus efforts upon the development of campus-based COLL 300 courses. However, based on this study it seems there was a significant return on the investment to be involved with the GBM for both students and faculty, especially relative to the positive impact that the program had on career preparation and professional development.

If the decision is made to invest in sustainable and immersive learning programs in the School of Business, the first investment needs to be dedicated human capital to support the development and coordination of these programs. In effect, to create sustainable and immersive learning programs in the School of Business there needs to be a champion for these efforts in the administration. There was a marked decline in support for the GBM program when the transition occurred between Associate Deans in the School of Business during the 2017-2018 academic year. This personnel change is not a reflection on the individuals involved, but rather a shift in priorities of the School of Business. As a result, the BBA director that had been supporting the GBM during the first two years, shifted to support the new one-year graduate programs. Thus, there was no single administrator that served as an advocate on behalf of internationalization and
related programs such as the GBM to coordinate efforts across the faculty, Reves Center, marketing and other campus offices.

At the institutional level, it is critical that the School of Business continues to strengthen relationships with the Reves Center and seeks opportunities to further promote such programs to students who would benefit from the curriculum. Since this is one of the only study abroad programs at W&M not offered through an Arts and Sciences department, it requires significant effort to reach non-business majors who would benefit from the program. Again, the lack of administrative and marketing resources to support the development and sustainability of the program is a significant barrier to its success.

**Recommendation 2: Program clarifications.** The GBM was created so quickly that a comprehensive evaluation of program objectives through backward design (Harvard Business Publishing, 2019) or another assessment approach was neither considered nor established. Since the GBM was a unique opportunity to develop the first minor for non-business majors in the School of Business, it was also a unique opportunity to develop an integrated curriculum at the program level. However, research has shown that faculty tend to focus their attention on course-level curriculum rather than program-level curriculum (Johns-Boast, 2013). Thus, even though there was a concerted effort to develop an integrated curriculum, especially during the first year of the program, this evaluation study found that greater effort needed to be dedicated to articulating the program objectives and determining appropriate assessments. As long as W&M remains focused on the inputs and outputs of the CIPP model (such as the percentage of students who study abroad) vs. the outcomes, W&M will struggle to determine the true impact of internationalization.
Since the development of intercultural competence was an important GBM objective, the faculty should have first created a shared definition of this concept in the context of the School of Business. Once the definitions of critical concepts have been solidified, then discussions can be had regarding how to measure the attainment of these concepts. In the case of intercultural competence, there are various surveys that could be adopted including the IDI (2019), the GPI (Research Institute for Studies in Education, 2017), and the TMIC (Schnabel et al., 2016). Such tools help to understand the baseline of an individual’s intercultural competence so that additional concepts and frameworks can be provided when needed to ensure that learning occurs before, during, and after the study abroad experience. Students are likely to focus on the external, sociocultural differences when arriving in a host country and may need to be primed to consider internal, psychological aspects of the experience before traveling to assist with the adjustment process (Goldstein & Keller, 2015).

Deardorff (2006) cautioned against using standardized surveys as the sole instrument for assessing the true impact of learning associated with intercultural competence as a result of a study abroad program. Thus, the insights from such surveys can be complemented with other assessment tools such as reflective journal essays or LinkedIn posts. These data sources can be triangulated with course evaluations and program evaluations, which can be conducted after the first week of orientation at W&M, after the first week at UCD, and at the end of the program. In addition, the Reves Center typically conducts an institutional assessment at the end of the study abroad experience; however, in the case of the GBM program, this survey data was only collected and shared with the School of Business in 2018. The need for the coordination of program
objectives and assessments is another reason that resources should be invested in an administrator to support these efforts, as outlined in the first recommendation.

**Recommendation 3: Incentivizing faculty international efforts.** The ACE CIGE model for comprehensive internationalization is based on several pillars to include faculty practices. The faculty practices pillar considers how the institution promotes faculty engagement in internationalization including opportunities to travel abroad for teaching and research (ACE, n.d.). Peterson and Helms (2013) found that if faculty “do not have opportunities to acquire international knowledge and skills, or lack incentives to take advantage of such opportunities, their ability to help students acquire the same knowledge and skills will undoubtedly suffer” (p. 32). Based on faculty feedback, the GBM program was a unique opportunity to engage faculty in practices related to building complex, interconnected academic programs.

As W&M and the School of Business continue to develop and expand online programs, which can attract students from around the world, these international experiences become even more important for our faculty. The new Studio for Teaching & Learning Innovation (William & Mary, 2019d) at W&M could be an ideal place to coordinate professional development for faculty related to teaching abroad as well as teaching students with international backgrounds. The Studio has been designed to facilitate structured learning experiences (both face-to-face and online) and academic innovation projects, which would enable best practices related to internationalization to be shared across the campus community.

During the program evaluation, two senior faculty members voiced serious concerns about the culture of “publish or perish” relative to tenure-track faculty. One
faculty member explained, “We’ve created this culture that panics our faculty about committing to one more thing, because it’s not going to ‘count.’ It's not going to ‘matter.’ I can’t think of many things we do that matter more than teaching abroad.” If faculty engagement is deemed critical to the success of internationalization (Eddy et al., 2013; Stohl, 2007), then W&M and the School of Business need to strengthen how they formally recognize the international efforts of their faculty as well.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

As of 2018, the GBM was the only study abroad program in the U.S. that allowed students to earn a minor designation during a summer semester through a hybrid approach of campus, online and host country learning experiences. Since this evaluation focused on a single program, in a specific discipline, at a single institution, future research could examine the intercultural competence and professional development of students and faculty across other study abroad programs, in other disciplines, at other institutions.

In addition, since the GBM was a unique opportunity to develop the first non-business minor in the School of Business, W&M could research the possibilities of launching another global minor program in a related discipline. In spring 2019, W&M created an Interdisciplinary Innovation & Entrepreneurship Minor (Raymond A. Mason School of Business, 2020b) that could be potentially be offered during the summer in a format similar to the GBM program. As one student noted, “The GBM could expand upon some of William & Mary’s current trending business initiatives like entrepreneurship, innovation, and sustainability. Those are things that students who are outside of the business school will be hearing about.” This could be an ideal opportunity
for W&M and the School of Business to consider lessons learned from this research and apply them to future curriculum development efforts.

As noted throughout this study, a primary area for improvement for the GBM program would be an intentional focus on both student and faculty assessment. Thus, recommendations for future research could include examining the effectiveness of different assessment tools to measure learning outcomes relative to intercultural competence as well as professional development. The findings of this study could be used to develop pre-test and post-test surveys to determine how a study abroad program contributed to the intercultural competence of students relative to cultural awareness, perspective and appreciation of diversity. Additional pre-test and post-test surveys could be given to students to determine how a study abroad program contributed to professional development through the strengthening of communication skills and teamwork. Similar pre-test and post-test surveys could be given to the faculty relative to intercultural competence and professional development. At W&M, it might also be interesting to compare intercultural competence learning outcomes from the GBM with outcomes from similar COLL 300 courses.

This program evaluation also revealed significant professional development opportunities, especially for students. Future research could expand upon these insights and apply a career readiness model to achieve a different vantage point in understanding student experiences in study abroad. The National Association of Colleges and Employers (2020) has developed a career readiness model based on eight competencies that could be examined in the context of study abroad. These competencies include critical thinking, communications, teamwork, digital technology, leadership, work ethic,
career management and global/intercultural fluency. Several of these competencies such as critical thinking, communications, teamwork and global/intercultural fluency were evident in the GBM program. Using the formalized National Association of Colleges and Employers model to better understand the impact of study abroad programs on career readiness would give credibility and even greater value to the insights gained through this program evaluation.

An unexpected but valuable data source for this program evaluation proved to be the reflective student posts on LinkedIn for the Marketing course in the GBM program. To a certain extent, these posts could be considered open data sources; other researchers can search for the term “Global Business Minor” on LinkedIn to find many of the students who participated in the program as well as the posts about their study abroad experiences to compare with students from other institutions. Also, students could potentially be asked to submit an essay prior to the start of their study abroad experience about their expectations for the program and then develop a LinkedIn post at the end of the program about their actual experiences for comparison purposes. At W&M, these LinkedIn profiles could prove to be an excellent tool to remain connected with students in the GBM program for longitudinal study purposes in the future.

Summary

This evaluation was a comprehensive review of the GBM program at W&M, the only study abroad program in the U.S. that allowed students to earn a minor designation during a summer semester through a hybrid approach of campus, online and host country learning experiences. This study examined various data sources (including course, program, and institutional documents) related to the GBM as well as interviews with
students and faculty. The evaluation questions sought to understand the facilitating conditions and barriers for the GBM program as well as how students and faculty perceived the GBM contributed to their intercultural competence and professional development.

This study revealed that a facilitating condition for the GBM program is the prioritization of internationalization at W&M. However, a significant barrier for the GBM program, especially from the perspective of the faculty, is a perceived lack of prioritization of internationalization in the School of Business. Students perceived the GBM contributed to their intercultural competence through increased cultural awareness, perspective and diversity as well as to their professional development through career awareness and building skills related to communication and teamwork. Faculty perceived the GBM contributed to their intercultural competence through increased cultural awareness and diversity as well as to their professional development through the enrichment of curriculum and enhancement of teaching skills.

Based on the evaluation findings, three strategic recommendations were presented. First, assuming internationalization is an institutional and school priority, then resources need to be dedicated to ensure sustainable and immersive learning programs. A dedicated administrator is vital to champion internationalization and coordinate logistics across the institution to ensure continuity for these programs. There is limited value in launching one-off programs that are delivered for a brief period of time or providing experiences that are not truly immersive in nature. Second, if a commitment is made to launch a program similar to the GBM, then a commitment also needs to be made to establish clear program objectives with intentional assessments. Third, for an institution
to truly develop a culture of internationalization, it needs to support and recognize faculty efforts to create experiential learning opportunities and teach abroad. If we want faculty to inspire students to change our world, then we need to give both students and faculty the opportunity to explore our world.
APPENDIX A

RESEARCHER AS INSTRUMENT STATEMENT

As an undergraduate student at Elmira College, I participated in my first study abroad program in San Salvador, Bahamas; it was honestly the most impactful learning experience of my life. At the end of those six weeks, I was surprised to discover that my most important lessons were not about island ecology, but about island culture. San Salvador had a very primitive infrastructure, with limited power and water. We traversed the island in an old flatbed truck and when we drove past the local school, I was dismayed at the condition of the building and wondered how students could effectively learn in that environment. My first study abroad experience had an indelible impact on the person, and professor, that I would become as it truly opened my eyes to the privileges that I had been given and the needs of others in our world.

Within days of completing my undergraduate education in 1990, I moved to the Western Pacific island of Guam with my new husband who served in the U.S. military. Eventually, I was able to find a position as the Assistant Director of the local talent and promotions agency. As a recent college graduate, I had a great drive and desire to quickly make a difference in the community. However, I soon realized that before I could make such a difference, I had to build relationships and gain the trust of those around me. Although the transition was difficult at first, I eventually learned how to adapt to this multicultural environment and was honored to receive the Governor of Guam Ambassador award for my community contributions.

My experience in Guam motivated me to learn even more about international markets. So, I left the island of Guam for a dramatically different island -- Manhattan in
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New York City to enroll at Columbia Business School in 1994. As part of my MBA program, I was one of two students selected to study abroad at London Business School for a semester. These educational experiences led to a marketing management role with Discovery Channel, an organization whose tagline was literally, “Explore Your World.” I eventually left Discovery for the opportunity to become a marketing manager at PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC) Management Consulting Services, which at the time was the world’s largest professional services firm with 250,000+ employees around the globe.

While at PwC, I was encouraged to enroll in the new Doctor of Management degree program at University of Maryland University College (UMUC) in the fall of 2000. I was fascinated with my technology courses on the impact of online learning, as I believed the world could be democratized through higher education. During my doctoral studies, I also had the opportunity to teach online courses for UMUC, which at the time (before University of Phoenix) was the world’s largest online institution. I felt as though I was witnessing a “tipping point” for higher education, as we were leveraging technology to pursue online learning in ways not previously imagined.

However, the pace of change was slow and I started to become frustrated with the limitations of distance education at that time. In 2001, we seemed relegated to teaching to the least common denominator, in effect the lowest level technology requirements to meet the needs of students around the globe. So, while our internationalization efforts were improving the accessibility of education, we were not necessarily delivering a high quality of education compared to traditional classrooms in the U.S. Fast forward to 2014, when I joined the faculty at William & Mary and technology had become an integral part of online learning and internationalization efforts in higher education.
Upon arriving at the School of Business, I was excited to contribute to the launch of the new Online MBA program and expand the reach of our institution. However, I was surprised at the limited availability of international education experiences for both students and faculty. There had been a handful of one-time programs offered over the years to undergraduate students, but no continuous study abroad experiences in the School of Business. And, there were nominal opportunities for faculty to travel or teach abroad beyond external offerings such as the Fulbright Scholar program. This lack of international activity within the School was very unexpected for me, since my previous institution, Saint Vincent College, ensured that every faculty member in the School of Business, Economics, and Government had been involved with study abroad programs or had taught overseas.

These background experiences were driving factors for me to accept the challenge put forth by our Associate Dean in the spring of 2016 to launch a Global Business Minor (GBM). The Associate Dean had a strong international background, having taught at several global institutions to include being a Fulbright Scholar. He envisioned that the GBM would be the first formalized offering in the School of Business specifically for non-business majors. Since courses during the traditional academic semesters were at full capacity in the School of Business, the GBM would be offered during the summer. The program would be structured as a hybrid approach to learning that involved traditional classroom experiences at both W&M and University College Dublin (UCD) in Ireland, complemented with online lessons. UCD was determined as the destination for several reasons including its Summer at UCD programme having been recognized as a leader in European study abroad. In addition, the growing role of Dublin as the European
headquarters for organizations such as Google and Microsoft was well-aligned with the intended curriculum of the GBM.

To spur the development of the program, the Associate Dean decided to send the Assistant Dean and myself to the Aspen Institute Undergraduate Consortium in June 2016 at Northwestern University. This venue provided a unique opportunity to meet with other selective colleges that were striving to effectively integrate business acumen into a liberal arts curriculum. This consortium was both inspiring and motivating, and we left Chicago with a working framework for the GBM.

The proposed program was met with great support from our peers and was quickly and unanimously passed at the September 2016 faculty meeting. I volunteered (and received no additional compensation) to lead the faculty curriculum efforts and worked with an administrative team from our BBA Office and Reves Center to develop and promote the program across campus. In addition, we hired a Program Director (a W&M graduate student) that would remain on-site for the duration of the time at UCD (since W&M faculty rotated every two weeks to teach different courses). With only six months to launch the program, constant collaboration and frequent communication with the administrative team was critical to our success. In the end, 35 students enrolled in the inaugural program offering, making it the second largest study abroad experience at W&M. We returned to the Aspen Institute Undergraduate Consortium in 2017 (just before we traveled to Ireland for the start of our first session at UCD) and received positive reviews of the GBM from other colleges and universities, several of whom asked us to share details of the final program structure.
The inaugural GBM program was pronounced a success by students, faculty, and staff. There were certainly opportunities for improvement, as expected with any initial offering; however, the program seemed to have met its objectives relative to a positive impact on students and faculty, and it also proved to be profitable for the School. Unfortunately, our Associate Dean left the institution in the spring of 2017 to become Dean of another nationally-ranked school of business. As planning began for 2018, the lack of an administrator to champion our efforts resulted in less coordinated communication and support across the institution. When a new Associate Dean was hired, he did not have an international background and was charged to primarily strengthen the research efforts of our School.

Still, the GBM had momentum from the previous year and achieved similar enrollment success for the summer of 2018, with 31 students completing the program. However, there were various student challenges in this second iteration, with one student needing to be sent home midway through the session at UCD. Since the program was developed as a living-learning environment, this student’s actions impacted all of the GBM participants, both inside and outside of the classroom. As such, the cohort team-based approach that had been adopted for the program during the first year was dissolved and new teams were developed for the remainder of the summer session. This structural change was an unexpected and difficult transition for several of our students.

As a result of these experiences in the summer of 2018, we had a faculty and staff debrief meeting in September 2018 with our new Associate Dean to discuss possible improvements to the program. Unfortunately, the BBA director who had supported the GBM during the first two years of the program was now being asked to shift her attention
to new graduate program offerings. Thus, we needed to consider how best to provide administrative support to the program moving forward. In addition to an on-site Program Director, the decision was made to hire a graduate assistant for each course so that participation could grow to at least 40 students in the program and there would be additional support in Ireland to address any student concerns.

Unfortunately, between 2017–2018 overall student demand for the School of Business decreased, reflecting a trend that many U.S. institutions were experiencing (Jaschik, 2019). In addition, the fees to earn a major or minor in the School of Business had doubled, which meant the BBA Office had to renew efforts to recruit students to our traditional programs (rather than promote the GBM). There were also a growing number of opportunities for non-business majors to engage with the School of Business through student associations, the Entrepreneurship Center, and a new Innovation & Entrepreneurship Minor program (Raymond A. Mason School of Business, 2020b). After only two years, the GBM experienced a significant decline in applicants (with only 10 student submissions in 2019); thus, the program was not offered in the summer of 2019 and was placed “on hiatus” for the summer of 2020.

However, the potential for the return of the GBM or a similar program is promising. Recently, W&M announced its new vision, mission and values statements to guide the institution moving forward. The W&M mission includes a desire to “cultivate creative thinkers, principled leaders, and compassionate global citizens equipped for lives of meaning and distinction” (William & Mary, 2020, para. 2). In addition, the institution is exploring how to strengthen academic program offerings in the summer months (William & Mary, 2019c) and the GBM is well-aligned to capitalize on this interest.
Thus, my genuine hope for this research is to better understand the value of the GBM relative to its impact on the intercultural competence and professional development of students and faculty. Based on the informal feedback that I have received to date, I believe the GBM had a positive impact on participants. However, I am open to discovering that is not the case and perhaps students and faculty feel as though they could have made a better investment of their time and resources in other ventures.

When I started formulating this research topic in early 2017, I would have never expected that the GBM would no longer be offered in the summer of 2019. Still, I am more excited than ever to pursue this program evaluation, no matter the outcome, as I know there are many valuable lessons to be learned from this experience. Although my own beliefs about the positive value of international education served as the impetus for my involvement with the GBM, I remain very open to the possibility that not all of the student or faculty participants will share my perspectives. I simply want to be able to communicate to administrators what was effective, and not effective, with the program so an informed decision can be made about continuing the GBM relative to alternative offerings at W&M. And, even if the GBM program is not offered again, these findings can be applied to future international education and summer course offerings. In addition, I hope that others reading this dissertation will find value in this evaluation and will use these insights to build successful programs of their own.
## APPENDIX B

### GLOBAL BUSINESS MINOR OUTCOMES LOGIC MODEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inputs</strong></td>
<td>What resources are dedicated to the program?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Funding – tuition and operational budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Facilities – William &amp; Mary (W&amp;M) and University College Dublin (UCD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Technology – Blackboard for program and course sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Human capital – students, faculty and staff to include School of Business (BBA and IT offices), Reves Center Global Education, Bursar and Registrar; Summer at UCD offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Prior experiences – students and faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities</strong></td>
<td>How does the program leverage inputs to achieve objectives?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• W&amp;M systems – manage program logistics and promote program across campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Academic model – hybrid approach that involves online learning as well as face-to-face teaching at W&amp;M and UCD across five distinct courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Experiential learning – course projects and site visits in Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evaluation – student satisfaction surveys upon completion of every course; student satisfaction surveys upon completion of the first week at W&amp;M and upon completion of the entire program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outputs</strong></td>
<td>What are the direct outputs of program activities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Number of student and faculty participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Number of student participants from across the U.S. and internationally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Number of faculty participants representing tenured and teaching faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student deliverables (to include LinkedIn posts, papers and presentations) across five distinct courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student and faculty site visits in Dublin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student and faculty excursions across Ireland to include Belfast and Galway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student course and program assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>What is the impact on student and faculty participants?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Short-Term – pre-departure to UCD</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Build community with W&amp;M students and faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Establish a knowledge base for students relative to course learning objectives and international travel that create context for the UCD experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Establish a knowledge base for faculty relative to program learning objectives and international travel that create context for the UCD experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Introduce students and faculty to intercultural competence and communication skills to empower them to engage with others in a dynamic global environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Instill in students an understanding of the importance of teamwork across diverse groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Intermediate – on-site at UCD</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Students gain knowledge of finance, management, marketing and special topics in the context of international business that contribute to professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Faculty gain greater knowledge of their respective discipline (finance, management, marketing or special topics) in the context of international business that contributes to professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Students cultivate an understanding of global business from host community perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Students and faculty improve intercultural competence and communication skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Students and faculty represent W&amp;M positively to UCD and the Irish community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Long-Term – post program for students and faculty</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Belief that the GBM program led to increased intercultural competence and professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ability to articulate the value of program experiences to potential employers and prospective students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Expanded network of colleagues at W&amp;M and in Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Further the W&amp;M commitment to internationalization and its mission to develop global citizens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

EMAIL REQUEST FOR STUDY PARTICIPATION

Subject: Interview Request for Dissertation Research on the Global Business Minor Program

Dear ______________,

I am writing in my role as a doctoral candidate at William & Mary, where my dissertation research is focused on student and faculty experiences in the Global Business Minor program.

As part of this research process, I would appreciate the opportunity to interview you regarding your personal experiences in the program. Attached is the interview guide to provide an understanding of the questions that will be asked.

The interviews will be conducted virtually and recorded through Zoom. The interviews should take no more than 60 minutes. Please let me know your availability to be interviewed at any time on January 28, 30 or 31.

The personal identities of interviewees will remain anonymous throughout the research and publication process.

My research prospectus has been reviewed through William & Mary’s Institutional Review Board to ensure compliance with appropriate and ethical research standards. This research is being overseen by my dissertation advisor, Dr. Pamela L. Eddy, Professor and Chair, Educational Policy, Planning and Leadership (peddy@wm.edu).

If you could please confirm or decline your availability to participate in this research by responding to this email no later than January 21, 2020, I would sincerely appreciate it.

With kind regards,

Dawn Edmiston

Dawn Edmiston, D.M. | Clinical Professor of Marketing | Raymond A. Mason School of Business | William & Mary | www.linkedin.com/in/dawnedmiston
Study Definition of Intercultural Competence:
The development of cultural awareness through experiential learning that results in a demonstrated ability to listen, observe and interpret as well as analyze, evaluate and relate to others with diverse backgrounds and experiences.

Study Definition of Professional Development:
Professional development for faculty is the process of maturing and evolving as a professional in their respective discipline. This arc of development often includes continuing education to learn and advance skills as well as professional reflection and a willingness to address one’s own needs.

1. How is internationalization considered as a priority at W&M? In the School of Business?
2. What was your initial motivation for wanting to become involved with the GBM program?
3. What opportunities exist to improve the design and/or implementation of the program?
4. What was the most pivotal or defining moment in the program for you?
5. What specific experiences – at W&M, online or at UCD – were most helpful in developing intercultural competence?
6. How did the GBM program contribute to building specific skills or perspectives that proved valuable to your professional development?
7. How has the knowledge gained from the program been helpful for thinking interculturally in your current professional role?
APPENDIX E

STUDENT INTERVIEW GUIDE

Study Definition of Intercultural Competence:
The development of cultural awareness through experiential learning that results in a
demonstrated ability to listen, observe and interpret as well as analyze, evaluate and
relate to others with diverse backgrounds and experiences.

Study Definition of Professional Development:
Professional development for students involves the choice of career, the awareness of
how a student’s intended profession may be viewed and practiced, and the acquisition
of attitudes and cross-cultural skills that help a student become an effective
professional.

1. How is internationalization considered as a priority at W&M? In the School of
   Business?
2. What was your initial motivation for wanting to become involved with the GBM
   program?
3. What opportunities exist to improve the design and/or implementation of the
   program?
4. What was the most pivotal or defining moment in the program for you?
5. What specific experiences – at W&M, online or at UCD – were most helpful in
developing intercultural competence?
6. How did the GBM program contribute to building specific skills or perspectives
   that proved valuable to your professional development?
7. How has the knowledge gained from the program been helpful for thinking
   interculturally in your current professional role?
APPENDIX F

PARTICIPANT INFORMED CONSENT

Protocol EDIRC-2020-01-10-14039-dmedmistonstra

Title: An Evaluation of a Global Business Minor Program on the Intercultural Competence and Professional Development of Students and Faculty

Principal Investigator: Dawn Edmiston

This is to certify that I, _______________________________________________ have been given the following information with respect to my participation in this study:

1. Purpose of the research: To evaluate the impact of a Global Business Minor program on the intercultural competence and professional development of faculty and students

2. Procedure to be followed: As a participant in this study, Dawn Edmiston will be interviewing you to explore how your experiences in the Global Business Minor program contributed to your intercultural competence and professional development. The interview will be voice recorded.

3. Discomforts and risks: There are no known risks associated with this research.

4. Duration of participation: Participation in this study will take approximately 1-1.5 hours.

5. Statement of confidentiality: Your data will be anonymous. Your data will not be associated with your name or any code so that your responses cannot be linked to your name in any way.

6. Voluntary participation: Participation is voluntary. You are free to withdraw at any time without penalty or loss of benefits. You may choose to skip any question or activity.

7. Incentive for participation: Participants will not be compensated for their participation.

8. Potential benefits: There are no known benefits of participating in the study. However, your participation in this research will contribute to the development of our understanding about the nature of the study.

9. Termination of participation: Participation may be terminated by the researcher if it is deemed that the participant is unable to perform the tasks presented.
10. Questions or concerns regarding participation in this research should be directed to: Pam Eddy, Ph.D., chair of the Educational Policy, Planning and Leadership Department at 757-221-2349 (peddy@wm.edu).

I am aware that I must be at least 18 years of age to participate in this project.

I am aware that I may report dissatisfaction with any aspect of this study to Jennifer Stevens, Ph.D., the Chair of the Protection of Human Subjects Committee at 757-221-3862 (jastev@wm.edu).

I agree to participate in this study and have read all the information provided on this form. My signature below confirms that my participation in this project is voluntary, and that I have received a copy of this consent form.

__________________________________________________________________________ date_________________
Signature

__________________________________________________________________________ date_________________
Witness

THIS PROJECT WAS APPROVED BY THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS COMMITTEE (Phone 757-221-3966) ON 2020-01-27 AND EXPIRES ON 2021-01-27.
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