Fall 12-2020

Internationalization: A Phenomenological Analysis of the Experiences of Faculty Who Have Led a Short-Term Educational Abroad Program

Rodin M. Ndandula
Old Dominion University, rndan001@odu.edu

INTERNATIONALIZATION: A PHENOMENOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIENCES OF FACULTY WHO HAVE LED A SHORT-TERM EDUCATION ABROAD PROGRAM

by

Rodin M. Ndandula
B.S. May 2013, Old Dominion University
M.E.M. May 2015, Old Dominion University

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of
Old Dominion University in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

HIGHER EDUCATION

OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY
December 2020

Approved by:

David F. Ayers (Director)

Chris Glass (Member)

Kim Bullington (Member)

ABSTRACT

INTERNATIONALIZATION: A PHENOMENOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIENCES OF FACULTY WHO HAVE LED A SHORT-TERM EDUCATION ABROAD PROGRAM

Rodin Ndandula
Old Dominion University, 2020
Director: Dr. David F. Ayers

Over the years, internationalization efforts in higher education institutions have been driven predominantly by the growing demands of the globalized world. Short-term education abroad programs have emerged as a popular strategy for attaining internationalization. Faculty at many institutions are instrumental to this process as they often are the leaders of these education abroad experiences. While considerable research exists on student experiences in education abroad, few studies have focused on the experiences of other members of these programs—faculty (Goode, 2008; Loebick, 2017; Savishinsky, 2012). The purpose of this phenomenological qualitative study is to understand the lived experiences of faculty who have led a short-term education abroad program. Within this study, "short-term" is used to indicate programs of one to eight weeks in duration as described by the Forum on Education Abroad (2019). Guided by a phenomenological framework, I sought to further the understanding of faculty's experiences leading short-tern education abroad program. To better understand this phenomenon and address the research question, data were collected through three semi-structured interviews with each participant, as well as through reflective journal entries. Six themes emerged from the research findings and analysis: Faculty Motivation; Intentionality in Program Design; Responsibility to Students, Home Institution, and Host Community; Deeper Faculty-Student Interaction; Disconnection with Campus Community; and Advice to Colleagues and Administrators.

This dissertation is dedicated to the one who prevailed to open the book and loosen its seven seals.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to recognize and express my sincere gratitude to everyone who helped me along this doctoral journey, most notably, those listed below:

- Thank you, Dr. David F. Ayers, for your unwavering support, guidance, and mentorship. I truly could not have completed this doctoral program without your help.
- Thank you, Dr. Chris Glass, for your advice and wealth of experience, especially surrounding my journey as an international educator. You truly are an example to many around the world.
- Thank you, Dr. Kim Bullington. You are the true definition of a mentor. I could not have made it through without you help. You have been there alongside of me every step of the way. Higher Education needs more people like you. I am so thankful for all of you.
- Thank you to my family and friends, both domestically and internationally, for always supporting and believing in me. I am blessed to have come from such a supportive community. Special thanks to my parents, Dominique and Martine Ndandula, for your steadfast love.
- Thank you to all my colleagues from ODU's Higher Education Program for creating a supportive learning environment. Special thanks to Dr. Preston Reilly for always holding me accountable and keeping me moving forward.
- Thank you to President John R. Broderick and members of the ODU Board of Visitors for your support and guidance along this journey.
- Last but certainly not least, thank you to all my colleagues in SEES for all your support. Special thanks to Dr. Don Stansberry for believing in me and giving me a chance. From my early days as a senator in SGA, to my graduate assistantship, to now as a

professional, you have been there every step of the way. Higher Education needs a leader like you. Thanks also to Ellen, Jane, Johnny, Scott, Traci, Vicki, Bridget, and others for your dedication to student success. I am blessed to have learned from your example.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Globalization has fundamentally altered the way people live, think, and behave (Steger, 2008). The way people make sense of an international and multicultural society—their lived experience of a global milieu—is often shaped by international institutions, including universities (Rhoads & Torres, 2006). Universities have, in fact, achieved prominence as primary nexus among citizens and global society (Rhoads & Szelényi, 2011). They have become international and intercultural learning spaces not by happenstance but through intentional processes of internationalization (American Council on Education, 2017; Childress, 2010, 2018; Knight, 2004; NAFSA, 2013).

Internationalization is the commitment, confirmed through action, to infuse international and comparative perspectives of students through the teaching, research, and service missions in higher education (NAFSA, 2011). One well-known strategy for achieving internationalization is study abroad. The variety of education abroad programs offered by universities extends far beyond study abroad, however. Another important type of international experience is education abroad, or an educational experience that occurs outside one's home country, is driven to a significant degree by learning goals, and is one to eight weeks in duration (Forum on Education Abroad, 2019). Students are increasingly apt to participate in short-term education abroad programs (American Council on Education, 2017), and these programs are becoming increasingly popular (Institute of International Education, 2017). Education abroad now plays a significant role in higher education (Altbach, 2004, 2007; Altbach & Lewis, 1996; American Council on Education, 2017; Childress, 2010).

Problem Statement

Education abroad has become the focus of a growing body of scholarship (Altbach & de Wit, 2015; Altbach & Knight, 2007). Many researchers have explored the ways students experience education abroad, including learning outcomes (Ogden, 2010), language acquisition (Wenner, 2009), and cultural competency (Rollins, 2009); yet, the experiences of other members of the academic community—particularly faculty—remain largely unexamined (Goodwin & Nact, 1991; Goode, 2008; Loebick, 2017; Savishinsky, 2012; Watts, 2015). It is important to address this gap in the literature, because faculty—through teaching, research, and service—are pivotal in internationalization efforts (Goode, 2008; Savishinsky, 2012; Lattuca & Stark, 2009; McCallon & Holmes, 2010; Mullens & Cuper, 2012). Given their important role in education abroad, faculty can help maximize university internationalization strategies.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study was to understand the lived experiences of faculty at a public doctoral research institution who have led short-term education abroad program in the social sciences. I examine faculty experiences through a phenomenological framework. Phenomenology is defined as a systematic attempt to uncover and describe the internal meaning structures of the living experience (van Manen, 1990, 2015). A phenomenological approach to research gives voice to the people who experienced the phenomenon (Giorgi, 2009) while also clarifying the meanings of phenomena through analysis of the descriptions (Husserl, 2014). Furthermore, it delineates things known tacitly but not articulated in depth (Finlay, 2008). This framework as well as its application among faculty leading short-term education abroad is discussed further in Chapter Three.

Research Question

In an attempt to provide insight into faculty's experiences in education abroad, the following research question was used to guide this study: How do faculty at a public doctoral research institution describe their experiences leading a short-term education abroad program?

Significance of the Study

There is a dearth of research on the experiences of faculty leading education abroad programs. Findings from this study may generate helpful insights to help the higher education community better understand faculty's lived experiences. Phenomenological studies of this kind are needed because they provide a deeper understanding of a multifaceted topic that may inform future policy, practice, and research regarding faculty's experiences in education abroad programs. The research outcomes may be useful to policymakers, institutional leaders, human resources, and international offices who, in practice, could use the data to recruit, effectively support, and retain quality faculty. The findings could also influence personnel policy to accommodate the professional and personal development of faculty working in international circles. It is important that the experiences of faculty leading education abroad programs be further investigated as their roles are directly connected to students' participation in these programs. This study may also serve as motivation for additional research related to faculty in education abroad. The scarcity of research on the lived experiences of faculty in education abroad highlights a gap in the literature on a significant group of individuals who contribute extensively to a field and profession that seldom acknowledges their realities or their impact. Researching their experiences not only creates the opportunity for their voices to be heard but also facilitates the opportunity for further research on them. Lastly, this study is significant as it may increase the overall awareness of the faculty roles in leading education abroad programs.

Definition of Terms

Various definitions have developed around the practice and process of internationalization as international education in all its forms has expanded throughout higher education. The ways in which certain concepts and terms have been defined has dramatically changed as scholars have sought to identify and describe the international aspects in education (Green & Olson, 2003; Knight, 2004, 2015; Schwietz, 2006; Siaya & Hayward, 2003). This field is still very much in a phase of defining itself and its widely used terms (Ogden, 2010). As this field of study has expanded and evolved, so has the need to establish a common language and reach common understandings of what terms do and do not mean. Common terms such as international and global are frequently used, sometimes interchangeably, and are easily confused with one another making the advancement of all aspects of internationalization more challenging in the absence of a shared language (American Council on Education, 2017; Forum on Education Abroad, 2018).

In addition to the need to distinguish between these and other terms from one another, the development of clearer definitions are also needed to help describe each of these concepts in a broader educational context. Many of the terms and concepts used within international education are inherently broad in scope. As such, having ways to differentiate their similarities, intersections, and/or differences with other aspects of the educational landscape is important (Forum on Education Abroad, 2018; Green & Olson, 2003). The following definitions, though not the only accepted ones, serve as reference points for the purpose of understanding and providing context for the discussion of education abroad within internationalization.

Globalization

Globalization has been referenced in various contexts including education, public policy, economic, and sociocultural (Albach & Knight, 2007; Berry, 2008; Hay, 2009; Stiglitz, 2002; Spring, 2008). According to Hay (2009), the question of what globalization is does not have a straightforward answer. This is largely as a result of the differing views held by its proponents and critics. Hays (2009) noted while some skeptics tend to adopt exact definitional standards of this term, others more radical set for themselves a less discriminating definitional hurdle. That is, they recognize the complexity and multifaceted nature of this term which, as a result, does not avail itself easily of a simple definition. Globalization is seen as antithetical to public policy in that it is less a consequence of constraints it is seen to impose but rather a consequence of political and contingent factors made out by political actors (Hay, 2009). It increases the competitive struggle amongst nations for global market share, and necessitate the privatization, technicization, and depoliticization of public policy (Hay, 2009). It describes changes in global economics affecting production, consumption, and investment (Spring, 2008). It also integrates countries and peoples of the world through vast reduction of costs of transportation and communication (Stiglitz, 2002). Similarly, Knight (2015) noted it involves "the flow of technology, economy, knowledge, people, values, and ideas across borders" (p. 2). Globalization affects nations differently based on its history, culture, priorities, and traditions. It is the economic, political, and social force driving higher education of the modern times toward greater international engagement (Altbach & Knight, 2007). It has resulted in unprecedented growth in the quality and accessibility of knowledge, and the integration of world financial and economic systems (Berry, 2008). While globalization has focused primarily on international transformation

and interconnectedness, internationalization in education, on the other hand, has been the response to that transformation.

Internationalization

Internationalization has been described in many ways over the years. For example, it has been described as being important (Knight, 2004, 2015), a fad (de Wit, 2002), symbolic (Bartell, 2003), and peace building (Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011). Other scholars have argued it is a national and institutional response to globalization (Knight, 2004; Siaya & Hayward, 2003; Stohl, 2007). Internationalization has also been studied as a cross disciplinary concept of national security (Stohl, 2007), science (Ponds, 2009), business (Jiang & Carpenter, 2011), and higher education (de Wit, 2002; Knight, 2004, 2015).

Despite the long history of internationalization efforts and research, it remains an ambiguous concept. To some degree this has been due to the notion internationalization efforts are shaped to meet the needs of the different disciplines within an institution (Kehm & Teichler, 2007). For example, from a business perspective, internationalization may be viewed as a process of adapting business operations (Jiang & Carpenter, 2011) whereas in education, it may be viewed as a way to increase intercultural competence (Hudzik, 2011; Hudzik & McCarthy, 2012; Matross Helms, 2013). Nonetheless, even within higher education there has been a great deal of confusion about what it means (Knight, 2004, 2015).

The definition of internationalization has been dependent on various aspects of institutions as well as disciplines. For example, internationalization, as it applies to institutional transformation, may look different when examining faculty engagement (Childress, 2010). A widely accepted definition (Knight, 2004) describes internationalization of higher education as "the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose,

functions or delivery of postsecondary education" (p. 11). Olson, Green, and Hill (2006), in a report by the American Council on Education, elaborated on this concept and coined the term *comprehensive internationalization* as "a process that leads to institutional transformation over time, built on an institutional vision for internationalization, a clearly articulated set of goals, and a strategy to integrate the internationally and globally focused programs and activities on campus" (p. viii). Several years later, the Association of International Educators (NAFSA, 2011), recognized comprehensive internationalization as a “commitment, confirmed through action, to infuse international and comparative perspectives throughout the teaching, research, and service missions of higher education which shapes institutional ethos and values and touches the entire higher education enterprise” (p. 6). Internationalization efforts must not only be effective but cultivate global competencies and innovations among all institutional stakeholders (Deardorff, 2006; De Beuchelaer, Lievens, & Bucker, 2012).

While there is no single plan to internationalize an institution, it is important to understand the differences among certain approaches campuses have employed as they have allowed members of those institutions to implement best practices to advance their strategic efforts. It is important to distinguish internationalization from international education which is a term used to refer to activities and programs as opposed to the more comprehensive internationalization which embraces processes, programs, and perspectives (Schwietz, 2006).

International education. International education describes the international aspects of higher education including all activities with an international aspect (Green & Olson, 2003). Increasingly, this term is used to encompass not only explicit and easily identifiable activities, such as education abroad, but also curricular integration of international contents, student and faculty mobility, institutional connections, as well as research.

Education abroad. Education abroad is education occurring outside the participant's home country, such as international experiences as work, volunteering, non-credit internships, and directed travel, as long as these programs are driven to a significant degree by learning goals (Forum on Education Abroad, 2019).

Study abroad. Study abroad, similar to but not to be confused with education abroad, is a subtype of education abroad resulting in progress toward an academic degree at a student's home institution which excludes the pursuit of a full academic degree at a foreign institution (Forum on Education Abroad, 2019).

Curriculum integration. Curriculum integration in the context of international education refers to the incorporation of coursework taken abroad into the academic context of the home campus. This involves weaving education abroad into the fabric of the on-campus curriculum through activities such as course matching, academic advising, departmental and collegiate informational and promotional materials, and the structuring of degree requirements. It often requires the review of coursework by the home institution's academic departments (Forum on Education Abroad, 2019). Curriculum integration factors prominently into the discussion of faculty engagement.

Faculty-led program. Program directed by a faculty member (or members) from the home campus who accompanies students abroad. Usually, though not always, it is brief in duration (Forum on Education Abroad, 2019). These faculty-led programs play significant roles in the internationalization efforts of an institution.

Short-term. A program lasting eight weeks or less (Forum on Education Abroad, 2019).

Overview of the Study

In this study, I chose a descriptive phenomenological approach to describe the essence of faculty's experience leading short-term education abroad programs. Using this approach allowed for the meanings structure to emerge from faculty's experiences. A purposive sample was used to identify participants (Seidman, 2006). The criteria to participate include being tenured faculty, non-tenured faculty, lecturers, or part-time faculty who have led at least one short-term education abroad program during the institution's 2014-2019 strategic plan cycle. I collected data through a series of semi-structure interviews and analyzed and reported them using Giorgi's (2009) model for descriptive phenomenology.

Summary

This chapter provided an overview of education abroad as a strategic effort for internationalization in higher education, discussed the problem statement, the purpose of the study, research question, significance of the study, and definition of relevant terms. This chapter also introduced the framework which will be used to guide this study. In the following chapter, a literature review on education abroad, as it relates to internationalization and faculty, is reviewed.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this phenomenological qualitative study was to understand the lived experiences of faculty from a public doctoral research institution who have led a short-term education abroad program. This chapter provides a review of the relevant literature used to frame and guide this research and identifies the gaps to be addressed. The first section presents a brief overview of internationalization within the context of higher education, descriptions of key terminologies, rationales, trends, and challenges of internationalization. The second section discusses education abroad as a strategic internationalization effort. The third section addresses the role of faculty in education abroad. The following research question was used to guide the present study: How do faculty at a public doctoral research institution describe their experiences leading a short-term education abroad program?

Internationalization in Higher Education

Internationalization is a mainstream element of higher education in many nations as it is in the United States (Harman, 2005; NAFSA, 2013). Meanwhile, within the context of higher education, internationalization has been highly debated in terms of its meaning, strategic approach, and its relationship to personnel development (de Wit, 2002). This section discusses internationalization in higher education as well as addresses some of its critical influencers and outcomes.

Historical Context

Colleges and universities around the world have long been international spaces (American Council on Education, 2012; Goode, 2013). Research has been performed in various languages, faculty and students have travelled abroad, and universities have adopted

internationalization plans from other cultural contexts (Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011; de Wit 2002).

Historically, there have been a limited number of educators in higher education who have focused on international education (de Wit 2002). Green and Olson (2003) noted one of the fundamental responsibilities of the United States higher education systems has been to prepare students for "productive and responsible citizenship" (p. 13). As a result, internationalization efforts of higher educations have had to play an essential role not only at the local level but at the national and international level as well. Policymakers have emphasized the need for institutions to prepare learning spaces for students to live and work in societies that operate across international borders (Deardorff, 2015; Green & Olson, 2003).

Over the years, several occurrences have also played a major role in supporting international education. For example, during the Cold War era, international education programs, such as the Fulbright program, emerged along with the passing of the *National Defense Education Act of 1958* (P.L. 85-864, 72 Stat. 1580) (Green & Olson, 2003). Later, the Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Program Act bill, though it was later rescinded, was introduced to Congress to promote and fund global education programs (Altbach & de Wit, 2015). More recently, an updated version of the similar bill was re-introduced to Congress in hopes to further the advancement of global education (S.1198, 116th Cong., 2019). Currently, leaders across higher education have come to terms with the reality the task ahead of them requires planned, strategic approaches and skilled personnel to ensure the success of internationalization (Green & Olson, 2003; Hoffa & DePaul, 2010).

Research on education abroad emerged in the 1950s and later by the late 1970s, a substantive body of literature had been established (Dolby & Rahman, 2008; Hoffa & DePaul,

2010). Since then, the rate, quality, and diversity of research has grown significantly. This trend has served as an important indicator to the recognition and response of the higher education community to the role of international educational experiences in the lives of students, faculty, and institutions.

Rationales for Internationalization

Higher education systems and institutions have undergone dramatic changes both at home and abroad (Knight, 2004). In an increasingly complex and interconnected global society, individuals, organizations, and government agencies have urged higher education institutions to foster learning environments that equips students with skills to be globally competent and thrive in today's political, social, cultural, and economic environment. This need to internationalize has increasingly manifested itself explicitly in the missions of higher education institutions (American Council on Education, 2012, 2017; Criswell & Zhu, 2015).

Rationales behind internationalization efforts differ significantly from institution to institution, and even between units and individuals. De Wit (2002) defined rationales for internationalization as "motivations for integrating an international dimension into higher education" (p. 84). They commonly include goals such as providing students, and sometimes other members of the institutional community, with the knowledge and abilities needed to navigate and thrive in a competitive, globalized and globalizing world; improving the quality and diversity of educational offerings and research opportunities within institutions; enhancing the competitiveness of institutions and their graduates, and promoting global citizenship (American Council on Education, 2002; de Wit, 2002; International Association of Universities, 2012).

Knight and de Wit (1995) postulated four major categories of rationales for internationalization: academic, economic, political, and socio-cultural. The most commonly cited

purpose for internationalization in the educational context is to support internationally focused academic learning goals, to increase internationally relevant knowledge. The following sections further discuss each category.

Academic Rationales

The successful execution of internationalization efforts supports to the overall institutional goals and the academic quality offered (Savishinsky, 2012). That is, it contributes students' intercultural competence, global citizenship and awareness, community development, and identity formation (Knight, 2004, 2015; Savishinsky, 2012). Institutions in the United States have been confronted with different academic expectations than in prior decades (Amblee & Dhayanity, 2018; Knight, 2015; Proctor & Rumbley, 2018). Educational administrators have been pressured to produce globally competent individuals and as a result have engaged in providing more interdisciplinary, learning opportunities preparing students to work in a more globally diverse workforce (Knight, 2015). The term, *globally competent*, refers to the knowledge and skills that help students' cross-disciplinary domains to comprehend global events and respond to them effectively (Badley, 2000; Deardorff, 2015). One-way institutions have done this has been through increased foreign language requirements and addition of new majors which have incorporated global perspectives into the academic programs and teachings (Knight, 2004, 2015). For institutions to infuse globally competent students, they should ensure the message of international education is valued and clearly transmitted in the teaching, learning, and service functions of the institution.

Economic Rationales

Internationalization efforts and activities have been influenced by economic realities (Savishinsky, 2012). The mobility of students and faculty across borders, and internationalization

at home efforts have also become large businesses in the United States (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Jiang & Carpenter, 2011). These realities have also resulted in the continued spread of globalization and the increase in the value of international skillsets (Knight, 2015). Institutions have also used international initiatives as a strategy to generate alternative funding sources (Knight, 2015). University leaders have been of the mindset a globally positioned institution generates new revenues which will procure financial benefits from external partners (Childress, 2010; Glass & Lee, 2018). One strategy which many institutions have used to generate additional funds has been through the enrollment of a large number of international students (Altbach & Knight, 2007). In addition, international students contribute to their institution's bottom line—economy (Altbach & Knight, 2007). According to a recent Open Doors report, international students contributed more than $39 billion to the U.S. economy through their expenditures on tuition and cost of living alone (Institute of International Education, 2017). Often, the source of these students' funds come from their home government, family, or personal resources (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Institute of International Education, 2017).

There are several other economic reasons driving internationalization such as job placement (Childress, 2010). This rationale has led many institutions to restructure the delivery of their courses and make them more widely accessible online and throughout other avenues. Institutions have also established branch campuses in other countries to generate more revenues (Altbach & Knight, 2007). This strategic effort has allowed foreign students to obtain a U.S. degree in their own country or region.

Political Rationales

Several political events have influenced the development of international education. Events like September 11, 2001, recent government bans, and other regulations have led many

institutions to change the way they perceive their own international relations and the manner in which they equip students with an intercultural awareness (American Council on Education, 2017; Childress, 2010). Universities and colleges around the nation have also used political motives to support institutional strategic plans linked to internationalization (Knight, 2015). Strategic cross border alliances have been an approach to support the creation of institutional networks and exchange partnerships. These partnerships have enhanced foreign policy and national security (Childress, 2010).

Socio-cultural Rationales

The internationalization of higher education has also satisfied many social-cultural purposes of institutions. Prestigious, selective U.S. universities have used international programs to provide international and cross-cultural perspectives for their students (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Knight, 2015). Education abroad experiences, internationalized curricula, and enhanced foreign language requirements have been credited for promoting intercultural understanding, cross-cultural communication skills, and national cultural identity (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Knight, 2015). As a result, socio-cultural internationalization rationales have become part of strategic plan discussions.

Overall, institutional stakeholders have had to deal with multiple rationales for their decision to internationalize. Rationales focused on academics, economics, political, and social-cultural have played a significant role. While some have been more complimentary and others more contradictory, the key to their continued advancement has been in the incorporation of effective educators, such as faculty, who understand how to channel the goals, rationales, and energy of different stakeholders so outcomes are achieved.

Strategies to Internationalization

Internationalization initiatives in higher education has occurred at home as well as abroad (Finkelstein, Walker, & Chen, 2013; Forum on Education Abroad, 2018; Hudzik, 2011; Knight, 2004). Many of these initiatives have grown significantly over the years. Among the most common models of international experiences are education abroad programs, independent study and internship opportunities, joint- and double-degree programs, visiting scholar exchange programs, along with international research (Forum on Education Abroad, 2018; Finkelstein, Walker, & Chen, 2013). While internationalization efforts taking place on campus may differ from one institution to another, they often include curricula with international content, foreign-language instruction, as well as international students and visiting scholars (Hudzik & McCarthy, 2012; Siaya & Hayward, 2003).

In recent years, international education efforts have grown tremendously (Altbach & Knight, 2007; American Council on Education, 2017). Enrollment in U.S. institutions' education abroad programming has steadily increased from the 2011 to 2016 academic year (Institute for International Education, 2017). This growth has demonstrated the positive response from institutions to international education, evincing the criticality of fostering opportunities for global learning, interaction, and cooperation.

Institutions of higher education have also been dedicated to international education. This has primarily been demonstrated by the promotion and sending and receiving of students and educators across borders (American Council on Education, 2017). A recent survey by the Forum on Education Abroad indicated, 89% of responding institutions are actively trying to send a greater number of students abroad (Forum on Education Abroad, 2018).

Irrespective of certain trends indicating growth in education abroad opportunities, the number of people in higher education who pursue education abroad and other international opportunities remains quite small (American Council on Education, 2017).

Challenges to Internationalization

While the future of international education may be difficult to forecast, abroad opportunities are likely to expand (Childress, 2009, 2010; Savishinsky, 2012).

Several institutional and individual challenges have often hindered the progress of internationalization. One commonly noted challenge has been lack of financing (Dewey & Duff, 2009; Kelsey & Dormody, 1995; Savishinsky, 2012; Viers, 2003). The financial constraints felt by many higher education institutions impact the ability to fund new international initiatives. As such, faculty have often characterized internationalization efforts as another undervalued, unfunded initiatives (Bond, Qian, Huang, 2003; Childress, 2010; Dewey & Duff, 2009; Qian & Huang, 2003). Other noted challenges inhibiting effective internationalization efforts include; lack of administrative support (Andreasen, 2003; Dewey & Duff, 2009), policies discouraging the participation of untenured faculty (Andreasen, 2003; Stohl, 2007), lack of time (Andreasen, 2003; Dewey & Duff, 2009; Siaya & Hayward, 2003), lack of language skills (Andreasen, 2003; Knight 2015), conflict with classes (Andreasen, 2003), lack of opportunity (Andreasen, 2003; Knight 2015), leaving current research (Andreasen, 2003), international work not conducive with raising a family (Andreasen, 2003), personal financial stability (Andreasen, 2003), compliance with additional institutional research board requirements (Dewey & Duff, 2009), lack of clarity regarding internationalization initiatives (Friesen, 2013), and finding temporary replacements for faculty who travel abroad (Childress, 2009).

Overall, while access to and involvement in international initiatives is very low, the continued growth in this area is encouraging to internationalization proponents (Institute of International Education, 2017). Institutional leaders who desire to engage faculty in international work, should seek to first address the above challenges. This monumental task cannot be accomplished by faculty alone, but rather through collaborative partnerships of every institutional stakeholder.

Internationalization Through Education Abroad

Higher education institutions have implemented various strategies for internationalization efforts (American Council on Education, 2017). One common strategy used to accomplish this goal has been through education abroad. In recent years, the participation in education abroad opportunities have steadily increased (Institute of International Education, 2017). These opportunities help create spaces for diverse understanding and network between people from different parts of the world (Institute of International Education, 2017).

Education abroad in higher education has been described as education occurring outside one's home country, driven by learning goals, encompassing a wide array of international education experiences (Forum on Education Abroad, 2019). Though many opportunities and experiences are seemingly similar when observing these programs, it is important to note there are often differences in terms of the role education abroad experiences plays for institutional or departmental goals. Engle and Engle (2003) identified seven main elements of overseas programs which include, "length of student sojourn, entry target-language competence, language used in course work, context of academic work, types of student housing, provisions for guided/structured cultural interaction and experiential learning, and guided reflection on cultural

experience" (p. 8). Education abroad also expands the space and boundaries of learning in higher education settings (Bremer, 2008; Hovey & Weinberg, 2009).

Purpose and Types of Education Abroad

Education abroad serves a variety of purposes. Some of these include cultivating social justice and peace, increasing opportunities to demonstrate democratic values, as well as developing responsible global citizens (Gillespie, 2009; Lewin, 2009; Loebick, 2017). Additionally, when one interacts with another's culture in an unfamiliar milieu, it leads to acquiring the knowledge necessary to attain competency in global citizenship (Lewin, 2009; Loebick, 2017).

Engle and Engle (2003) recognized five primary types and categories of education abroad: cross-cultural programs with an emphasis on immersion, contact, and encounter; study tours; and short-term education abroad. Cross-cultural immersion and encounter programs often focus on advanced language proficiency, offering home stays and guided cultural integration. Cross-cultural contact programs focus on beginner or intermediate language proficiency, offering little travel and learning opportunities and provide limited formal cultural integration. Traditionally, these programs, lasting a semester to a year, have commonly been implemented in higher education context.

Antithetical to the three aforementioned education abroad programs, study tours and short-term education abroad have significantly expanded in both program offerings and participation over the years. Study tours provide participants an international experience which lasts anywhere from several days to a few weeks (Engle & Engle, 2003) and hardly require any language proficiency. Because participants travel and live together as a group, the bulk of the coursework or preparation is done prior to their travel. Like study tours, short-term education

abroad programs usually last one to eight weeks (Engle & Engle, 2003; Forum on Education Abroad, 2019; Institute of International Education, 2014). Nonetheless, these programs differ slightly in that they often target some language learning which include, pre-travel orientation programs in-country, on-the-ground course work, post-travel meetings, and afford cultural integration through excursions, home stays, and interaction with local communities (Loebick, 2017).

Short-Term Education Abroad

The most widely used approach to promote internationalization efforts in higher education is through short-term education abroad (American Council on Education, 2017; Green, Luu, & Burris, 2008; Institute of International Education, 2014). Of those who participate in education abroad, approximately 65% do so through short-term programs (Institute of International Education, 2017). These one to eight-week programs provide international learning opportunities to a more diverse body of students and faculty (Edge, 2012). Short-term education abroad also provides a variety of program types, duration, qualities, and disciplinary focus to a diverse group of people who would be unable to participate in the traditional semester or year-long programs (Hulstrand, 2009). In addition, short-term education abroad programs are often led by faculty and provide an opportunity for them and students to interact and learn together (Hulstrand, 2009; Lucas, 2009).

Critics of Short-Term Education Abroad

Many positive outcomes from short-term education abroad have been well documented (Dirkx, Janka Miller, Sinclair, & Vizvary, 2016; Dolby & Rahman, 2008; Dwyer, 2004; Festervand & Tillery, 2001; Goode, 2008; Heely, 2005; Goodwin & Nacht, 1991; Hulstrand, 2009; Lewin, 2009; Loebick, 2017; Lucas, 2009; Savishinsky, 2012; Twombly, Salisbury,

Tumanut, & Klute, 2012; Viers, 2003). However, there have also been some criticisms of their quality and outcomes (Alghamdi & Otte, 2016; Bolen, 2001; Engle & Engle, 2003; Twombly, Salisbury, Tumanut, & Klute, 2012). Critics contend the increasing use of short-term education abroad structure could lead to a commercialization of education abroad (Alghamdi & Otte, 2016; Bolen, 2001; Zemach-Bersin, 2007) which could gravely affect its purposes and outcomes (Twombly, Salisbury, Tumanut, & Klute, 2012). Another critique noted short-term programs could potentially produce touristic experiences for those who participate that does not increase their cultural competency (Zemach-Bersin, 2007, 2009). Furthermore, discussions continue to surface on the meanings, effectiveness, components of education abroad (Allen & Herron, 2003; Dwyer, 2004; Schmidt-Rinehart & Knight, 2004).

Faculty and Education Abroad

Education abroad has played a significant role in internationalization efforts (American Council on Education, 2017; Childress, 2009). Faculty-led programs have been the most commonly used approach for attaining international experiences (Barnhart, Ricks, & Speier, 1997; Institute for International Education, 2017). These programs, geared toward students, are often designed and led by faculty from that campus.

This section discusses the learning outcome of faculty leading education abroad, and existing studies related to faculty and education abroad, particularly in short-term. These studies acknowledge the limited literature on faculty in education abroad, and indicate areas for further research, which I sought to address in this study.

Faculty Learning Outcomes in Education Abroad

Although much of the literature surrounding education abroad has focused on student learning, studies show faculty and other leaders also benefit from this learning experience

(American Council on Education, 2012, 2017; Goodwin & Nacht, 1991; Heely, 2005). These learning outcomes include cultural sensitivity (American Council on Education, 2012; Koernig, 2007), self-understanding (Goodwin & Nacht, 1991), personal and professional learning (Loebick, 2017; Savishinsky, 2012; Viers, 2003), as well as others.

Various learning outcomes for faculty have surfaced from international experiences that differ from students. Engagement in international education events has been tied to a rise in internationalization of course content and teaching techniques (American Council on Education, 2012, 2017; Goodwin & Nacht, 1991; Savishinsky, 2012). Faculty noted involvement in international initiatives enhanced their prior and current research activities (American Council on Education, 2012, 20117; Loebick, 2017; Savishinsky, 2012). Other beneficial outcomes faculty have experienced has been in expanding and maintaining their professional networks (Goodwin & Nacht, 1991), increasing their understanding of and relationship with students (Loebick, 2017; Savishinsky, 2012; Viers, 2003), sustaining international competence (Goodwin & Nacht, 1991), and academic administration, intellectual growth, acculturation, academic validation, intellectual growth, and cognitive reposition (Festervand & Tillery, 2001).

Faculty Role in Education Abroad

Irrespective of the research interests in internationalization at the institutional level (de Wit, 2002), and faculty's role being recognized (Bedenlier & Zawacki-Richter, 2015; Finkelstein, Walker, & Chen, 2013), there remains a dearth of research on faculty involvement in education abroad (Savishinsky, 2012). Given that the opportunity to lead an education abroad program is a unique way for faculty to influence students, as well as education abroad often being advertised as one of the most prominent indicators of a university's commitment to internationalization (American Council on Education, 2017; Green & Olson, 2003) in the U.S, it

is surprising not many institutions have taken advantage of this opportunity (Green, 2013). Institutions in the United States have an opportunity to lead in this area as other nations have not yet tapped into this model approach (Green, 2013; Huang, 2007; Fabregas Janeiro, Fabre, & Rosete, 2012). They have focused instead on increasing traditional student exchange agreements, recruiting more international faculty, engaging in international research projects, and establishing joint degree programs (Fabregas Janeiro, Fabre, & Rosete, 2012; Green, 2013; Huang, 2007). As a result, only a small number of studies have performed empirical research on faculty and their experiences in leading education abroad programs (Dewey & Duff, 2009; Goode, 2008; Loebick, 2017; Rasch, 2001; Savishinksy, 2012; Strang, 2006; Watts, 2015). The research on short-term education abroad programs conducted by Rasch (2001), Strang (2006), Goode, (2008); Watts (2015), and Loebick (2017) deserves special attention in this study as they specifically focus on faculty leaders in education abroad.

Rasch (2001) used a grounded theory approach in a qualitative research study to explore the perception of 15 faculty from a private research university, concerning their role in and impact on education abroad. The study, which was the first of its kind, set a standard for future studies and emphasized the important role of a faculty leading education abroad programs. Rasch (2001) asserted faculty' ability to "share their knowledge, foster, and guide cultural experiences has a direct impact on the student group experience as well as the building of self-awareness and shifting life values" (p.118). Furthermore, faculty described their roles abroad, using terms such as, being a counselor, confidant, parent, professor, administrator, caretaker, cultural guide, friend, and many others. Given the disconnect in faculty perception and institutional commitment toward education abroad, Rasch's study highlighted the critical need for training and development to occur between institutions and individual faculty members for the success of this

endeavor. Lastly, faculty in this study noted leading education abroad program gave them the opportunity to be innovative in the instruction approach. As such, I sought to further uncover the innovation needed in preparing for this type of program.

Strang (2006) conducted an exploratory qualitative study focusing on faculty leaders of education abroad programs. This study examined faculty's perception on their motivation to lead, impact of their prior experience, as well as their philosophy on leadership. This study had two phases. Phase One consisted of face-to-face interviews with five experienced education abroad faculty, and Phase Two consisted of an open-ended survey based on the interview responses which was developed and distributed to faculty leaders. Participants were purposefully selected and consisted of faculty who led education abroad experiences at least five times. An interpretive method was utilized to code the data to reveal categories and similarities and then to draw conclusions.

Findings from Strang (2006) indicated, the common motivator for faculty who led programs abroad included being concerned about personal and student growth, a love of travel, and an enjoyment from the reduced cost provided by their institution to the travel. Faculty's prior experience also influenced their leadership abroad. Lastly, while faculty exhibited leadership skills, they often failed to clearly articulate what it entailed. Strange concluded faculty who lead education abroad programs do so to enhance the lives of their students and bring the world closer to their hearts. The inward motivation demonstrated by faculty to do something bigger than for themselves is worth further understanding. As such, when institutions understand the obstacles and joys faculty leaders experience while traveling abroad with students, they can properly prepare them to provide strong leadership and a safe journey.

Goode (2008) conducted a single case study at an undergraduate liberal arts college investigating the role of faculty who led education abroad programs. Goode noted while existing research explored the multiple dimensions of the faculty's role in education abroad, there has been less analysis of the place of intercultural development in this role. As such, the focus of this study was on how intercultural development, which is frequently named one of the primary goals of education abroad programs, informs this position. Goode employed a qualitative and quantitative strategies through individual interviews and the administration of the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) to complete the case study. Using purposive sampling, Goode reached out to 34 faculty at this institution, eight of whom agreed to participate, who had led education abroad programs between the year 2000 and 2004. The IDI was then sent to the interview participants. Data were later transcribed and coded for themes. Findings from the study indicated faculty perceived their roles abroad as being multifaceted. More specifically, faculty described four dimensions to their roles: deans of students, logistical, intercultural, and academic dimensions.

These various dimensions allowed them to fully experience the heights and depths of what leading an education abroad program entailed. Similar to Strang's (2006) study, Goode (2008) noted formal and informal preparations were key to faculty's success abroad. These preparatory phases enhanced their overall experiences. Furthermore, Goode noted all faculty participants demonstrated characteristics of being in transitionary stages as it relates to their intercultural development, signifying faculty who led these programs were still working through some of their personal issues associated with a particular worldview while abroad. Lastly, Goode suggested future studies should be conducted in different settings to investigate faculty's

perspective of their role and experiences of faculty leaders of these programs to identify best practices and implementations.

Savishinsky (2012) conducted a case study exploration of how college and university faculty encountered and navigated the institutional practices that support and constrained their participation in common international activities, specifically education abroad. This study took place at three higher education institutions located in the Pacific Northwest. Savishinsky purposefully selected participants from a large pool of current and former faculty who had led one or more formal education abroad programs. Savishinsky used in-depth interviews. Findings revealed faculty involvement is influenced, both positively and negatively, by idiosyncratic organizational characteristics of academic departments, as well as the nature of the academic disciplines around which departments are typically organized. Faculty also noted financial and budgetary issues inhibited their involvement in education abroad.

Savishinsky (2012) concluded, despite significant institutional initiatives and rhetoric in favor of increased internationalization, faculty face diverse institutional policies, practices, and attitudes that prevent their participation. Savishinsky also highlighted ways in which institutions can encourage and support their engagement and participation. These efforts included: exploring individual institutions to understand what types of individuals within the campus are more inclined to engage in the work of education abroad, how faculty's prior international experiences influence their role as educators and decision makers, broadening the scope of this study by including diverse institutions to yield more reliable data related to tendencies of institutions and faculty to further inform future research and practices.

Watts (2015) used a qualitative, descriptive study to explore faculty experiences leading education abroad program and how their experiences shaped their personal and professional

development. Using a qualitative research design and using purposeful sampling, Watts interviewed twelve faculty from a public flagship university. Similar to Rasch's (2001) study, the findings from Watts (2015) added to the body of literature on the complex roles of faculty in education abroad. Faculty in this study described some of their roles including, managing students' safety and health, ensuring the financial aspects of the program feasible, and honoring the local community by showing them respect. Watts (2015) noted faculty developed a relationship with their students which had an impact on how they appreciated their own experiences, gave them a better understanding of today's student, and influenced their teaching approaches.

One noteworthy finding in Watts (2015) was campus-community disconnect. Faculty noted being frustrated with the lack of interest from colleagues at their home institution regarding their experienced abroad. Watts maintained this is pertinent information for institutions seeking to improve their training of faculty leaders of an education abroad program, particularly before, during, and after the program. Like the previous studies mentioned above, Watts also suggested other similar studies should be explored in different institutional context to further the understanding of faculty experiences in education abroad programs.

Loebick (2017) conducted a basic qualitative exploration study to develop an understanding of the perspectives of faculty as leaders of short-term education abroad programs at the graduate level. Loebick purposefully gathered data from a variety of faculty from two doctoral granting research institutions. Through a series of in-person interviews, five main themes stemmed from faculty leaders in graduate education abroad: professional development and personal benefits, personal growth from a comparative experience, development of self-awareness, increased creativity in teaching, and personal learning. Faculty also identified

characteristics commonly associated with graduate education abroad denote these experiences which included: rigorous graduate level course content, an intense depth of engagement, heightened professionalism, contextualized professional and personal application of concepts, and graduate students' ability to professionally adapt to new cultural and disciplinary contexts. Loebick suggested, future research should explore the role of relationship during short-term education abroad program, and how these role impact internationalization goals in higher education.

Overall, all six studies (Goode, 2008; Loebick, 2017; Rasch, 2001; Strang, 2006; Savishinsky, 2012; Watts, 2015) noted faculty's concerns with the challenges and opportunities encounter leading education abroad. Of the six studies, two (Rasch, 2001; Watts, 2015) had a single case study focus. While all six studies offered empirical evidence acknowledging the complex nature of leading a program abroad and how faculty are not always understood by their peers or administrators at their home campus, none of them (Goode, 2008; Loebick, 2017; Rasch, 2001; Strang, 2006; Watt, 2015) specifically linked individual faculty's experiences abroad with a phenomenological perspective of these leaders. In this study, I sought to fill this void by addressing the role of context in shaping experiences of these leaders. In addition, I built on the work of prior research through a phenomenological framework on the experiences of faculty abroad.

Faculty Challenges in Education Abroad

Understanding challenges of faculty participation can provide an opportunity for new developments in institutional policy and practice fostering greater participation and enhance education abroad experiences. Faculty engage in various internationalization efforts for different reasons (Austin & McDaniels, 2006; Childress, 2009; Goodwin & Nacht, 1991; Green & Olson,

2003; Hustvedt & Dickson, 2011; Savishinsky, 2012). Faculty's decision to develop and lead education abroad program is fundamentally key to sustain and grow such programs at many institutions. Additionally, faculty-led programs are successful when the institutions are committed to encouraging and positioning faculty to engage in the considerable amount of work involved in leading an education abroad program. Wade (2008) noted "faculty are more likely to participate in engagement activities that take less time and preparation, such as public service, than time-intensive engagement activities that require careful planning but could be more directly tied to faculty roles and responsibilities" (p. 106). Kuh's (2008) work on high impact practices emphasized education abroad as one of the significant contributors to student retention and success. This practice helps students explore cultures, life experiences, and world views different from their own. As a result, its promotion and the continued engagement of faculty is needed now more than ever. Raby (2007) indicated, faculty can only play an active role in education abroad if an environment is designed to ensure their success. As such, it is important for institutional leaders to understand faculty's needs and experiences to best support them.

Summary

This chapter discussed relevant literature used to frame and guide this research and identified the gaps I intended to address. A brief historical overview of internationalization within the context of higher education was presented, the rationales, trends, and challenges of internationalization. In addition, this chapter discussed education abroad as a strategic internationalization effort and the role of faculty in education abroad.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this phenomenological study was to understand the lived experiences of faculty from a public research institution who have led a short-term education abroad program. Phenomenology is a systematic attempt to describe and uncover the internal meaning of structures of living experience (van Manen, 1990, 2015). Researchers have approached phenomenology in various ways. In this study, I chose a descriptive phenomenological approach as it focuses on describing the essence of a phenomenon from the perspectives of those who have experienced it (Giorgi, 2009; Husserl, 1931, 1991, 2014; Lopez & Willis, 2004; Moustakas, 1994; van Manen, 1990, 2015). Using this approach revealed general meaning structures to emerge from faculty's education abroad experiences.

Research Question

In an attempt to provide insight into faculty's experiences in education abroad, the following research question was used to guide this study: How do faculty at a public research institution describe their experiences leading a short-term education abroad program?

Rationale for a Phenomenological Approach

There are various reasons for using a phenomenological approach to research. This section discusses the key components for doing so which include, the difference between methodology and methods, phenomenology as a methodology, the philosophy of phenomenology, the difference between interpretive and descriptive phenomenology, and using phenomenology as a research approach.

Methodology and Methods

While the terms methodology and methods have been used interchangeably within research, they are different. Methodology refers to the philosophical framework that must be assimilated by the researcher, so the principles and assumptions of the particular approach are clearly described and justified (Schwandt, 2015). On the other hand, *methods* refer to the research techniques and procedures for collecting, analyzing, and presenting the data of the research (van Manen, 1990, 2015). The structure needed to prepare and implement a qualitative research is a methodology and methods (Giorgi & Giorgi, 2003; Fry, 2016). The chosen methodology must be justifiable from the philosophical positions guiding the study.

Phenomenology as Methodology

A research approach was necessary in this study to identify the essence of the experiences of faculty who have led short-term education abroad program. Given that to rationalize, define, quantity, and generalize this phenomenon within the positivist paradigm, where there is a hierarchical distance between the researcher and participants, would be unfitting, a phenomenological qualitative approach was thus needed (Wertz, 2011; Fry, 2016). Husserl maintained people are different from material nature by virtue of their capacity for consciousness; thus, require approaches other than those developed by the corporeal sciences to be scientifically studied (Husserl, 1991, 2014; Wertz, 2011). Phenomenology was been chosen as the most appropriate research methodology as it studies everyday examples of human life and shed light on its essence (Scharff, 2019).

Other qualitative approaches to research could have been selected such as grounded theory, discourse analysis, or narrative analysis; however, the intent of this study was to describe the actual lived experiences of faculty leaders of education abroad programs and describe the

phenomenon explicitly rather than construct a theory or analyze identities or stories (Starks & Brown, 2007; Wertz, 2011). For example, van Manen (2015) stressed, unlike grounded theory or ethnography, phenomenology does not "aim to develop theory nor explicate meanings that are relevant to understanding cultures or social groups" (p. 6). As such, a phenomenological approach was the most appropriate approach for this study.

Phenomenology as a research methodology can delineate things known tacitly but not articulated in depth (Finlay, 2008). It also describes phenomena that are not well understood or difficult to rationalize (Bevan, 2014; Finlay 2008). Furthermore, it aims to gain a deeper understanding of everyday experiences offering the clarification of possible understandings (van Manen, 1990, 2015). As there is a dearth of literature of the experiences of faculty who have led education abroad program, phenomenology offered a research methodology that asked for the very nature of a phenomenon—the essence (Husserl, 2008). A phenomenological approach to research gives voice to the people who experienced a particular phenomenon (Giorgi, 2009) while also clarifying the meanings of phenomena through analysis of their descriptions (Husserl, 2014). It is important to acknowledge that phenomenology is first and foremost a philosophy as well as a research approach (Finlay 2008; Fry, 2016; Giorgi, 2009; Seidman, 2006). It is therefore necessary to explore it more thoroughly to enable more in-depth comprehension of this methodology.

Philosophy of Phenomenology

Phenomenological philosophers have had different interpretations and applications of phenomenology (Dastur, 2017; Finlay, 2008, 2009; Moran, 2003; Scharff, 2012). The Greek word for phenomenon refers to something which shows itself by bringing it into daylight (Dastur, 2017). Philosopher Wilhelm Dilthey presented a contemporary understanding of

phenomenology by studying psychology and the unique issues of one's embeddedness with the world (Dastur, 2017; Scharff, 2012). Dilthey opposed the idea of an experimental approach in psychology and advocated for a method based on descriptions and understandings (Giorgi, 2009). He believed humans could never have the objectivity respected by the natural sciences as their interests were inseparable from their pre-existing involvement in experiential life (Scharff, 2012; Todres & Holloway, 2004).

Edmund Husserl (1931), though critical of Dilthey's philosophy, was fascinated in his descriptive emphasis and explored it philosophically. Husserl observed that the progress of the positivist natural science paradigm had led to the point of view where scientific means were the most prestigious method to obtain the truth (Dastur, 2017; Husserl, 1991, 1931; Scharff, 2012). Husserl also noted such scientific principles would create a contradiction between science and the everyday world which would ultimately lead to dehumanizing society (Fry, 2016). To better this dilemma Husserl believed the world of every day experiences could become the foundation of science and a legitimate resource for philosophical thinking. Building on the works of Dilthey, Husserl believed description, rather than explanation, was the best approach for identifying constituents of human behavior (Churchill & Wertz, 2015; Dastur, 2017; Husserl, 2014; Scharff, 2012).

According to Heidegger (1962), a student of Husserl, this premise was encumbered with categories of the natural science method (Dastur, 2017; Scharff, 2019). Heidegger (1962) asserted Husserl's obsession with natural science led to him lose sight of the original point of the phenomenon being studied. On the other hand, Heidegger was interested in the nature of being in which existence knows itself only in relation with others (Dastur, 2017; Scharff, 2019). He argued because of the wide variety of direct experiences within consciousness in comparison to

nature, no experience could be replicated and was in its essence unique. Over time, there was a shift in Heidegger's research view where he substituted the notion of knowing to that of understanding (Churchill & Wertz, 2015; Dastur, 2017; Heidegger, 1962; Scharff, 2012). For Heidegger, this notion involved being aware of oneself, belonging to the world, and relating with others.

The absence of clearly articulated approach for achieving phenomenological research combined with the challenge of comprehending the philosophical foundation of such research epitomize two major challenges for the researcher (Churchill & Wertz, 2015; Dastur, 2017; Scharff, 2012). As a result, much of the discussion within phenomenological research has stemmed around the use of whether to use an interpretive or a descriptive approach.

Descriptive and Interpretive Phenomenology

Finlay (2008) asserted all phenomenological research begins with tangible descriptions of the lived experience and is therefore all descriptive in that it seeks to describe rather than explain. Finlay (2008) also noted any research that does not have as its central feature a description focused on the lived experience cannot be deemed phenomenology. Given all phenomenology is descriptive in nature, researchers have differentiated between descriptive and interpretative phenomenology (Giorgi, 2009; Finlay, 2008; Lopez & Willis, 2004). It is therefore necessary to explore both methodologies and their related philosophical foundations in depth to offer insight into what is most appropriate for this study.

A descriptive phenomenological approach, inspired by Husserl (1931), seeks to reveal the general meaning structures of a phenomenon (Finlay, 2008; Lopez & Willis, 2004). In this type of approach, researchers stay close to what is given to them in all its richness and complexity (Finlay, 2008), and limit themselves to only making assertion supported by relevant intuitive

validations (Giorgi, 1985, 2009, 2012). Husserl's descriptive phenomenology assumes experiences, as perceived by participants' consciousness, has value and should be an object of scientific study. In this frame of thought, it is believed subjective information is an important component to research as one seeks to understand individual motivation because one's actions is influenced by what they perceive to be real (Li & Tu, 2016).

Husserl's main purpose was to elucidate the original experience by bracketing (*epoche*) personal assumptions in order to attain the genuine true essence of the phenomena as experienced by those being studied (Lopez and Willis, 2004). The main idea of this approach was to attain transcendental subjectivity (Lopez and Willis, 2004). Another aspect of Husserl's approach indicates there are features to a lived experience that are common to all those who have the experience, which must be identified for there to be generalization of description (Lopez and Willis, 2004; Morley, 2011). This research methodology aimed to explicate direct description and analysis of participants' experiences.

Interpretive phenomenology, inspired by Heidegger's *hermeneutic* philosophy, asserts we are inextricably embedded in the world and have an inescapable historicity of all understanding (Heidegger, 1962). Heidegger maintained interpretation is at the core of any phenomenological description in that it is not an added step to phenomenological method but rather that being in the world is inherent with interpretation. As such, interpretive phenomenology does not seek to remove certain presuppositions as it considers them to be part of the essence of a phenomenon (Heidegger, 1962; Finlay, 2008). Interpretive inquiry embraces the concept of suited freedom, meaning individuals are free to make choices, but their choices are not absolute. This concept of suited freedom is contrary to Husserl's concept of radical autonomy in that, rather than seeking

pure description of the real world as perceived by participants, the researcher seeks to describe the meanings of individuals' experiences and how those meaning influence their actions.

In this research study, a descriptive phenomenology was used as the appropriate methodology as it facilitates the understanding of the lived experiences of faculty and provide detailed data for analysis. I also chose a descriptive phenomenological approach over interpretive as it emphasizes a return to reflective intuition to describe and clarify experience as it was lived (Giorgi, 2009). It is this level of reflection on the experience that fits the aim of this study (Finlay, 2008). Descriptive phenomenology also provides a logical framework and rigor for qualitative research which can elucidate phenomena which are difficult to define and clarify (Giorgi, 2009).

As phenomenology became a popular philosophy in the twentieth century and many philosophers became attracted to it, various interpretations began to surface that differed from Husserl's original thoughts. Consequently, social scientists who became interested in phenomenology were interested in the different versions. One contemporary psychologist, Amedeo Giorgi, who based his work on Husserl's thoughts, developed a version of a phenomenological psychological method that was both "scientifically rigorous and psychologically fruitful" (Giorgi, Giorgi, Morley, 2012).

Using Phenomenology as a Research Methodology

Giorgi (2009) strongly stressed one must comprehend the significant differences between phenomenology as a philosophy and its application prior to engaging in a descriptive phenomenological study. Giorgi (2009) noted while phenomenology can and does provide the basis for a qualitative methodology, it is not an exact template for research methods. To Giorgi,

others' perspectives on an experience, instead of one's a personal philosophical reflection, offers tangible descriptions. Giorgi (2009) also underscored descriptions from participants are obtained from the perspective of the natural attitude, which is described as the attitude of everyday life. According to Husserl (1931), natural attitude as the standpoint of a person's everyday life through their "sight, touch, hearing, etc., in the different ways of sensory perception things are for me simply there, in a verbal or figurative "present" whether or not I pay them special attention by busying myself with them" (p. 101).

This criterion was fulfilled in this study as descriptions were achieved through data collection of participants' natural attitude.

Site Description

This study occurred within a single institutional setting: a public doctoral research university located in the southeast region of the United States. The university has an enrollment size of over 24,000 students and a faculty to student ratio of 18 to 1. It has a defined internationalization strategy and a history of faculty-led education abroad programs. It collaborates with faculty from all its colleges on the development and support of partnerships with overseas institutions and creates opportunities for education abroad experiences through a combination of consortia, bilateral exchanges, and faculty-led programs. I entered this study with an understanding of the campus culture and structure.

Participants Selection

A phenomenological framework requires a relatively homogenous group of participants (Giorgi, 2009; Moustakas, 1994; van Manen, 2015) who have significant and meaningful experiences of the phenomenon being investigated (Giorgi, 2009; Moustakas, 1994; van Manen, 2015). Phenomenological researchers commonly use purposive sampling to identify potential

participants (Seidman, 2006), and I chose this strategy as well. Participants may be tenure-line faculty of any rank, lecturers, or part-time faculty, but they must have led at least one short-term education abroad program during the institution's 2014-2019 strategic plan cycle. I selected this time frame because under this current strategic plan cycle the university, as indicated in goal four, sought to increase participation in abroad opportunities as well as support for faculty. Using the contact information of faculty-led programs located on the institution's public directory, I sent out an invitation to participate in the study through email (Appendix A). The email invitation included the purpose, description, data collection methods, and estimated timeline for the study. I also provided potential participants with my contact number should they wish to reach out to me with questions about my research prior to confirming to participate. Participants were also asked to provide their Curriculum Vitae (CV) which was used for the sole purpose of verifying their adherence to the selection criteria. Once all participants were confirmed, I shared additional information with them about the study and availability to schedule the first interview. Participant completed a consent form (Appendix B).

While studies have suggested different sample sizes for qualitative studies such as five to 20 (Creswell, 2013), and at least six (Morse, 1994), Giorgi (2009) asserted it is not the sample size that is important but rather the depth of the description of the phenomena. As such, he supported the idea that some research that only has one participant can be sufficient, whereas in other more complex research phenomena, enough participants were necessary to identify a range of various perspectives. To reach this goal, he recommended using at least three (Giorgi, 2009). Using Giorgi's recommendation, I chose to involve six participants in this study.

Data Collection

Phenomenological interviews consist of in-depth open dialogues and questions focusing on participants' experience with the intent of recreating many dimensions of that experience

(Englander, 2012; Giorgi, 2009; Langdridge, 2008) and providing a richness of detail and context that shape the experience (Langdridge, 2008).

Using Seidman's (2006) model for phenomenological interviews, participants were interviewed three times (Appendix C). The total time commitment for each participant was approximately 135 minutes in length (Seidman, 2006). Each interview lasted approximately 30-60 minutes. These meetings offered a contextual understanding of interviewees' experiences (Seidman, 2006). The first interview explored the interviewee's life history to provide insight into the context in which they experienced the phenomenon. It also provided opportunities for the participant to "reconstruct" (p. 17) the details of their experiences within the context in which it occurred. During the second interview, participants "concentrated on the concrete details of their lived experience in the topic area of the study" (p. 18). For example, participants may have reconstructed a specific day during which they led an education abroad program. The third interview offered a setting in which participants reflected on their experiences to make meaning of them. Meaning making requires participants to "look at how the factors in their lives interact to bring them to their present situation" (p. 18).

The sequence of the three interviews allowed participants to describe the context, details, and meaning of the experience of leading an education abroad program as it relates to their academic work and professional lives, as well as how they envisioned this effort contributing, or not, to institutional internationalization. It was my intention for there to be breaks, as Seidman suggested, of three days to one week between each interview with each participant over the span of two to three weeks. Seidman (2006) suggested this gives participants the time to "mull over the preceding interview but not enough time to lose the connection between the two" (p. 21).

To remain within the realm of phenomenological research, I placed emphasis on the relationships with the faculty participants and open-ended dialogues in order to fully understand their lifeworld experiences (Husserl, 1991, 2014; Todres, 2005). I intended to make the interviews as flexible as possible by asking clarifying questions, rather than leading questions, in order to shed light on the full meaning of their descriptions (Todres & Holloway, 2004). Researchers should aim to get in the moment of these interviews to expound on how the phenomenon is experienced by participants (Finlay, 2008). This is described as being phenomenologically orientated during the interview process (Finlay, 2009). Throughout the interview process I paid close attention to three processes to enable phenomenological orientation: openness, empathy, and attentive listening (Finlay, 2009). Openness was achieved through suspending assumptions of the phenomena. This attitude of openness and receptivity was attained by emptying one-self to be filled by another. Empathy was achieved by developing an attitude of being with the other in a relational space. Finlay referred to this as engaging reflexively with both one's own body and their intersubjective encounter with the interviewee. Attentive listening was a combination of both openness and empathy. This process is characterized by one demonstrating curiosity, contemplation, and compassion.

Participants were given pseudonyms for confidentiality purposes. Each interview was recorded using a digital audio recorder and I transcribed the interviews. In addition to an audio recording of the interview, I collected data from each participant session using note taking, including an outline of participants' answers to the questions. I also reviewed the notes and outlines following each interview to manage the large amount of information prior to and during data analysis. Following each interview, I provided each participant with a copy of the interview transcript for member checking purposes—confirming the accuracy of the findings (Lincoln &

Guba, 1985). This gave participants the opportunity to modify, correct, or omit anything said during our conversations. I also used peer debriefing at different stages of the study. Lincoln and Guba described this as, “the process of exposing oneself to a disinterested peer in a manner paralleling an analytical session and for the purpose of exploring aspects of the inquiry that might otherwise remain only implicit within the inquirer's mind” (p. 308). A colleague experienced with qualitative coding techniques served as a peer debriefer to suggest ideas and provide feedback to help me maintain objectivity (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using Giorgi’s (2009) five-step method for phenomenological study following data collection.

Step One: Assume Phenomenological Attitude

In the first step, I assumed the attitude of scientific phenomenological reduction (Broomé, 2011, 2014; Giorgi, 2009; Giorgi, Giorgi, & Morley, 2012). That is, I took the objects that emerged within the description to simply be objects that presented themselves from participants’ consciousness (Giorgi, Giorgi, & Morley, 2012). Husserl referred to this as bracketing process where the knowledge coming from an attitude other than the phenomenological one is put aside and rendered non-functional (Broomé, 2011, 2014; Giorgi, 2009; Giorgi, Giorgi, & Morley, 2012).

Step Two: Read Entire Transcription

In step two, I read through the entire written transcription provided by the participants to grasp the basic sense of the whole situated description (Broomé, 2011, 2014; Giorgi, 2009; Giorgi, Giorgi, & Morley, 2012).

Step Three: Delineate Meaning Units

In the third step, I created parts by delineating the meaning units within the text, all the while remaining in an attitude of scientific phenomenological reduction (Broomé, 2011, 2014; Giorgi, 2009; Giorgi, Giorgi, & Morley, 2012). This involved rereading the text and marking slashes in places where meaning transitions were observed (Broomé, 2011, 2014; Giorgi, 2009; Giorgi, Giorgi, & Morley, 2012). It is important to note that these meaning units were interdependent and were done in subsequent steps (Broomé, 2011, 2014; Giorgi, 2009; Giorgi, Giorgi, & Morley, 2012). I also changed all the first-person statements into third person to avoid fusing my and the faculty participants' experiences (Broomé, 2011, 2014; Giorgi, 2009; Giorgi, Giorgi, & Morley, 2012).

Step Four: Transform Meaning Units

In the fourth step, I intuited and transformed faculty's original expressions into ones that highlighted their lived psychological meanings (Broomé, 2011, 2014; Giorgi, 2009; Giorgi, Giorgi, & Morley, 2012). This process required the use of free imaginative variation and making implicit factors explicit (Broomé, 2011, 2014; Giorgi, 2009; Giorgi, Giorgi, & Morley, 2012). That is, I had to change faculty's original expressions so that the psychological meaning of what they expressed could be more directly apprehended (Broomé, 2011, 2014; Giorgi, 2009; Giorgi, Giorgi, & Morley, 2012). While this was a slow and challenging process, it allowed the opportunity to better familiarize myself with the data and discern what was needed.

Step Five: General Structure

In step five, I used the transformed meaning unit expressions gathered in the previous step as the basis to get the general structure of faculty's experiences (Broomé, 2011, 2014; Giorgi, 2009; Giorgi, Giorgi, & Morley, 2012). This included reviewing all the written

transformations and then determining what was essential. This is known as an *eidetic* reduction process where the researcher looks at a phenomenon and then systematically varies it in order to determine its essence (Broomé, 2011, 2014; Giorgi, 2009; Giorgi, Giorgi, & Morley, 2012). This process derived from the notion of parts and wholes (Broomé, 2011, 2014). That is, while the general structure is related to the whole description and may be expressed in ways that differ, it nonetheless is formed by interdependent individual parts (Broomé, 2011, 2014; Giorgi, 2009; Giorgi, Giorgi, & Morley, 2012).

Role of Researcher

In this study, my role as researcher was to develop and facilitate the interviews and allow the participants to voice their experiences. I was aware of my personal feelings about faculty involved in leading education abroad and took precautionary measures by withholding interpretations and presuppositions about participants' experiences. This bracketing process helped to keep the interviews as authentic as possible and to minimize preconceptions about the phenomena based on my prior experiences. It is important to note I serve as a scholar practitioner at this public doctoral research university and have been involved in various international education activity. To avoid my background as an educator biasing the analysis, I paid careful attention to monitor my personal feelings and looked for instances when I might begin to insert my own perception of reality into the analysis. A research journal was maintained to monitor this process, and the journal entries allowed the space necessary to capture initial thoughts and feelings immediately following the interviews. The journal was also brought out upon initial and subsequent readings of the transcripts to enable the sorting out of preliminary impressions and reactions to interviews.

Limitations and Delimitations

As a phenomenological study, I did not seek to generalize to other contexts, but rather to inform and advance subsequent research efforts. As a qualitative study, findings cannot be generalized to a population, but rather the use of these method will allow for and facilitate the emergence of new themes and issues in the course of data collection and analysis. Replicating this study due to the uniqueness of the individuals who participate may be another limitation. Furthermore, while bracketing techniques were used to eliminate researcher bias, human elements may have influenced the overall outcome of the study.

This phenomenological study generated findings to advance the understanding of faculty experiences in internationalization. Delimitations are choices made by the researcher that should be mentioned. In this study, participants were delimited to being a faculty from a public research institution of higher education within the southeast region of the United States who have led a short-term education abroad program. It was conceivable faculty rationales of engagement in education abroad may differ from institutions in different locations. As such, the findings from this study may not be generalizable to all types of higher education contexts.

Ethics

Participants were informed of how the findings were going to used as well as their options to limit their participation in or withdraw from the study at any point. Since the data are being published as a dissertation, participants remained anonymous and had the opportunity to provide feedback without any consequence. Institutional Review Board approval was obtained prior to the beginning of the study. Each participant was asked to sign an Informed Consent form for the audio recording of the interview prior to the interview. After each interview was completed and transcribed, the original data file was deleted from the digital voice recorder so it

could be cleared for the next interview. The results from this study are being published in the researcher's dissertation and may also be published in scholarly publications and presented at conferences.

Trustworthiness

To ensure trustworthiness in this research study, member checking and peer debriefing was used. Lincoln and Guba (1985?) noted member-checking involves giving participants a chance to confirm the accuracy or validity of the "analytic categories, interpretations, and conclusions" developed (p. 314). I used peer debriefing at different stages of the study. Lincoln and Guba (1985), described peer debriefing as "the process of exposing oneself to a disinterested peer in a manner paralleling an analytic session and for the purpose of exploring aspects of the inquiry that might otherwise remain only implicit within the inquirer's mind" (p. 308). A colleague experienced with qualitative coding techniques served as a peer debriefer for the purpose suggesting ideas and providing feedback, which helped me maintain objectivity (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Summary

In this chapter I discussed the research methodology and methods of this phenomenological study. More specifically, I highlighted the research question, phenomenological rationale, research design, participants and sampling, data collection, data analysis, researcher's role, assumptions, limitations and delimitations, ethics, and trustworthiness. The outcomes of this research study added to the limited empirical scholarship in this area of faculty-led education abroad and provide insights assisting higher education leaders make informed decisions to enhance internationalization efforts.

CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS

The purpose of this phenomenological study was to understand the lived experiences of faculty from a public research institution who have led a short-term education abroad program in the social sciences. In this study, I chose a descriptive phenomenological approach as it focuses on describing the essence of a phenomenon from the perspectives of those who have experienced it.

In this chapter, I discuss the findings gathered from semi-structured interviews and reflective journals that emerged from this descriptive phenomenological study. A focus was given to faculty's pre-education abroad, during education abroad, and post education abroad experiences. In addition, Chapter Four includes a brief description of the faculty participants allowing the reader to gain a better understanding of their situated context to enable a comprehension of what it is like to lead an education abroad program. Following the descriptions of the participants, the six major themes and 20 subthemes are discussed in detail, using excerpts from the participants' interviews to support the reasons for each theme. A summary of the main points is provided at the conclusion of the chapter.

Participants

Participants included six (n = 6) faculty members who led at least one short-term education abroad program in the social sciences during their institution's 2014-2019 strategic plan cycle. A specific criterion was utilized to select participants for this study. Using the contact information of faculty-led programs located on the institution's public directory, where the names and contact information of the faculty were identified, I invited 14 faculty to participate in this study. Of the final sample of six *(n = 6)* faculty participants, one was a tenured full

professor, two were tenured associate professors, one was a tenure-track assistant professor, one was a senior lecturer, and one an adjunct faculty/full-time student affairs professional. One faculty participant self-identified as a first-generation college student and another as a native of the host country in which the education abroad took place. Four academic disciplines were represented, with site locations from four continents for program destinations. All the participants had facilitated at least one program within the last five years, and participants' number of years leading education abroad programs ranged from five years to 20 years. Table 1 provides a profile breakdown for the six faculty participants. To protect their privacy, the participants' actual names are replaced by pseudonyms.

Table 1

Faculty Profile Breakdown

Participants (Pseudonyms)	Region/Country of Education Abroad	Years Leading Education Abroad	Academic Discipline	Program Size	Native of Host Country?
Dr. Ellison	Europe/Italy	10+	Teaching & Learning	20-30	No
Dr. Graham	Europe/UK, Ireland; Asia/Hong Kong	20+	Higher Education	15-20	No
Dr. Howard	Europe/Ireland South America/Guatemala	10+	Nursing/Global Health	20-30	No
Dr. Williams	Asia/Thailand	10+	Higher Education	15-20	Yes
Dr. Flynn	Africa/South Africa	10+	Women's Studies	10-15	No
Dr. Carson	Europe/Italy	5+	Literacy Education	20-30	No

A more detailed breakdown of faculty profiles is provided in Appendix D.

Participant #1: Dr. Ellison

Dr. Ellison is a tenure-track faculty currently serving as an assistant professor in Teaching and Learning. In the last decade, she has developed and led several education abroad programs at her current and former institution, taking students to Europe. Her most recent trip was to Italy where she led an educational program for aspiring teachers. As once a first-generation college student, she now sees her educational role to students being that of an advocate. She is an active member of her local and international community. She is a recipient of an award for Innovation in International Education. Her work has primarily centered on early childhood pedagogy, child development, arts education, creative and informal learning environment.

Participant #2: Dr. Graham

Dr. Graham is a tenured associate professor in Higher Education. Over the last 20 years, he has led education abroad programs at his current institution, taking students to Europe and Asia. His most recent trips were to the United Kingdom, Ireland, and Hong Kong where he led a program that compared different higher education systems. He has also mentored other faculty who have led education abroad programs. He enjoys learning about other cultures. He is a recipient of a prestigious Fulbright Fellowship. He is heavily involved in his local and international community. His work has primarily centered on higher education law, international education, comparative education, and student affairs.

Participant #3: Dr. Howard

Dr. Howard is a senior lecturer in Nursing/Global Health. She has taken students to Europe and South America in the last 10 years. Recently, she took students to Ireland and Guatemala where she focused on global health education. She is a global ambassador who enjoys

learning about and embracing other cultures. Her work has primarily centered on health promotion, global health, and nursing.

Participant #4: Dr. Williams

Dr. Williams is an adjunct faculty member and a full-time student affairs professional. She teaches in Higher Education. During the last five years, she has led education abroad program at her current institution taking students to Asia. Her most recent trip was to Thailand where she co-led a program that compared different higher education systems. She is a native of the country in which she co-led her education abroad program. She also has firsthand experience collaborating with international and domestic students as well as faculty members to create an inclusive community and to implement cultural and international educational opportunities for authentic interaction and learning. Prior to her work in higher education, she served with an international non-profit organization for several years and is an active member of her local and international community.

Participant #5: Dr. Flynn

Dr. Flynn is a tenured a full professor in Women's Studies. In the last decade, she has developed and led education abroad programs at her current institution taking students to Africa. Recently, she took students to South Africa where she led a program that viewed social inequalities. She is a renowned international speaker and an active member of her community. Her work has primarily centered on global development, gender, migration and informal economy, post-conflict transition, and refugee studies.

Participant #6: Dr. Carson

Dr. Carson is a tenured associate professor in Literacy Education. Over the last 10 years, she has developed and led education abroad programs both at her current and former institution.

She recently took students to Italy in Europe where she led an educational program for aspiring teachers. As a global educator, she has mentored countless students and created pathways for them to experience the world. She is also a recipient of an award for Innovation in International Education. Her work has primarily centered on adolescent, literacy, disciplinary literacy, digital literacy, and design based-based research.

Summary of Key Findings

Faculty participants provided rich description of their experiences leading short-term education abroad program. The interview protocol guided participants to describe their pre-education abroad, during education abroad, and post education abroad experience. Table 2 outlines the six major themes and subthemes associated with each of the education abroad experience.

Table 2

Education Abroad Themes

Timeframe	Findings Themes	Counter Findings

Pre-Education Abroad	*Faculty motivation
	- Opportunity to give back
	  - Rewarding
	  - Identity
	- Personal gratification
		*Creating something new
		*Space to recharge

	*Intentionality in Program Design - Program objectives/curriculum - Integration of local community and culture - Program cost - Partnership and availability of resources	*Selection process
During Education Abroad	*Responsibility - Students - Home institution - Host community	*Shared responsibility
	*Deeper Faculty-Student Interaction - Time spent together - Difficult conversations - Student development	*Family members
Post Education Abroad	*Disconnection with Campus Community - Misunderstanding and underestimation - Institutional support - Lack of institutional support - Faculty perseverance	*Gender differences
	*Advice to Colleagues and Institutional Leaders - Partnership - Preparation - Engage in new experience - Make experience affordable to all students	*Integrate Research

The following presents a detailed description of the thematic findings as determined through an in-depth analysis of the participants' interviews and reflective journal entries. Direct quotes are also used to provide contextual information that support each of the described themes.

Findings: Faculty Experience Pre-Education Abroad

Successful education abroad program requires educators to make arrangements beforehand. In discussing their prior international experiences, planning strategies, and expectations for the education abroad program, two predominant themes emerged from faculty members' pre-education abroad experiences: motivation for leading the program and intentionality in the program design.

Theme One: Faculty Motivation

Faculty were motivated to lead education abroad programs for two reasons: (a) the opportunity to give back, and (b) personal gratification. These desires stemmed primarily from their own experiences abroad as students or other meaningful international experiences.

Opportunity to Give Back. Faculty described giving back as an opportunity to pass on an international experience to students, such as what they once received, that would benefit them in the long term. Taking students abroad who may have never traveled outside their local community was impactful to all faculty participants.

Rewarding. Faculty were motivated to give back for several reasons but primarily because it was a rewarding experience that allowed them to share memorable moments with their students and reflect on their own journeys. Dr. Howard, for example, shared how her giving back greatly impacted her. She noted:

> In talking with students, I found a lot of them shared a similar interest or very interested in education abroad programs. I've been traveling globally for several years. I think I knew how those opportunities had impacted me and I wanted to share that opportunity. (Dr. Howard)

Giving back for her was impactful because it gave her the opportunity to connect with her students on similar interests and share some of her traveling experiences with them.

Some faculty also explained how their personal experiences as undergraduate or graduate students motivated them to give back to their now current students. Dr. Ellison, for example, shared how she was not exposed to these experiences as an undergraduate, but through the mentorship she received in graduate school she knew this was an experience she wanted to pass on. She described her experience as the following:

> It all initially started kind of watching other students go as an undergraduate and never really having the encouragement of my faculty as an undergraduate to think about the importance of that type of experience. And then having good mentorship when I was in my doctoral program where they had several education abroad programs that took place over the summer typically. And then kind of having that opportunity as an initial faculty member to get involved. (Dr. Ellison)

For her, giving back was a process she experienced from earlier in her academic journey to later on. She witnessed its impact from different levels and knew how important it was for her to continue the legacy.

Similarly, Dr. Carson and Dr. Williams shared how their graduate experience played a significant role in them now being proponents of education abroad and offering these experiences to their students. Dr. Carson described her experience as the following:

> When I started working with the education abroad program as a doctoral student, I never studied abroad as an undergrad. I didn't have enough money. It just was never an option for me. I'd already had been a high school English teacher for four years. When I did the education abroad program, the whole time I was like, oh my gosh, I should have done

> this as an undergrad. This is so amazing. It would have changed the way that I taught. I felt like I was a very empathetic teacher, but I had no idea really. So, that's what kind of drives me to do what I do. (Dr. Carson)

She previously thought going on an education abroad program was not an option for her and as a result she did not participate. Later, after going on an education abroad program, she realized this was not the case and the joy and new perspective she gained abroad were the reasons why she continues to give back through her work. Another faculty, Dr. Williams, described her experience as the following:

> I started my career in international education with a nonprofit international education organization. Because of that, I think, it totally changed my perspective about education. As a PhD student I had the opportunity to also plan faculty led education abroad programs. It's given me the very first insight information about the whole aspect of faculty led programs. So, now when the opportunity presented itself, I thought it was also important for the institution and it has a lot of benefit to our students as well. (Dr. Williams)

The opportunity she received as a doctoral student to plan and co-lead a program opened her eyes to the new possibilities of international education. This was an experience that did not only benefit students but the institution. Because her faculty mentors were supportive of her growth throughout her educational journey, she felt it was only necessary to reciprocate the same thing to her current students.

As a first-generation college student, first in her family to get a college degree, Dr. Ellison discussed how her work with this population of students as a way of giving back, which she finds rewarding. She described her experience as the following:

> I, as an undergraduate myself, was [a] first generation college student. I knew that there was education abroad, but I didn't think it was for me because I had never been anywhere or traveled anywhere…Now I see my job as being somebody who is working with a lot of first-generation college students and letting them know that it's an experience for you. This is something that we can make happen for you. It's not something that just the wealthy can do or those whose parents are paying their way through a school like that. We've got a lot of resources we can draw on and it's an important experience I think in particular for that population of students that haven't had an opportunity to see the world beyond their immediate kind of surroundings. I wish I had done that myself as an undergraduate. (Dr. Ellison)

She shared how this experience, which she once felt was only for the more affluent individuals, is available to all students, especially underrepresented students. It was not only her goal to inform students of all the resources available to them and how they could access them but a rewarding experiences.

Identity. Faculty also stated how giving back through education abroad allowed them to connect to their core identity. Identity played a significant role among all faculty not only leading education abroad but in empowering them to continue their work. Dr. Flynn, for example, traced her experience back to when she was a little girl who desired to have a learning experience through cultural immersion. She expressed her experience as the following:

> I knew I wanted to do research and create my own classroom experience. My whole identity around professor life was in taking students abroad. And I felt like it was some way of responding to my own experiences of a young girl who was pretty isolated and wanted to have that experience of immersion. And then of course she gets so much more

> back and those synergies and those magical moments. It always felt like a real expression of my own purpose. (Dr. Flynn)

For Dr. Flynn, giving back allowed her to truly pursue her purpose. The benefit she experienced far outweighed what she envisioned as a young girl.

In general, faculty were motivated to give back through education abroad because it was a rewarding experience and was part of their identity. Providing students these international experiences opened doors to endless opportunities.

Personal gratification. Leading education abroad program was also a personal gratifying experience for all faculty. Therefore, these gratifying sentiments derived from seeing students develop, transform, and overcome personal obstacles. Dr. Ellison, Dr. Graham, Dr. Williams, and Dr. Carson shared similar thoughts of how these experiences were personally gratifying to them. Dr. Ellison described her experience as the following:

> I think, watching the students feel relief. That's always super cool for me. It reminds me of why I wanted to work with students to begin with because there's very few experiences where you get to see somebody shift their thinking and so that's super cool. (Dr. Ellison)

For her, watching students experience something that caused them to have a shift their thinking was gratifying. It reminded her of why she wanted to work in the field that she is in now and work with students. Likewise, Dr. Graham described his experience as the following:

> We've had a number of occasions where the education abroad was the first time that the student had ever gone outside of the United States and to see the wonder in their eyes as they engaged in another culture that they were completely unfamiliar with and having them tell you at the end that this was a life changing experience for them. It's always very

> rewarding to see that kind of things. We have had students who, as part of the class, have to write a paper who we've gotten a number of them published. So those are positive kinds of things that have come out of the education abroad experience. And, just exposing people to different kinds of systems really make them understand how wonderful the U.S. system is. I think they have developed an appreciation for the U.S. system by seeing things that other countries have or don't have that we have or don't have. We've also seen a number of students who have begun to host education abroad at their institutions once they've graduated and gone to work. So, we see that as kind of the legacy of what we're doing as well. So, all those are positive things. (Dr. Graham)

It was important for him to see the legacy of the program continue. That is, offering a program to students who then wanted to pass it on to future generations. In addition, seeing students transition from curious observers to later describing their experiences as life changing was personally gratifying. Along the same lines, Dr. Howard described her experience as the following:

> Seeing the students have that personal growth and seeing their worldview broaden. Their enthusiasm. Also, I really have to compliment our students and just kind of seeing how amazing they are when they interact with the community and when they really put a lot of effort into their health promotion projects to make them meaningful for the communities that they're serving. So, I think that's definitely some of the highs. I would also say when we feel like we make an impact on the community. (Dr. Howard)

She found it gratifying seeing her students grow and broaden their perspectives as a result of going on the education abroad program. In addition, the opportunity students had to engaged

with the local community was also a positive experience that further underscored their growth in an unfamiliar setting. Like Dr. Ellison, Dr. Williams described her experience as the following:

> So, for me as a professional, it is very rewarding again to see the change, to see some shifts because some of the students, this is the first time that they go out of the country or for some this is the first time that they go to an Asian country or go to a country where English is not the first language. So, there's a lot of opportunity that I think at the end it is worth it. It's encouraging more than anything, I think, to see the impact that the program has on students. Some students feel that, now if I can go here, I can go anywhere else. I think that it generates interest and awareness. (Dr. Williams)

The feeling of seeing her student shift their thinking was personally gratifying for her. This was a worthwhile experience that raised awareness and generated more interests in international education. Furthermore, Dr. Carson discussed the personal gratification she experienced seeing her students transform. She described her experience as the following:

> I really like to just watch students transform. I see them when they started this program and then I watched them in Italy and when they come back. It's almost like you're a different person sometimes. It really helps them come out of their shells and in a lot of ways it helps them become a more confident teacher. In a lot of ways, a more empathetic. It's interesting because you don't usually put empathy and confidence in the same sentence, but the students are more confident in their own beliefs, which had been transformed through this experience and I feel like they've become more empathetic to their students that they're teaching and just to other people too. I think that those are all really positive things. (Dr. Carson)

The transformation she described was watching students, who were current or aspiring teachers, become more empathic and confident individuals as a whole. These personally gratifying experiences were the reasons why she always sought opportunities to give back.

Counter Findings: Create a New Experience and Recharge

Contrary to giving back and personal gratification shared by most faculty leading education abroad program, some faculty had unique reasons for leading their program. The excitement in creating something new came up with one participant who after drawing on experiences from a previous institution and having conversations with colleagues wanted to establish a program that had an international focus. Dr. Graham described his experience creating something new as the following:

> I came into education abroad, through the development of the higher ed program curriculum here. I was working with the then director of international programs and I said, you know, something that does not exist out there in the higher ed world is a curriculum that focuses upon international students and in international education. So, as part of that discussion, we developed the track in the master's degree, the international leadership track in the master's degree. And in a sense kind of spun that track off as an emphasis area in the PhD program in higher education and in community college leadership PhD program.

The excitement to develop a curriculum that focused upon learning about other systems of higher education around the world, not only allowed students to be better informed about how other systems work but was exciting for Dr. Graham. It was an opportunity think creatively, compare, and examine other systems to see where improvements needed to be made in their home context.

Another faculty discussed how the experience of leading an education abroad program provided them with the space to recharge from their work and help them navigate the complex bureaucratic higher education system. This was contrary to the joy felt by other faculty. Dr. Carson, for example, described recharging through education abroad as the following:

> I feel like these experiences help keep me sane as a faculty member. My institution is a great place to work. I love working here and I am very supported as a faculty member and I very much enjoy my department and my job. There're so many things that go on in higher ed that can be very frustrating. So, from a professional perspective, this is where I find some joy in what I do because it's not another department meeting where we talk about the budget and how we have no money and talk about getting more students in our program, and those daily conversations that we have. (Dr. Carson)

She discussed how the multiple demands placed on faculty in higher education settings can often be frustrating and as such, she sought an opportunity to recharge through an authentic international experience.

Summary

Overall, faculty were motivated to lead education abroad program because it was an opportunity to give back to students and was personally gratifying. Though leading education abroad program was rewarding for these faculty, it also involved a significant amount of energy and intentionality.

Theme Two: Intentionality in Program Design

Designing a successful education abroad program required a significant level intentionality. That is, carefully planning each program to incorporate key elements that ensured student learning and success. As such, faculty often attributed the length of time planning such a

program to the great level of attention to details. The key elements faculty considered in their planning process were, developing structured curricula with program objectives, integrating local communities and cultures, cost, and identifying partners and available resources for the program.

Program Objectives/Curriculum. Faculty discussed the importance of identifying program outcomes and developing a structured curriculum. Each program was designed with the intention to maximize student learning on international education concepts in the social sciences and to expose them to the local community and culture. It is important to note learning about culture was a fundamental aim of the course and program abroad. Dr. Williams described her experience being intentional in her planning as the following:

> We will sit down first and make sure and discuss about the goal and objective and why we selected that destination. Once we land into the country, someone else need[s] to have an expertise to make sure that student or the whole experience is meaningful and it's worth the time and the investment and meets the expectations and criteria. So, we sat down and came up with objective of what we would like to achieve. We also thought about what some of the activities are that we want to do because we don't want this to be just like an excursion where students to just go there and have a good time. We want to make sure that students have the opportunity to engage. (Dr. Williams)

For her, being intentional entailed a process of developing goals and objectives for what she wanted to achieve which would ultimately maximize students' time and to gain the full benefit of the program. Being intentional also involved identifying program objectives. It consisted of carefully identifying partners who the faculty would work with for the success of the program. Dr. William often reflected on her own experience as a student and how her mentor's program

was always intentional and thought out. These were fundamental aspects of the program that she felt were key and had to incorporate into her own program.

Similarly, Dr. Carson even expressed her frustration in seeing faculty who take this endeavor lightly by not preparing in advance. She described this frustration as the following:

> Something that I've seen that kind of upsets me a little bit, faculty try to do an education abroad program because they really want to go to a certain place. Like, Oh, I want to visit Ireland, so I'm going to do an education abroad trip to Ireland and then they'll do a very light curriculum and they'll go with that. That's not a great abroad program in my opinion. (Dr. Carson)

Developing an effective curriculum required time and intentionality. Dr. Carson discussed how her frustration came after she reflected on the amount of energy spent and careful planning, she devoted to her program. As such, making light of this experience was doing a disservice to the students.

Integration of Local Community and Culture. Faculty sought to integrate the local community and culture into the education abroad program. These experiences made the program come to life for her. They discussed wanting to provide students learning experiences that allowed them to not only to learn content related to their fields in the social science but also to immerse themselves in the community.

Both Dr. Carson and Dr. Williams shared how they always sought opportunities to incorporate aspects of the local community into the itinerary, particularly by going to landmarks and historical locations. Dr. Carson described her integrations process as the following:

> There's a lot of interesting things. The town that we lived in is was a deportation town during world war II. So, there were concentration camps right outside of Capri, but

> Carving was a city where they took everyone to and sorted them essentially. There was a Jewish ghetto there. So, we do some historical tours and things like that. In that region because they had this approach to education that is very child focused, sometimes we'll take them to different schools that they might not be in. Every year there's something like a special visit that we do. (Dr. Carson)

Sight-seeing and visits were integral parts of the education abroad experience for all faculty, especially Dr. Carson, given the significance of the location of the program. As a historical enthusiast herself, incorporating these contexts into the program exposed students and herself to another dimension of education which they may not have been familiar with. Another faculty, Dr. Williams, described her experience sight-seeing as the following:

> When we first [land], we did some kind of in-country tour to get students excited and familiar with some of the local and get them to relax and prep them to be familiar. So, the first day we did the local tour and then met with the campus partners, the faculty member that we worked with, and we also went outside to do sightseeing and also site visit. So, whenever we go and traveled, we made sure that we had one or two hours so students can learn from the experience when we go out of Bangkok. We went to the beach because that's what Thailand is known for to make sure that students get that feeling because travel is long. (Dr. Williams)

As a native of the local host country in which they visited and knowing a lot of the ins and out, for her, having a smooth transition was important. It allowed the group to familiarize themselves with the surrounding and local partners. Incorporating such opportunities into the program also allowed the group to take a break from the scheduled traditional indoors activities.

Often, faculty take students on programs abroad and only expose them to a certain institutional context in which they are visiting. All faculty discussed how providing a comprehensive cultural learning experience to students was critical to the ultimate goal of the education abroad program. Dr. Williams, for example, expressed her preparation strategies as the following:

> In terms of program planning, I think that we should not only go and visit the university, but it needs to have some cultural experiences. Not as a tourist but what is it that the local are doing? And not to mention some of the government office department. To provide a comprehensive experience within a short period of time but more than anything provides students an opportunity to engage with the local. (Dr. Williams)

In her situation, being intentional entailed providing a comprehensive experience. It was crucial to maximize students' time abroad and the program by experiencing different contexts. For her, this experience was not only an opportunity to connect with the local culture but was a prideful moment to showcase the host country.

Faculty also discussed family being another institutional context that added another layer to the experience. Both Dr. Ellison and Dr. Flynn shared similar thoughts on local cultural immersion as part of the intentional learning experience. They discussed how their students were able lodge with local host families and as a result maximized their overall experience. Dr. Ellison described her experience as the following:

> So, remember our students stay with families. We stayed with a family too. They live with a family and the family either takes them to their school during the day or they give them a bike or something and they ride. (Dr. Ellison)

In her case, the group was fortunate to stay with local family volunteers who had to go through a screening process in order to host the group. Faculty played a significant role in that process by intentionally integrating the local family aspect. She was grateful for all the volunteers who were very resourceful not just in meeting their basic needs but transportation as well.

Dr. Flynn took cultural exposure even further by taking students to areas of the country where they could see social inequalities. This, she believed painted a fuller image of the realities of another nation that students in the United States may be blinded to. She described this approach as the following:

> We always looked at social inequality and injustice. So, we would go from a township in South Africa where people were living without electricity, living in shacks, and living in sand settlements. And then we would meet someone at four o'clock in a coffee shop downtown and students would get a cappuccino in a very posh part of town. And I remember a lot of my work with them was just helping them navigate moving through those spaces because it seemed really dramatic for them. They're in Cape Town, whereas we do have inequality in the U.S. but often times people are protected by their economic brackets. (Dr. Flynn)

Faculty planned abroad events to facilitate learning that occurred through multiple perspectives. These did not just happen serendipitously but rather intentionally. Dr. Flynn and other faculty discussed being very intentional in their program to build structured time each day to have one-on-one or group conversations to process what they all experienced. These were her favorite moments with her students as it allowed her to really get to know them better but also see the experience from their perspectives.

Program Cost. All faculty discussed efforts to keep the program costs low. Faculty thought about their students' different socioeconomic backgrounds and they realized the programs would be accessible only if costs were kept low. Dr. Williams and Dr. Carson explained the financial implications of the program as the following:

> Because education abroad can be so expensive, and I think that faculty member's idea contributes a lot to the cost of the program, we agreed that we should put that piece into the consideration as well. For example, I submitted grants to get the U.S. Embassy in Thailand to help with some. We also got some funding from a different department to help support this program. We just try to put everything together, especially since this is a higher education program (Dr. Williams)

> One of the hardest things in particularly right now, I mean I was doing this through the recession that started in 2008. Convincing people to spend money on education abroad is hard. It's very hard. When I was at my former institution, quite a few students are not on financial aid. Here, it's a little different. Here, it's been very much a struggle to figure out. We've gone from a month-long program to a week-long spring break program to cut down on costs. And our program is very affordable if you're looking across education abroad programs and we still struggle to get students in our program. Our program this year didn't make. (Dr. Carson)

For these two faculty, being intentional meant taking financial implications into consideration. They described seeing the desire of some students wanting to participate but could not, and as such, they felt they had to take actions. The challenges of leading an education abroad coupled with program affordability led faculty seek other streams to funding to supplement the program

cost. Most faculty discussed often referring students to the education abroad office to discuss options for financing the program.

Partnership and Availability of Resources. Faculty found it vital to identify in-country partners and resources to ensure a successful program experience. They described how this process involved the partnership and support from the education abroad office and other offices both on campus and from the host country. Dr. Graham described his intentional preparation as the following:

> We prepare very well in [advance] and we work very closely with the study abroad office at the university to make sure that students have safety issues and they know about safety issues while they're in country, to know about medical issues, where the closest hospital where we're staying. The medical system within the country we are going to visit, make sure that they all have insurance—all of those kinds of things that protect the students while they are there. (Dr. Graham)

For Dr. Graham, being intentional entailed making sure he had proper healthcare resources in-country to protect students. Through the relationships he developed with the education abroad office prior to the program, he was positioned to easily address situations that arose. Another faculty, Dr. Howard, described her experience being intentional about the partnership she developed as the following:

> We've also been able to meet with an academic practice builder that helps understand our academic goals and immerses us in that community. We have a couple of faculty that we work with on this week. We built our academic goals for the program. So, it's almost like we have three partners, maybe four partners. We have the faculty developing the course, the students that are going to be taking the course and they have academic goals and

> needs. The community partner has their community needs, and then we have our vendor really that we work with to help set us all up. So that all happens before we get to the students. (Dr. Howard)

For her, being intentional meant partnering with others to make sure the international experience was related to specific learning outcomes for students. Additionally, Dr. Howard elaborated on being intentional about selecting partners in-country stating the group should be proactive. She described her experience as the following

> So, we're looking for a match in a community where our students can have an opportunity for that service learning and a community health projects is usually what we're looking for. When I say looking for that, we think is best practice to have a community partner so that we're not just coming in with our ideas and implementing those ideas maybe where it's not what the community wants. So, we're immediately looking for a community partner. And then we engage with that community partner to see if some of the skillset that we can match the needs that they have. (Dr. Howard)

It was important for her and all other faculty to ensure the group did not impose its agenda on the community but rather met their needs or partnered on a project.

Counter Findings: Selection Process

Some experiences also emerged throughout interviews; however, which differed from the experiences provided by most faculty. It is essential to understand these experiences as they also shed light on other experiences. One faculty member, being cognizant to whom the program was offered, expressed how her and her colleague expanded the program to include undergraduate students which then presented new challenges of its own—selection. Nonetheless, it was a good

lesson for future program planning. In addition to her previous description, Dr. Ellison described another experience of being intentional as the following:

> So, this is an interesting year for us because this is the first time we've offered it to undergrads. So, we've gotten a lot of interests, which is great. We have a good number signed up and so we're excited. But we had to think through some of our expectations. So, because you come in and you hit the ground running there and we place you in a classroom, we know we need you to have had a little bit of experience working with kids prior to going. So that was something, to be honest with you, we didn't think of it until we did the education abroad day and I had freshmen coming up and asking if they could come. So, thinking about when a good time is to have this experience, like middle of your program or last part of your program. So that's one of the things we're kind of wrestling with now. I think that this year will help inform our decisions about being a little more strict on the parameters next year. (Dr. Ellison)

She discussed being intentional in terms of the selection process and which student could participate in the program. Given the nature of the program she and the other faculty co-led, it was important for them to select students who would not only benefit from the program but be successful. The process of selecting the right students for the program involved also having to say no to some students who applied. This heart wrenching part of the experience was one that she dreaded. This particular experience of carefully selecting a cohort of students, though not uncommon in leading education abroad program, was unique to this faculty in this study as it caused her to step out of her comfort zone.

Summary

Overall, intentionality to program design was essential for all faculty during the planning stages. Most faculty were intentional about the program objectives and curriculum, integrating learning experiences such as the local community and culture into the program, cost, and identifying partners and available resources. While these intentional practices were shared among all faculty, one faculty discussed how selecting students for the program played a role in her experience. The implementation of a program that included a well-structured curriculum and culturally appropriate aspects during the education abroad also came with its own challenges. Faculty assumed several roles and responsibilities while abroad that influenced their experiences. The following section discuss these responsibilities further.

Findings: Faculty Experience During Education Abroad

During the education abroad program, faculty's day-to-day experiences consisted of a variety of high and low moments. All faculty indicated though students were always their main focus while abroad, they sometimes also assumed different roles in the process. Two common themes emerged from their experiences during the education abroad program: Responsibility to students, home institution, and host community; and a deeper interaction with their students.

Theme Three: Responsibility to Students, Institution, and Host Community

All faculty underscored the responsibility they carried while abroad. These obligations to their students, home institution, and host community influenced their experience leading students abroad.

Responsibility to Students. There is an element of sobriety and fear that is felt by many faculty while abroad. Faculty described the sensing the weight of the responsibility to students. While faculty in study were in constant communication with their home institution while abroad,

they felt an internal challenge to steward the program well. While externally no one may have noticed, internally they wrestled with countless decisions regarding students. They were responsible for students' safety and wellbeing, emergency troubleshooting, behavioral management, and student engagement the entire time they were abroad.

Safety and Wellbeing. Students' safety and wellbeing were the primary responsibility for all faculty while abroad. They felt it was paramount to students not only to enjoy their experience abroad but to ensure that unpredictable circumstances were minimized in-country. In discussing his safety and wellbeing precautionary measures, Dr. Graham expressed how students needed to understand the dangerous world around them. He described his experience as the following:

> My background is in law. Risk management is very important to me. So, letting students know and being aware of myself that students should not engage in some activities for safety purposes and liability purposes. For instance, we want to make sure that students go to various places together and don't place themselves in physical jeopardy. Obviously, the world is often a dangerous place now with terrorism and other things going on and so we ask them to be cautious and aware of their surroundings. Anytime they're in a public location and particularly once they're identified as Americans, they sometimes can be targets and we want to make sure that they understand that and are careful as a result of that. (Dr. Graham)

Using his law and risk management experience as a framework in his program, he ensured that students were aware of their surroundings. For Dr. Graham, precaution not only played a big role while abroad but ensured students' safety and wellbeing. Other faculty members, like Dr.

Howard and Dr. Williams, noted similar things as it relates to being responsible for their students. Dr. Williams noted the following:

> The first time a student went with me, it was just kind of serendipitous and that worked out well, but I learned better about planning and things like that as I went. I also think about keeping students safe and thinking about student safety and student health and wellness and having orientations and those kinds of things. (Dr. Howard)
>
> I think everything that we do has to be strategic in terms of safety, in term of costs, and in terms of the learning even though it's fun. (Dr. Williams)

Students' safety and wellbeing was an integral part of the program for all faculty. For these two faculty in particular, it meant every student being aware of safety precautions prior to the program.

In some instances, faculty demonstrated their concerns for students' safety and wellbeing by being their parents. This instinctual protective reaction was seen as the appropriate response at that moment. Dr. Flynn and Dr. Ellison, for example, described their experiences as the following:

> You have to be in the student's overall world in a much different way, you know? So, I feel like I tried to be a supportive human being and you do become a bit of a parent while you're there. And the places I went, there was always an element of consciousness around safety and you know travel limitations. (Dr. Flynn)
>
> We did have an African-American student one year who felt very uncomfortable, like students at another institution made her feel very uncomfortable. I turned into mama bear. Like how dare that happened to my student? So, those were the things that I'm kind of talking about. (Dr. Ellison)

All faculty, particularly these two, discussed being parents in some way or another while abroad. This meant they had to put students' needs ahead of their own by doing whatever they deemed necessary should anything hinder any of their students from enjoying the program experience.

***Emergency Troubleshooting*.** Faculty described emergency troubleshooting as finding alternative solutions in the event of an unforeseen circumstance. Faculty discussed their responsibility to student when faced with various emergency situations. More specifically, they expressed experiences in which they were sometimes challenged by students, transportation mishaps, or climate. These situations impacted their overall experience as leaders. All faculty shared how they had to assume these responsibilities while abroad and the pressure that came with it . For both Dr. Howard and Dr. Graham, in particular, troubleshooting entailed navigating the transportation challenges that arose. Dr. Howard described her experience as the following:

> Two years ago, it took the team 30 hours to get there. When you watch the students really adapt without a lot of whining and complaining, then you know, you got a good group when they're just like, it is what it is. We can't control the weather, our flight schedule, or things. Sometimes it's exhausting when you have some travel woes, but I would say in general you can't control that. That's no big deal. Occasionally we've had some health issues that we've had to access the local healthcare system for students that weren't feeling well or things like that. (Dr. Howard)

While returning from an education abroad program, Dr. Graham, a seasoned faculty in higher education who has led countless program abroad, described the hardship of flight travel he experienced and how he overcame it. He described his experience as the following:

> We had a flight coming back from Europe, which was the roughest flight I've been on in any flight I've ever taken. We had almost an hour of really heavy turbulence and as we

> tried to land in New York City, the wind shear forced us to move from our intended airport to an airport in upstate New York where we had to land and wait for several hours before we could go back to New York City. As the weather calmed down and by the time we got back, we had missed our connecting flight. As the leader of that group, I went to the airlines to try to figure out what we were going to do. (Dr. Graham)

For these faculty, being responsible for students meant instinctually doing whatever it took to ensure that the group arrived at its intended destination despite illness, transportation, or travel woes. Other faculty, like Dr. Ellison and Dr. Flynn, described their experiences as the following:

> And then the occasional troubleshooting of problems that come up which is inevitable. Sometimes it's something just like losing a passport. Other times it's somebody having a hard time or trying to be a source of support across the board during that time for the students, the schools, and the families. (Dr. Ellison)
>
> One time we were somewhere on a Sunday afternoon and our wonderful driver was there and a guy came up and just kind of bullied him and acted like he was going to punch him, and things just changed in a heartbeat. And I remember thinking, just remember things can change. And here I had these 12 students and what would happened to them? What if something had happened to the driver and we were in a context where it would have been hard for me to drive them home, you know? So, I'm a spiritual person. I see value in a lot of religions but there were some nights where I definitely prayed. (Dr. Flynn)

For these faculty, troubleshooting emergency situations was more than a physical act but rather an emotional and spiritual one. Dr. Ellison discussed needing to comfort a student who was having a difficult time while Dr. Flynn turned to prayer to address an incident that could have

quickly had negative ramifications. Both of these situations further speak to the assumed responsibilities faculty often must take in the event of emergency.

Behavioral Management. On certain occasions students exercised poor behavioral judgments that could have jeopardized the cohesiveness of the group or put themselves at harm. Faculty described behavioral management as maintaining order while abroad. This management was particularly important in the presences of key individuals from the host country. On those occasions, faculty exercised their roles and responsibilities to students as leaders by disciplining them. Dr. Graham and Dr. Flynn described these experiences as the following:

> We had a student who didn't think that this was really an educational program and he stayed intoxicated most of the time that we were away until I threatened to send him home early and made him room with one of the other people who kept him under control the whole time. That was problematic. We had a student with us who, when we went on a social trip in Hong Kong on a cruise boat, stole some things from the ship and his colleagues told me about them and I made him return them and threatened to send him home. So, we've had some student misbehavior from time to time and the travel transportation issues. (Dr. Graham)

> I think of myself as a very tolerant person but after a while of playing complaining, as a leader, I reached my max. We had a student who was complaining and complaining, and I said, I want you to look at what you're voicing of these complaints. Does the group and I wonder if you could deal with it in a different way if you could maybe journal about it or think about what's missing. But it's kind of taking over the verbal space. She said, well, I just didn't think I was going to come to African and deal with so much poverty. Yeah, I don't know what you imagined, but I always hold on to that line [of] course on wealth.

> Although it is interesting. And of course, as a leader, I have to really pay attention to that because if a person infuses our energy as a leader, then that impacts the whole process and the rest of the group. And you never know. (Dr. Flynn)

Dr. Graham and Dr. Flynn dealt with student issues such as, theft, public intoxication, complaining. While they were the only ones who specifically dealt with these student behavioral issues while abroad, all faculty discussed addressing these potential issues in their program orientation prior to the departure.

Student Engagement. Faculty expressed keeping students engaged was another form of responsibility they had to embrace. All faculty described student engagement as participating in events, activities, presentations. This approach was not only a learning opportunity for their students but also to demonstrate the busyness entailed in these programs. Dr. Howard and Dr. Ellison described their responsibility to students as the following:

> So, we like to keep them busy. I mean we get up pretty early. We usually have breakfast with our host families. We like to stay with host families and be more immersed and then we're either out at our community site doing health promotion projects or we do schedule in a lot of kind of cultural immersion things too. (Dr. Howard)

> We are very busy when we're there. Like every moment of the day is kind of spent supporting the students on the ground because, you know, a lot of them are placed in the same schools so we wanted to make sure we're checking in with them during the day to see how that's going. But then that afternoon we've got our events that we're doing together or meetings together and then you go back with your family and they feed you and you spend time with your family in the evening. It's exhausting because they eat late, they go to bed late. It's a whole different cultural experience. (Dr. Ellison)

For Dr. Howard and Dr. Ellison, being responsible to students meant keeping them busy through different planned events. It was important to all faculty that students maximized their time abroad by participating in these events. Dr. Williams, on the other hand, described her experience as the following:

> We have to think about ways that we can get them to engage. Maybe I will move next to them or move around so it kind of helps. So, those are the things because we want to also impress. Not to make something up but to make sure that students show their max capacity of who they are. It's a good way to train them too because sometimes when you land into a situation you sometimes lose your interest, but the show must go on. What do you do? (Dr. Williams)

For her, being responsible to students involved actively observing the room during group presentations and intervening should students start to show disinterest. Though fatigue played a role in the long days, Dr. Williams used this opportunity as a teaching moment and ensured her students were respectful to the presenters. Other faculty engaged students through group conversations and asking them certain question to gauge their experience.

Responsibility to Home Institution. Faculty viewed themselves and their students as representatives of their home institution who needed to reflect its values. All faculty discussed often having various conversations with their students regarding their expectations and roles. This responsibility, of course, did not come without its own challenges. Dr. Graham, Dr. Ellison, and Dr. Howard described how they demonstrated this responsibility as the following:

> I think you set expectations of the students in terms of behavior, paying attention to details, appropriate dress—all of those kinds of things. Because the education abroad in which we engage involves going to universities and we are speaking with senior

> administrators in those universities and colleges. So, understanding that they're going as professionals and engaging with other professionals is a very important aspect. They also need to understand that expected quality of behavior in their off hours is expected of them. Certainly, we want students to enjoy their time there and all of the students that we take with us are mature adults since we don't deal with undergraduates who are under 21 but still expect them to act responsibly outside of the regular work hours that we're there in the country. (Dr. Graham)
>
> It basically comes down to, do not embarrass me. I do not want to get a call at three in the morning from the local police station. We're kind of fortunate in that we bring mainly people who want to be teachers. (Dr. Ellison)
>
> I think it also requires the faculty to model those types of behaviors. Letting the students know ahead of time what the expectations are. (Dr. Howard)

While education abroad meant faculty and students were not physically present at their home institution, they still had to behave as its representatives. These three faculty, along with others, shared how they instilled expectations in advance to the group, so everyone did not lose sight of their roles while abroad. Similar to the behavioral management, all faculty noted these expectations were the guiding principles that kept them accountable to one another.

Responsibility to Host Community. Faculty often discussed wanting to ensure their presence in the country did not take advantage of the local community. That is, they were always trying to be respectful realizing their program had an impact on the local community. All faculty attempted to mitigate negative social and behavioral impacts created by the program. Dr. Howard discussed her responsibility to the host community as the following:

> So, of course we want to be good guests when we go into another community. A lot of times I'll tell students, ‘if you're looking for a party spring break, please sign up for a cruise or a trip to Cancun. This is a working spring break with academic goals. That it is a class, it's not a trip. It's a program.’ A lot of the class happens to take place in an international setting. We're working while we're there. So, a lot of times is spent managing expectations of the students. I feel dually obligated to meet the needs of the students, their learning needs, but while also being a good community partner in meeting the needs of communities. I think that it requires a lot of communication between all of them. (Dr. Howard)

The local community was an integral part of Dr. Howard’s education abroad program. This was a location that she had taken students on multiple occasions and as such, honoring the local by the group’s presence was a shared understanding among all faculty members.

Furthermore, other faculty discussed how the responsibility of honoring the host community sustained their partnership and long-term relations. Dr. Ellison and Dr. Williams described their experiences as the following:

> We have good partners there which I think it takes years to develop those kinds of relationships and they are so good to us and flexible that I don't know if I ever want to do it anywhere else unless it just stopped working out there. The students have such a good experience and they're so helpful for us when issues come up and mishaps happen that the partners on the ground there are great. (Dr. Ellison)

> The only thing that I keep thinking after we do one and will continue is that, what can we do to make sure that we can sustain the relationship between our university and our partner in country because we don't want them to see us as a visitor who just come, go,

> play, and leave. What can we do to make sure that we sustain the partnership? I think that is also a key that will not only benefit students or the department, but also university in general. (Dr. Williams)

Because the education abroad experience for these faculty, particularly in these communities had a positive impact on them and their students, they wanted to continue the tradition. All faculty expressed having a positive experience with their peers from the host community. Some even described their relationships with their peers as having another family member who lives in another part of the world.

Counter Findings: Shared Responsibility

While all faculty discussed having varied responsibilities while abroad, it was evident among some who viewed this responsibility differently. They did not want to carry this load independently. This was an internal conviction they held in that though they saw themselves serving on the front line, they believed all institutional stakeholders on campus shared this responsibility. This was interesting to hear given the fact that they also spoke on the support the received from their home institution and other colleague. While they may have made light of their personal challenges abroad, the nonverbal emotions may have surface as they reflected on their time abroad.

Summary

Overall, faculty expressed they were responsibility to their students, home institution, and host community while abroad with some noting it was a responsibility that need to be shared among all stakeholders. The following section discusses the interactions faculty had with students while abroad. Faculty described these interactions as being deeper than those in their traditional classroom settings.

Theme Four: Deeper Faculty-Student Interaction

The education abroad program allowed faculty to interact with students on a much deeper and more meaningful way than in the traditional classroom settings. Faculty described having special conversations and moments with their students which provided the space for individual bonding to occur and to create healthy group dynamics. Faculty also expressed the joy they received observing students transform as a result of experiencing another culture and how their overall interactions influenced them.

Richness from Being Together. The deeper level of interaction between faculty and students was a result of the amount of time they spent with one another and the experiences they shared within the group. This unique bonding experience left a lasting impression on all faculty members. Dr. Flynn, Dr. Ellison, and Dr. Graham shared how the bond they had with students primarily through living, working, and attending social events together impacted them. Dr. Flynn described her experience interacting with students as the following:

> Well, the first piece that comes to mind is simply living with students. You know, we have a beautiful little bed and breakfast that's very humble and there were just enough rooms for a group of 12 and so, just getting up and sharing the sink and brushing your teeth besides students. I mean just living beside is a whole element and then food becomes a great issue. People tend to have a pretty predictable experience of missing their own food, about halfway through, just when the romantic notion is passing, you know, something's not. And then the day to day immersion, I think one of the reasons that education abroad takes so much is that it is 24/7 that you're constantly on and you're facilitating their living as well as their learning. But if they don't have the living in a comfortable way, then they really can't learn. (Dr. Flynn)

The interaction Dr. Flynn shared with students through the time spent together allowed her to learn more about her students. Being constantly in close proximity to one another not only allowed her to really get to know her students but learn about their likes and dislikes. Similarly, Dr. Ellison expressed her experience as the following:

> On a larger scale, in terms of working with students, it reminds me of why I wanted to go through graduate school and be a professor. It's kind of that romanticized notion of getting to know your students and having these relationships. They, as in terms of that group, are the ones that I know the best when they graduate. So, a lot of folks are in your class once or twice and I don't see them again. But that group you get to really know. So, it reminds me of why I wanted to do this to begin with. (Dr. Ellison)

For her, the time she spent with her students abroad not only allow her to get to know students but reminded her of why she joined her profession. It was interesting to hear about the long-lasting bond she developed with her students even after they had graduated. Furthermore, Dr. Graham described his experience as the following:

> Because these are mostly master's and doctoral students, we engage with them in professional ways, but we also can more comfortably associate with students in a social kind of way because we feel our students are junior colleagues and, thus, we treat them that way. So, going places together as groups with group meals, doing touristy things with them, are things that we can as faculty members engage in outside of the regular educational activities that we're doing and interacting with students as we travel is important. So, being able to interact with them socially is a little bit different than with younger students. (Dr. Graham)

For Dr. Graham, students were considered junior colleagues who went on the program. As such, he discussed being able to freely engage in social activities with them. The trust he placed on students strengthened their interaction and allowed them to enjoy more than one social events together while abroad. This sentiment was shared among most other faculty as they described their time spent together as being an inherent part of their education abroad experience.

Conversations of Vulnerability. Due to the close relationship faculty developed with their students while abroad, there was also room for a wide variety of personal conversations that took place. Dr. Flynn and Dr. Ellison explained how they sometimes had to have difficulty conversations with some students but all the while still enjoying each other's company. They described their experiences as the following:

> I used to thrive into that [conversation]. Just listening to students on the bus and joking with them. And then those really personal moments where you have to say, you can't wear that here. That's not appropriate. (Dr. Flynn)
>
> We have to talk to the girls in particular that Italian men and culture and how not to get engaged in those things. So, for me, those are kind of the low moments but it's also just the learning experience in general. So, having really kind of heartfelt conversations with our women of color that have gone with and talking through their concerns and then being there and having to go well is always, for me, a really powerful thing. (Dr. Ellison)

The difficult conversations, for these faculty, often centered around students dressing modestly and recognizing their surroundings. It was important for faculty students understood the different realities of another country. All faculty discussed always making themselves available to students, which made them feel comfortable discussing any of their concerns.

Observing Student Development. Furthermore, a common sentiment faculty also expressed in their interactions with students was the joy they received observing students step out of their comfort zone to experience a new environment, and as a result transform into an entirely different individual by the end of the trip. This joy was the reasons why they not only developed the program but continued to lead these programs year after year. Dr. Howard, for example, shared her interaction with her students and how this experience generated interests in other international experiences. She expressed her experience as the following:

> For me personally, I do get a lot of personal satisfaction out of the relationships that I've formed with these students. It's different when you have this intense program of study together in a different place. You get to know students a lot better and sometimes on a more personal level, which can just be something that you always don't get an opportunity to know him as well in a class that meets a few times a week. So, I've enjoyed that. And then I think I get a lot of personal satisfaction from watching them grow. I think pretty universally, students grow personally and in their cultural awareness and maybe even in their cultural enthusiasm. After they kind of do one trip, it seems like they want to do more and more and more. (Dr. Howard)

For Dr. Howard, the interaction she had with her students also brought personal satisfaction and joy. The experience of the short-term education abroad program had long-term impact.

Counter Findings: Family Members

While all faculty discussed having some level of interaction with students, some faculty had unique experiences. As such, it is essential to explore it further. Dr. Ellison, for example, shared how the connections she made with students' family members played a unique role for

her as the faculty leader. These relationships with family members strengthened her relationship with students. She described her experience as the following:

> When we meet, we meet with their parents, family, husbands, whoever the weekends right before we go. And that's always interesting to me too because the parents are nervous and we have to reassure them like, I'm going to take care of your baby while they're there. I understand because we are parents ourselves. It's a different role than you ever have as a faculty member because I don't interact with families, except at graduation and tell them how great their kid is. So that's also something I really do enjoy is getting to know students at a deeper level because I don't get to do that any other time. So, we get to know each other really well over that time. (Dr. Ellison)

Considering some of the students who participated in the program were first generation, this experience was much more meaningful for her, student, and family members. Another faculty member discussed students' family members along with her own family and how her husband and kid were influenced by her time abroad. She described her experience as the following:

> I can't tell you how many parents will email me and say, 'Oh my gosh', my kid has changed. They used to be shy or they used to not think of others and as much and now they're doing this and this. That's really great to see. I've been married this entire time, so I used to go live in Italy for a month every year without my husband and now I have a kid and it was fine. He played a lot of golf when I was gone. Right now, I feel like it's different. I come back and especially because I have a kid, I FaceTime, and I've kept in touch with my husband and all that kind of stuff. And so, I think it's a little different, but there's still that feeling of like, this isn't the same (Dr. Carson)

Reflecting on her experience abroad, it was evident students' family members were appreciative of the impact the program had on the student. Dr. Carson's family went through different experiences from her various times abroad. She discussed how technology has helped to keep them connected to one another. Because this was a short-term education abroad program, she felt lest distant from her family.

Summary

Overall, the deeper interaction faculty developed with students not only offered them a holistic view of their students but allowed them to exchange special moments with them which then influenced their experience. While these interactive experiences were rich and beneficial to all faculty, they also noted feeling some levels of disconnection with their campus community upon their return. The following section discuss these disconnections further.

Findings: Post Education Abroad

Reflecting on their experiences post the education abroad program, faculty discussed experiencing various sentiments. Though this experience greatly impacted them, they had to navigate through different processes upon their return. Two common themes emerged from their experiences after the education abroad program: Disconnection with the campus community and advices to colleagues and administrators.

Theme Five: Disconnection with Campus Community

Education abroad maybe a well-known concept to many stakeholders on campus; however, faculty indicated experiencing some levels of misunderstanding and underestimation among their colleagues and administrators regarding what it took to lead the education abroad program. In addition, the expressed persevering despite having mixed feelings regarding the institutional support.

Misunderstanding and underestimation. Faculty described misunderstanding and underestimation as other faculty not fully grasping what the experience entailed yet having firm assertions of what it should have looked like. Faculty felt these assertions from colleagues robbed them of their own experience. It was as if they lacked the expertise of their program. Faculty often characterized the education abroad experience as a vacation filled with excitement rather than work. Though these sentiments were shared among all faculty in one way or another, Dr. Howard, for example, poignantly expressed her experience as the following:

> We try to share some of those experiences sometimes by having forums and we'll share some of the projects and things that we did but I think one thing that we do find is it's hard to share those experiences that we've lived and the people back at home don't quite get what we've done. So, a couple of examples of that I think, there are a lot of faculty on campus that have never participated in an education abroad that don't understand the value of it. So, in their mind how could you get a full credit worth of class when you're only gone for this amount of time and how does that equal three credits? Sometimes they just don't understand the math because they don't realize we were actually having class before we went, then we went, and then we came back and had a reflection and things like that. So sometimes it's hard to communicate to faculty how much students are doing and gaining from this. When we try to share our experiences, people weren't there so they don't seem to quite understand the whole context of it. (Dr. Howard)

Additionally, Dr. Howard also underscored the pressure coupled with the reward involved in leading such a program. She described how faculty often underestimated the amount of energy involved in leading an education abroad program. She conveyed this aspect as the following:

> I think faculty underestimate how much time and energy it takes to run an education abroad program. Sometimes I think they might think they're signing up for it because it's gonna be a trip or fun outing. I could tell you for sure that if I'm going to take a vacation, it's not going to be with 25 people that I don't know and that I'm in charge of. So certainly not going to be that. Those that are planning it might underestimate just how busy it really is and how much pressure it is to keep them going but it's kind of one of those high tradeoffs, high reward. So high stakes, high reward. (Dr. Howard)

For her, the disconnection happened when trying to share her experience in a forum with faculty, some of whom had never went on an education abroad. Failing to fully grasp how a short-term program was designed was an additional challenge she found as she navigated approaches to communicate her experience to others. Other faculty had similar reactions. Dr. Carson, for example, described her experience dealing with faculty peers as the following:

> One, it's not a professional term or an academic term, but it is a crap ton of work and there are days where I'm definitely like, I cannot believe I've spent an entire day working on education abroad and this doesn't account for anything. From like a tenure perspective, working with the students, seeing their excitement, I feel like that's more of a difference I'm making in people's lives (Dr. Carson)

She described how faculty who had not been on a program abroad underestimated the amount of time required to lead such a program. She also discussed how the time commitment and responsibility of leading an education abroad program was seen by her peers as a distraction rather than something that enhanced their experience. This was a shared concerned among all faculty.

Faculty also had varied reactions regarding the level of institutional support they received. Some indicated that leading an education abroad program had positive outcomes on their career trajectory as well as recognition on campus while others noted it was challenging.

Institutional Support. Institutional support had a significant role in faculty who wanted to continue their program. Some faculty expressed how opportunities were made available to them that would not have been possible had they not participated in this type of work. Dr. Flynn, for example, described her experience with institutional support as the following:

> There's a reality, like you do get street credit and you do get a certain level social capital for kind of being that endurance leader. I mean, if you're an education abroad leader, I do think you have social capitol in the university. The president for example, would know that and there are so few of us and you do kind of get known and there's a reward. It doesn't come into monetary or in time, of course you don't even really get to trade your teaching time but there's a certain social political capital I think that comes from it. One shouldn't be driven by that, but I was surprised at how quickly I became associated. Like people who don't know me at all would know the program. (Dr. Flynn)

For Dr. Flynn, the institutional support she received led to different associations on campus as a result of her work. Being recognized as a leader in this field was a positive experience for her. Other faculty noted serving on committees or attending certain events on campus that they would have never took part in had it not been for this experience. While some faculty had positive experiences regarding the support the received, others did not.

Lack of Institutional Support. Some faculty indicated experiencing a lack of support from their colleagues and administrators. The variety of responses from the faculty ranged from

being unrecognized to being scrutinized. Dr. Carson, for example, shared her sentiments as the following:

> Quite frankly, we don't spend a lot of time at the university celebrating our successes. It's more focused on what do we need to do if it's not going well. As far as research is concerned, you're constantly focused on doing your research and publishing, getting a book in, all that kind of stuff. That's super stressful and you don't really, at least I haven't yet, see immediate rewards from that besides getting tenure. That was great but at the same time, like professionally, you publish something and then it's just there. That's it. It's like, 'Oh, good job!' Maybe a handful of people in my field are gonna read this if they need to cite it. (Dr. Carson)

Dr. Carson conveyed her displeasure with the lack of support from an academic point of view. She noted faculty devote considerable amount of time on their work but are not adequately celebrated. Another faculty, Dr. Howard, described the scrutiny she experienced as the following:

> I would say faculty peers. You're scrutinized, not necessarily at this institution, but I've been to conferences and talked about education abroad programs where other people were sharing their education abroad and the faculty attending were a little more aggressive in questioning their practices. Maybe it's a little more high stakes. I mean you got to keep students safe. You've got to be a good representative of the U.S. You've got to be sensitive when you're in there. So maybe that's something I've noticed even when I'm just sitting as an observer that there's a little more scrutiny and the way people ask their questions about the way you conduct your class. (Dr. Howard)

The scrutiny she experienced came from other faculty who questioned her instructional approaches while abroad. The many interrogative questions further speak to the disconnect among faculty peers in terms of what leading an education abroad program entailed. Dr. Flynn described her experience as the following.

> When I went up for tenure, my chair at the time said, you know, a lot of your portfolio is based on your international work and your education abroad. And she said, that's great, but you have to write about what you do in the classrooms. Here I was overexpressing that I found so much identity in education abroad. I think the nature of what I do, because so much of it is humanitarian based, you kind of get that label of like the good-hearted professor who goes out. (Dr. Flynn)

For Dr. Flynn, she experienced a disconnect between her and her chair when it came time for her to go up for tenure. Though she identified with her work and had work extremely hard to attain the level of success she had gained, it still was not enough in the eyes of her chair. The lack of acknowledgment in the variety of international work she produced is indicative of the disconnect between faculty and their peers and administrators. Overall, faculty had mixed feelings regarding the support they received from the institution.

Faculty Perseverance. Despite of the level of support, or lack thereof, received from colleagues and administrators, faculty often persevered. That is, because they self-identified with this type of work, they were tenacious to see it through fruition. In other words, education abroad was part of faculty's lives. While most faculty discussed persevering despite obstacles, one faculty spoke about the reason why she persevered. Dr. Williams described her experience as the following:

> For me in particular I believe in this, right, but then for this particular program. First of all, I see the need and second because I know that, coming from another country I know that to help build a program, perhaps I can use myself to benefit the program. (Dr. Williams)

For Dr. Williams, along with all other faculty, they saw the need for such a program and wholeheartedly believed in it. Because of the impact of such a program, faculty knew they had to whatever it took to ensure the success of the program.

Counter Findings: Gender Differences

Contrary to most faculty who expressed disconnection in terms of institutional support or lack thereof and their perseverance they demonstrated despite experiencing challenges; one faculty member had a unique experience. She discussed the gender differences between female and male faculty who led education abroad program. Dr. Flynn described her experience as the following:

> It's very gendered. You know, like the good woman professor who goes to the women's clinics and helps with poverty, you know, there's some stuff there. Versus like the archeologist [male faculty] who goes to Greece. I mean, faculty do kind of get archetype placed in the kind of study abroad they do. (Dr. Flynn)

The gender preference placed on male faculty who have led these program was more favorable compared to female. Dr. Flynn discussed how this was a topic not often discussed among faculty. It was important for Dr. Flynn to raise awareness on this gender inequality through sharing her experience. She felt that though her work was recognized, it was not recognized to the same degree as her male counterpart. It was as if she had to do more than her male colleagues just to be appropriately recognized.

Summary

Overall, faculty viewed these mixed reactions of support from colleagues and administrators as suggestive of the disconnection between their education abroad experience and the campus community. Despite challenges, faculty often preserved. Faculty also saw themselves as ambassadors of these program promoting the institution's global mission through their work and having an impact on students.

Theme Six: Advice to Colleagues and Administrators

Faculty reflected on their experiences abroad and provided advices to their colleagues and administrators who were either interested in leading education abroad program for the first or have led it in the past but not in recent years. Four common aspects were highlighted from their responses which included: Partnership, preparation, engaging new experiences, and making the program affordable to all students.

Partnerships. All faculty were adamant about identifying other faculty who would partner to co-lead the program. They stressed the importance of collaboration as a key component to education abroad program. They noted this aspect to ensure their colleagues were aware this type of work required a tremendous amount of energy and should not be taken lightly. Dr. Ellison, for example, described her partnership approach as the following:

> Find a faculty member to work with because I don't know how you could do it by yourself. Like I'm super grateful for my colleague, so I handle a lot of the readings and the class stuff. She handles the logistics because that's not my thing. Right? You tell me where to go and I'll show up on time, but I need you to make the schedule. I will think outside the box and try to pull the readings and think about the types of projects and

> things that they can do but not, I need you to make sure we're all at the airport at the right time. (Dr. Ellison)

For Dr. Ellison, it was important to have another faculty who she could share the load of leading the program. She discussed how her colleague would draw on each other's strengths to in planning the program. Similar to Dr. Ellison, Dr. Carson provided the following advice:

> Find someone to work with. Do not do it by yourself. I feel like if you do this by yourself, you're going to hit a wall and you're going to fatigue very quickly. Find good partnerships. (Dr. Carson)

For Dr. Carson, partnering meant finding good individuals to work with so that one did not burn themselves out.

Faculty also noted partnering with the education abroad office or other stakeholders within the institution ensured a successful implementation of the program. This advice was shared by all faculty who acknowledge the enormity of this endeavor. Dr. Howard provided the following advice:

> I think those that are thinking of [leading] an education abroad should definitely want to consult with the education abroad office. There's a lot of resources there that will help you to keep students safe, understand policies and procedures within the university. They will also help you advertise. There's even a financial incentive sometimes for going through there because they might be connected to student scholarships. So definitely connecting with study abroad. Also definitely thinking about if you're gonna do service learning, having a community partner, so that you're working directly with that community partner. I also think another best practice is to think about returning to the same place and having a sustainable program. Certainly, if you're doing the programs like

> we do where we're working with the community and doing community projects, we need to know them well and earn their trust to do that. (Dr. Howard)

Dr. Howard stressed partnering with the education abroad office mainly for the resource they can provide. Being in a position to assist with marketing, financial insensitive, and liability concerns, the education abroad office added another layer of support to faculty.

Preparation. All faculty stressed the importance of preparing in advance but at the same time being flexible to adjust one's stated plan should something else arise. This was stated to minimized unforeseen circumstances. Dr. Williams, for example, provided the following advice:

> Make sure that you know the resource, you know the country, and some of the key partners. I think that is kind of a key to make the program a success because it helps a lot with student experience. If the faculty feel comfortable, student know it and then they'll feel comfortable as well. Structure and planned objective are important, but when you get there, flexibility is also important. That's why the knowledge about in-country, knowledge about where you go and all that is important. Sometimes you might have to switch gear, change your mind and make a decision. What if you planned to go to the beach and then all of a sudden, it's raining? So, what will you do? I think that's why familiarity and do a lot of research before you select and do anything. (Dr. Williams)

For Dr. Williams, and other faculty, it was important for leaders to familiarized themselves prior to leading the program. This entailed having alternate plans and options while in country. While she spoke directly on this point, other faculty provided similar advice on preparing well in advance.

Engage in New Experiences. Faculty discussed it was important to step out of one's comfort zone to expose students to a world of endless possibilities. Faculty felt this step would

broaden their colleagues' global perspective and enhanced their teaching approach. Dr. Flynn, for example, shared the following advice:

> If you want to test the real meaning of your teaching, take students into the field. Trust that you will be ignited by what comes back and you'll be challenged far beyond any other assessment and that you can find such deep purpose. (Dr. Flynn)

Another faculty, Dr. Graham, described stepping out of ones' comfort zone as the following:

> Take the Nike platitude. Just do it! I think that an important thing is that if it's appropriate within the curriculum of a course or a program to engage in international activity and to take students to experience what goes on in other countries is so positive that I would encourage any faculty member who has even the vaguest interest in that to explore it and to do it if they can. It's that impactful upon students, no matter what you're studying. (Dr. Graham)

For both Dr. Flynn and Dr. Graham, as well as other, engaging in new experiences was associated with positive outcomes. They discussed how the program abroad had a lasting impact on them they encouraged those who desired to lead students abroad to simply to do it.

Making This Experience Affordable to All Students. Often, administrators seek ways to sustain these initiatives but fail to do so due to other competing demands. All faculty discussed how this was possible by making the education abroad experience available to a wider audience. Dr. Ellison, for example, provided the following advice:

> If we could figure out how to give voice to those things, maybe there would be more institutional supports for education abroad programs. If you want students to look a certain way, well they can look that way if you have these really powerful experiences. If

> we can figure out ways to help support education abroad programs more holistically for all students, not just the ones that can afford it. (Dr. Ellison)

Providing the resources for all students to have this experience was vital not only for Dr. Ellison but all other faculty. Considering students came from different socioeconomic backgrounds, institutional leaders who capitalized on the opportunity by make education abroad affordable to more students could have a significant impact on the lives of their students.

Counter Findings: Integrate Research

Contrary to most faculty who only shared advices on preparation, partnering with others, engaging in new experiences, and affordability, it was interesting to hear one faculty who shared a unique yet practical advice. Dr. Flynn noted it was crucial for faculty who take students abroad to integrate their research into the abroad program. She noted the following:

> I would say to faculty, make sure you're doing research as you're in sights. So, I always use my students time to draw data as well and then I published some on that. So, you know, for a faculty who have to get tenure, if they're going there and not publishing, you know, it does take up a lot of time. I do think one should try to integrate research, and that's the model of community-based learning and service learning. (Dr. Flynn)

For Dr. Flynn, education abroad experience and research went hand-in-hand. Faculty who recognized this opportunity could maximize their time abroad and ultimately reach their promotional goals. While her experience was unique to faculty participants in this study, it is a common occurrence in the field.

Summary

Overall, faculty not only common shared advice based on their reflection abroad but to highlight the importance of this type of work and how this experience was needed in every academic discipline.

Summary

This chapter provided detailed summaries of the six participants to allow the reader to become better familiar with the experiences of faculty leading an education abroad program. In addition, this chapter revealed the thematic findings that were developed as a result of the data collection and analysis process as outlined in Chapter Three. The responses from the participants' three semi-structured interviews and reflective journal entries yielded the following six themes: 1) Faculty Motivation, 2) Intentionality in Program Design, 3) Responsibility to Students, Home Institution, and Host Community, 4) Deeper Faculty-Student Interaction, 5) Disconnection with Campus Community, and 6) Advice to Colleagues and Administrators. Each of the themes were supported by excerpts from the participants' data material. The following chapter, Chapter Five, provides a discussion of the findings as it relates to the research questions, the theoretical framework, and the scholarship connected to the topic. In response to this study's findings, recommendations for policy and practice, and suggestions for future research are also provided.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS

The research described in this dissertation was intended to fill the gap in the existing literature on university faculty experiences with education abroad programs. I used a descriptive phenomenological approach to gain an in-depth understanding of the lived experiences of six faculty members who had experience leading an education abroad program. These experiences are described in Chapter 4. Below, I reflect on the findings, surmise connections to the extant literature, and consider implications for future research, practice, and policy.

Summary of Findings

The purpose of this phenomenological study was to understand the lived experiences of faculty from a public research institution who have led a short-term education abroad program in the social sciences. Through a descriptive phenomenological approach, I described the essence of a phenomenon from the perspectives of faculty who experienced it. Findings were consistent across all stages of data collection and analysis. Six themes and 20 subthemes emerged from faculty participant's experience pre, during, and post education abroad.

The first theme related to faculty member's motivation for leading education abroad; subthemes included both an opportunity to give back and personal gratification. The second theme was intentionality in program design, including the following subthemes: (a) developing structured curriculum with program objectives, (b) integrating local community and culture, (c) program cost, and (d) identifying partners and available resources for the program. The third theme involved responsibility to students, home institution, and host community. Related subthemes included students' safety and wellbeing, emergency troubleshooting, behavior management, student engagement, representing the home institution well, and honoring the host

community. The fourth theme cohered around deeper faculty-student interaction; subthemes included time spent together, family connections, difficult conversations, and student development. The fifth theme related to a sense of disconnection with the campus community. Relevant subthemes consisted of misunderstandings and underestimations, mixed sentiments on institutional support, and perseverance. Lastly, themes emerging from advice to colleague and administrators included partnership, preparation, engaging in new experiences, and making these experiences affordable to a wider audience.

Discussion of Findings

In the previous chapter I explained the six themes that emerged from the data analysis process. Excerpts from the participants' semi-structured interviews were provided to demonstrate the themes' relevance and consistency throughout the data collection and analysis. Here, I discuss each theme further, expounding on each theme's meaning as it relates to faculty's lived experiences and as it aligns with the extant literature. In addition, the connection to the implications for future research, practice, and policy are also discussed.

Theme One: Faculty Motivation

Faculty were motivated to lead education abroad program because it presented an opportunity to give back and was personally gratifying. These findings support existing literature surrounding the motivation for leading education abroad program (Goodwin & Nacht, 1991; Lewin, 2009; Loebick, 2017; Nyangau, 2018; Raczkosk & Robinson, 2019; Strang, 2006). That is, there is an interplay between faculty's self-identification, motivations for engaging in international work, and program outcome. For example, Nyangau (2018) found faculty motivation derived from their desire to facilitate and enhance student learning and development, prepare global citizens, the enjoyment and personal fulfillment, and to build international

networks. Similarly, results of this study suggest faculty motivations are not mutually exclusive but rather connected, specifically to prior experience. Prior experiences are important to consider when examining influences that inform faculty decisions to engage in international work.

A similar comparison holds with Raczkosk and Robinson (2019) who found faculty were motivated mainly as a result of previous experiences, student inspiration, the benefit from pre-existing structures, building international human capital, and connecting and networking with other faculty. Likewise, faculty participants in the present study drew from their previous experience to provide students with an experience that would broaden their global understanding. There was also satisfaction among faculty in seeing their students overcome challenges and grow in a foreign context. Faculty noted these desires often stemmed from their own experiences abroad as students or other international experiences which were meaningful to them. These sentiments further speak to the intangible benefits (Alghamdi & Otte, 2016) of leading education abroad program. That is, faculty demonstrated that at the core of their individual selves, they were educators. When they experienced motivation to lead education abroad programs, they realized that it had a deep commitment to student learning. This was the case for all faculty as they experienced personal and professional benefits leading these programs. Given that in a phenomenological study the everyday examples of human life are studied to illuminate its essence (Dastur, 2017; Finlay, 2008; Giorgi, 2009; Husserl, 2014; Scharff, 2019), it was important as a researcher to stay close to what was given to me by faculty, in all its richness and complexity, and limit myself to only making assertions underpinned by relevant intuitive validations. This approach allowed me to understand faculty's motivations especially since their actions may have been influenced by what they perceive. This is especially true considering

human beings generally go about their daily living without critically reflecting on their experiences.

Theme Two: Intentionality in Program Design

An important part of the way faculty experienced education abroad was intentionality. Conceivably, faculty could experience planning as trivial, administrative tasks. That was not the case for participants in this study. Intentionality was meaningful for faculty participants because it gave them the space and time to carefully consider all the different aspects of their program, particularly as it relates the program objectives and curriculum, integration of local the community and culture, cost, and the partnership and availability of resources. Though these planning stages often took several months and sometimes even years, faculty noted they were worthwhile learning experiences. Consistent with their role as educators, faculty made the connection between intentionality and student learning. Faculty noted students were able to articulate what they learned at the different stages of the program. There were no observed distinctions between seasoned faculty and newer ones in the way they experienced student learning. This finding is congruent with existing research (Goode, 2008; Rasch, 2001; Stebleton, Soria, & Cherney, 2013) which highlighted the importance of carefully designing programs that incorporated learning objectives into the program, particularly through orientations, embedded pre and post reflections, faculty interaction with students, and in country interactions with locals. Furthermore, this finding supports Passarelli and Kolb (2012) who found education abroad programs should provide faculty with the opportunity to integrate experiential learning into their course's curriculum.

Theme Three: Responsibility to Students, Home Institution, and Host Community

Leading an education abroad program is a major responsibility. The roles faculty undertake extends far beyond the scope of their academic abilities. Faculty members in this study compared their experience to non-academic roles such as a parent, advisor, colleague, and friend. This finding corroborates Rasch (2001) who noted faculty embrace different roles abroad, such as being a parent, counselor, professor, administrator, caretaker, cultural guide, friend, and many others, all of which influence their experiences. Faculty who shoulder this great level of responsibility individually, without a co-leader, run the risk of being overwhelmed. It is important for policy makers, future faculty, and administrators to understand the demands of leading an education abroad program because faculty's commitment to international work significantly influences students' success. As representatives of the university, students rely heavily on faculty members' expertise and guidance while abroad. Without this understanding, they may perceive education abroad as a sort of vacation for faculty and fail to provide adequate support.

In addition, education abroad programs create safety liability concerns for higher education institutions. Watts (2015) noted there is a real possibility that serious safety liability concerns, particularly in transportation or group excursions, may occur during a short-term education abroad such that faculty must assume direct responsibility of being program leaders and representative of their home institution. Similarly, Alberts, Marzen, and Prum (2015) found students' safety was a concern shared not only among faculty and institutions, but state and federal agencies. Faculty in this study expressed student's safety was their primary concern pre, during, and post the education abroad program. Another concern was in terms of legal liability. Students may encounter situations such as being victims of harassment or make poor choices

causing them to be intoxicated while abroad (Hummer, Pedersen, Mirza, & Labrie, 2010). In these situations, faculty would need to follow student conduct and Title IX protocols on site while also responding to their other responsibilities. While faculty in this study did not specifically discuss any form of harassment as a concern, they did mention dealing with intoxicated students. The lack of clear policies, procedures, and resources to effectively deal with issues immediately as they arise in another part of the world is concerning and needs to be addressed.

Theme Four: Deeper Faculty-Student Interaction

Education abroad program allowed faculty to have a more personal interaction with their students while abroad compared to traditional classroom settings. Faculty in this study conveyed having special moments with their students which allowed them to see students through a different lens. This experience is not only meaningful during the education abroad program but continues afterward. These interactions often translated to faculty's classrooms, particularly through collaboration in research projects or mentor-mentee relationships. As a phenomenon, education abroad seems to extend far beyond the immediate overseas experience. It seems to contribute to the professional and personal development of the educator. Furthermore, these enhanced interactions promoted student learning (Lewin, 2009, Savishinsky, 2012; Soria & Troisi, 2013). For example, students developed intercultural skills and behaviors as result of their experience that can then be applied in different disciplines.

Theme Five: Disconnection with Campus Community

Though education abroad maybe a well-known concept among many institutional stakeholders, faculty noted they experienced misunderstandings and underestimations among their colleagues and administrators. They also observed mixed feelings in relation to institutional

support. This finding is congruent with other research (Loebick, 2017; Watts, 2015) which highlighted faculty were disappointed by the lack of interest or disconnect from their peers upon their return. Findings from this study and previous research is indicative of the fact that there is not only a disconnect regarding faculty's responsibilities leading education abroad program but on their contribution to the university and the impact their work has on the current and prospective students. If administrators or other faculty went on education abroad programs with faculty leaders, they may have a different perspective. These assertions further speak to the need to foster a culture of global awareness on campus and strengthen internationalization efforts.

Theme Six: Advice to Colleagues and Administrators

Reflecting on their education abroad program, faculty wanted to share their experience so that colleagues and administrators understood its value on educators and students, as well as the demands and stresses they encountered. Partnering with colleagues or other offices, devoting considerable time to preparation in advance, stepping out of their comfort zone by engaging in new experiences, and making program affordable to all students were critical take away from faculty. These findings support Savishinsky (2012) who stressed it was important faculty developed collaborative efforts with others to advance institutions internationalization efforts. Additionally, considering faculty saw students through new lens as a result of their deeper interactions, the same might be said about their colleagues or administrators who decide to leave their comfort zones and engaged in a new experience like education abroad. Findings from this study reaffirmed that phenomenological approach to research gives voice to individuals, particularly those with shared experiences. Furthermore, leading an education abroad program gave faculty in this study new insights into global perspectives, from which they could speak to, that very few individuals ever have.

Implications for Future Research

In this study, I explored the lived experiences of faculty at a public doctoral research institution who have led a short-term education abroad program in the social sciences. To advance the scholarship in education abroad, particularly among faculty-led program, implications for further research are suggested. The following discuss these implications.

Group Process

Group process refers to the development and evolution of patterns of relationships between and among group participants (Forsyth, 2010; Tuckman, 1965; Yalom & Leszcz, 2005). These sequentially developments can be constructive or disruptive in an education abroad context (Scherrer, Olcoń, Butterfield, & Kebede, 2016). This suggests that future faculty who lead education abroad program might benefit from understanding how to manage such groups to ultimately maintain the positive morale of everyone in the program and to create an inclusive education abroad environment. The interactions between faculty and students as well as among students has an influence on the group as a whole. This is especially true in education abroad program at many institutions that consist of individuals from diverse backgrounds. Although all faculty in this study referenced the impact of different developments in a group, only one faculty provided a proactive approach to disband disruptive group process. For this faculty, building time in their itinerary for scheduled one-on-ones and group debriefs at the end of each day as a way to maintain the inclusion and cohesiveness of the group. With students from diverse backgrounds, the potential for challenging situations to arise is likely to occur, especially if students perceive or experience any form of discrimination.

Lowe, Byron, and Mennicke (2014) noted students' race within a group played a significant role in shaping their education abroad experience. Additionally, because there is no

clear data pointing to how the interaction of students from diverse background impacts a group's overall experience abroad, more empirical research could be done in this area (Paparella, 2018). Bodycott (2015), for example, explored intragroup conflicts and noted these conflicts are a result of differences in personality, identity, expectations and goals, and the stresses linked with acculturation. Paying attention to these aspects is critical to reduce possible conflicts.

As the demographic of students interested in and going on short-term education abroad program continues to change–that is, there is more underrepresented students from different ethnic and cultural backgrounds, faculty will need assistance applying effective communication strategies, as well as other approaches, to enhance group cohesiveness (Paparella, 2018). College student educators working in student affairs offices often have knowledge and experience dealing with group processes, student learning, and other vital areas. Policies and practices that connect this expertise with education abroad could be beneficial. One approach to bridging this gap is to explore the influence of cultural and ethnic differences has among education abroad participants prior to and after the program. Student affairs practioners who go with faculty on these program can be instrumental in observing these key patterns in addition to their other roles and responsibilities. While I found that faculty in this study focused more on discussing their students' experiences rather than their own– which raises the question of what did they fail to recognize in the mist of the program—I want to explore this research question further.

Intercultural Competence

Faculty in this study differed in their intercultural competence. That is, their abilities to develop targeted knowledge, skills, and attitudes that led to noticeable behaviors and communications that were effective in intercultural interactions (Deardorff, 2004). While some faculty exhibited a strong dedication to incorporate cultural immersion opportunities for students,

others did not. Though opportunities such as staying with host families may be an effective practice, some faculty elected not to incorporate it due to the location of the program and language barriers. Through this study, it was evident faculty members who led programs in disciplines such as sociology or global health tended to prioritize cultural immersion more so than other faculty. This finding is relevant for education abroad offices as it may assist them to determine the degree to which individual program's goals prioritize cultural immersion. Some faculty may be less familiar with the intercultural components of an education abroad program, and as a result, benefit from additional training and support from the education abroad office.

Goode (2008) measured the level of intercultural development for faculty in his study through the Intercultural Development Inventory. Future research can replicate his quantitative approach on a larger scale with faculty from several institutions. While my study did not statistically measure each individual faculty participant's intercultural competence, future research can examine it and the correlation between faculty's intercultural competence and the education abroad program's goals and objectives. Studies like Deardorff (2020, 2011) have addressed how to assess and develop intercultural competence among higher education professionals and its influence on students.

Offering professional development opportunities in the area of intercultural skills development, through workshops, seminars, and other trainings, by veteran professionals can further enhance faculty's cultural competence. Regarding policy, institutions can provide clear baseline standards to faculty as to what education abroad programs should entail.

Colleagues and Administrators Perspective

Faculty in this study discussed experiencing disconnect between themselves and their colleagues and administrators upon their return. This was demonstrated through

misunderstandings and underestimations as they attempted to share their abroad experience. Research can examine the perspectives of other faculty colleagues and administrators in key offices who drive internationalization efforts to gauge their awareness of what motivates faculty to lead programs abroad. This remains a significant area for further study since there may be a disconnect between a university's ambitious internationalization mission with the actualities of faculty who lead short-term education abroad program. Studies, such as Kreber (2009) which focused on different perspectives on internationalization efforts, may provide a good foundation for future research, practice, and policy.

Personal and Professional Identity

The concept of a faculty member's research reflecting their personal life suggests there is a connection with their identity. It was evident faculty's experiences abroad were linked to their personal and professional identities. Faculty in this study exerted great efforts to plan and execute their education abroad program demonstrating their passion to engage with students in a foreign educational context. Faculty were motivated to promote student learning. There were improved relationships with students, and there were intrinsic rewards associated with student learning. Combined, these draw implications for the way faculty see themselves and the way they experience their careers as educators. Neumann (2009) found faculty research is not only limited to the good of public consumption but rather has deep implications on them throughout their lives. Similarly, Thirolf (2013) found at the core of faculty's identities is their love for teaching and interacting with students. More empirical research on faculty, drawing on previous studies, should focus on how this connection may be recreated over time based on their experiences leading education abroad program. One practical implication may involve asking

faculty to provide feedback in more personal ways, like digital storytelling, that will then be shared with other faculty and administrators.

Longitudinal or Replication Study

Faculty involved in this study had experience leading one or more short-term education abroad program lasting two to three weeks in length. Their reflection of the experience leading education abroad program may be expressed differently after one year or in five-years' time. For example, a faculty may build productive relationships with students for a year or so after the program abroad but five years later, would that they still see students in this new light, or would they revert back to a more distanced relationship with them? Is it important for faculty to lead education abroad experiences as a means of maintaining the way they perceive and interact with students? In terms of long-term relationships, would alumni who have participated in education abroad contribute more to the university fundraising efforts? Do faculty who have been supported in an education abroad program tend to stay at the university? Lastly, as university's compete for faculty, is support for education abroad a mechanism for recruiting or a to help retain faculty? Longitudinal research, similar to Behnke, Seo, and Miller (2014) who examined education abroad over the span of nine years, would allow for a greater understanding of causal relationships, elevate the most important variables, and minimize an overgeneralizing of findings.

Furthermore, given this study was conducted at a public research institution, the support structure, design process, and incentives at other institutional types may differ, thereby impacting the experience of faculty leading education abroad program. To gain a broader perspective on the faculty experience, it is important to replicate this study at other institutional types.

Experiential Learning

Faculty who design short-term education abroad program that encompass intentional interactions between students and locals from the host country, allow students the time to reflect on what they experienced, and then apply what they learned to a real-world context, are implementing experiential learning practices (Passarelli and Kolb, 2012). Experiential learning is a cyclical process where new experiences develop from prior ones, portrayed by four stages: concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation (Kolb, 1984; Passarelli & Kolb, 2012; Roberts, Conner, & Jones, 2013). While some of the faculty in this study demonstrated a solid understanding of experiential learning principles, others appeared to be less familiar. Faculty can begin to incorporate more class time for students to reflect while reducing content-based instruction. In addition, they can incorporate onboarding process, such as training, to better prepare students for the intercultural experience awaiting them abroad, and re-entry events afterwards will help them to debrief and process their experiences (Paparella, 2018). Furthermore, faculty who do not adjust their courses that has abroad components risk sacrificing experiential learning opportunities (Paparella, 2018). Studies like Lutterman-Aguilar and Gingerich (2015), Passarelli and Kolb (2012), and Roberts, Conner, and Jones, 2013) may serve as a useful guide for future research, practice, and policy.

Health and Wellness

Student mental health has continued to raise concerns across colleges and universities in the United States. In response, institutions implemented wellness programs to promote a healthier way of life among students (Barr, 2013). This is especially true in a foreign context, where once the novelty wears off, living abroad can be stressful, and students experience anxiety and depression. Faculty in this study expressed being concerned about their students' wellbeing.

A report by the American College Health Association (2019) revealed over 46% of college students reported feeling so depressed within the last 12 months that it was difficult for them to function. According to report by the Association for International Educators-NAFSA (2016), the numbers of students on college campuses dealing with serious mental health concerns such as depression, bipolar disorder, and anxiety disorders continues to increase. Future studies can draw on findings from previous research and others, like Bathke & Kim (2016) which examined the link between students' education abroad and mental health, to better train educators. It is imperative that institutional leaders put a policy in place requiring faculty to undergo a health and wellness training to learn more and be better equipped to recognize common warning signs related to mental health among students. In addition, education abroad offices could also partner with faculty and campus wellness staff to take advantage of regular campus programming in this area.

Implications for Practice and Policy

The following discuss the implications to practice and policy to advance the scholarship in education abroad.

Reward System

Faculty in this study emphasized that the commitment to lead a program abroad year-after-year is great and should be rewarded, considering the planning and execution process. Institutions should implement policies that grant leave time for faculty based on a pre-determined length of service. These efforts by the university would need to be factored into the university's budget and departmental course load requirements. Granting leave time to faculty could further the institution's internationalization efforts, generate interest amount other faculty,

and decrease faculty overall burnout. The physical demands and emotional fatigue from education abroad can lead to faculty burnout and stress (Barr, 2013).

Another incentive institutions can provide is to adjust their tenure and promotion process. Faculty will be more invested in education abroad if the institution added service activities or off-campus educational programs to their research requirements (Paparella, 2018). Given the pressures they face, specifically tenured-track, proper planning, and the strategic choice of an education abroad program will benefit both faculty and students (Moseley, 2009; Nyangau, 2018). This is in large part because faculty's research portfolio can be enhanced, they may be able to involve students in their research projects, and they might also develop connections with other faculty internationally. According to a report by the American Council on Education (2015) on internalizing the tenure code, the number of the criteria typically set forth in tenure codes are open to interpretation, causing confusion among faculty. For example, what is considered a prominent publication? What is an influential discipline associations worthy of faculty service? Unless clearly specified, the answers to these questions may or may not include international activities. Implementing policies could reap long-term benefits if the university can point to significant learning gains among the students who participate in these experiences. It is important to faculty and administrators engage in discussions regarding this topic and changes made to the tenure and promotion process.

Mentoring and Re-Entry Program

Institutions can develop a mentoring program, in collaboration with the education abroad office, to create a pathway for sustained faculty involvement. Faculty in this study discussed how other faculty mentors were critical in their development as education abroad program leaders. A formal or informal mentoring structures, as suggested by (Niehaus, Reading, Nelson, Wegener,

& Arthur, 2018), can be instituted to allow interested faculty to co-lead a program with a seasoned faculty. This effort may also advance future research, policy, and practice.

Additionally, institutions can invest in faculty by providing them with the resources post education abroad to allow them to effectively process their experiences. These can be through formal or informal avenues such as open forums, one-on-one consultations, or guided reflection exercises. Learners often formulate abstract conceptualizations about what has taken place as their reflection deepens (Passarelli & Kolb, 2012). An education abroad program is as much of a learning experience for faculty as it is for students (Stebleton, Soria, & Cherney, 2013). Incorporating intentional reflection will sustain and encourage faculty's engagement and development.

Conclusion

Though leading a short-term education abroad program can be laborious, it is a worthwhile experience that is both personally and professionally gratifying to faculty. Findings from this study demonstrated how leading education abroad programs require a great amount of preparation, commitment, and responsibility. The findings also highlighted how the deeper faculty-student connections developed could have an influence on faculty. Faculty thoroughly enjoyed seeing their students thrive and overcome challenges in a foreign context. To ensure the continuance of programs, it is important that institutions, specifically faculty colleagues, administrators, and student support services, understand what the roles and responsibilities of leading an education abroad program entails. Closing the disconnection between the faculty actual experience and perceived experience from other colleagues and administrators is essential to implement a campus support network where faculty can work toward closing this gap. Additionally, establishing incentives for all faculty to provide consistency across disciplines will

encourage them to consider leading education abroad program. Focusing on the needs of faculty when they return to campus by having spaces for them to reflect on their experiences is beneficial. It is an institution's responsibility to foster an inclusive environment that promotes global awareness and inquiry among its students, faculty, and staff.

REFERENCES

Alberts, R. J., Marzen, C. G., & Prum, D. A. (2015). Studying is dangerous? Possible federal remedies for study abroad liability. *Journal of College and University Law, 41*(2), 189-236.

Alghamdi, H. and Otte, S. (2016). The challenges and benefits of study abroad. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 6*(5): 16-22.

Allen, H. W., & Herron, C. A. (2003). A mixed methodology investigation of the linguistic and affective outcomes of summer study abroad. *Foreign Language Annals, 36*(3), 370-384.

Altbach, P. G., & Lewis, L. S. (1996). The academic profession in international perspective. In P. G. Altbach (Ed.), *The international academic profession: Portraits of fourteen countries* (pp. 3-48). Princeton, New Jersey: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Altbach, P. G. (2004). Globalization and the university: Myths and realities in an unequal world. *Tertiary Education and Management, 10*(1), 3-25.

Altbach, P. G. (2007). A dozen years of service to higher education. *International Higher Education, 50,* 2-4.

Altbach, P. G., & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motives and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11*, 290–305.

Altbach, P.G., & de Wit, H. (2015). Internationalization and global tension: Lessons from history. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 19*(1), 4-10.

Amblee, N.C., & Dhayanithy, D. (2018). How faculty members develop views on internationalization: The case of a top-ranked Indian business school. *Research in Comparative and International Education, 13*(3), 397-417.

American College Health Association. (2019). *National college health assessment II: Reference group undergraduates executive summary spring 2019*. Hanover, MD: American College Health Association.

American Council on Education. (2002). *Beyond September 11: A comprehensive national policy on international education*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

American Council on Education. (2015). *Internationalizing the tenure code: Policy to promote a globally focused faculty.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

American Council on Education. (2017). *Mapping internationalization on U.S. campuses: 2017 edition.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Andreasen, R. J. (2003). Barriers to international involvement. *Journal of International Agricultural and Extension Education, 10*, 65–69.

Austin, A. E., & McDaniels, M. (2006). Preparing the professoriate of the future: Graduate student socialization for faculty roles. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research*. Springer: The Netherlands.

Badley, G. (2000). Developing globally-competent university teachers. *Innovations in Education and Training International, 37,* 244–253.

Barnhart, B., Ricks, T., & Speier, P. (1997). Faculty roles. In W. Hoffa & J. Pearson (Eds.), *NAFSA's guide to education abroad for advisors and administrators.* (pp. 37-56). Washington DC: NAFSA: Association of International Educators.

Barr, T. (2013). Utilizing student affairs professionals to enhance student and faculty experiences and mitigate risk in short-term, facjulty-led study abroad programs. *Journal of International Education in Business, 6*(2), 136-147.

Bartell, M. (2003). Internationalization of universities: A university culture-based framework. *Higher Education, 45,* 43-70.

Bathke, A., & Kim, R. (2016). Keep Calm and Go Abroad: The Effect of Learning Abroad on Student Mental Health. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, *27*, 1.

Bedenlier, S., & Zawacki-Richter, O. (2015). Internationalization of higher education and the impacts on academic faculty members. *Research in Comparative and International Education*, *10*(2), 185-201.

Behnke, C., Seo, S., & Miller, K. (2014). Enhancing the study abroad experience: A longitudinal analysis of hospitality-oriented, study abroad program evaluations. *Tourism Management, 42*, 271-281.

Berry, J. W. (2008). Globalization and acculturation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *32*, 328–336.

Bevan, M. (2014). A method of phenomenological interviewing. *Qualitative Health Research*, *24*(1), 136-144.

Bodycott, P. (2015). Intragroup conflict during study abroad. *Journal of International Student*s, *5*(3), 244-259

Bolen, M. C. (2001). Consumerism and U.S. study abroad. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *5*(3), 182-200.

Bond, S. L., Qian, J., & Huang, J. (2003). *The role of faculty in internationalizing the undergraduate curriculum and classroom experience. A selected literature review*. CBIE Research Millennium Series, Research Paper No. 8. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Bureau for International Education.

Brandenburg, U., & de Wit, H. (2011). The end of internationalization. *International Higher Education, 62*(Winter), 15-17.

Bremer, D. (2008). Planning tomorrow's urban world. *International Educator, 17*(4), 32-39.

Broomé, R. E. (2011). An empathetic psychological perspective of police deadly force training. Journal of Phenomenological Psychology, 42, 137-156.

Broomé, R. E. (2014). A Phenomenological psychological study of the police officer's lived experience of the use of deadly force. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 54*(2), 158-181.

Childress, L. K. (2009). Planning for internationalization by investing in faculty. *Journal of International and Global Studies, 1*(1), 30-49.

Childress, L. K. (2010) Interdisciplinary: A catalyst for faculty engagement in internationalization. *Journal of Global Initiatives: Policy, Pedagogy, Perspective 4*(1): 71–94.

Childress, L. K. (2018). *The twenty-first century university: Developing faculty engagement in internationalization.* New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Churchill, S. and Wertz, F. J. (2015). Introduction to phenomenological research in psychology: historical, conceptual, and methodological foundations. In K. J. Sneider (Ed.), *Handbook of Humanistic Psychology*, Second (Revised) Edition (pp. 248-262). New York: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Criswell J. R., & Zhu H. (2015). Faculty internationalization priorities. *FIRE: Forum for International Research in Education 2*(1): 22–40.

Dastur, F. (2017). *Questions of phenomenology: Language, alterity, temporality, finitude* (Trans. by Robert Vallier). New York: Fordham University Press.

Deardorff, D. K. (2006). Identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 10*(3), 241-266.

Deardorff, D. K. (2011). Assessing intercultural competence. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 2011(149), 65-79.

Deardorff, D. K. (2015). Intercultural competence: Mapping the future research agenda. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 48*, 3-5.

Deardorff, D. K. (2020). *Manual for Developing Intercultural Competences: Story Circles* (UNESCO/Routledge) Open Access at https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000370336.

De Beuchelaer, A., Lievens, F. & Bucker, J. (2012). The role of faculty members' crosscultural competencies in their perceived teaching quality: Evidence from culturally-diverse classes in four European countries. *Journal of Higher Education, 83*(2), 217-248.

Dewey, P., & Duff, S. (2009). Reason before passion: Faculty views on internationalization in higher education. *Higher Education: The International Journal of Higher Education and Educational Planning, 58*(4), 491-504.

de Wit, H. (1995). *Strategies for internationalization of higher education:* A comparative study of Australia, Canada, Europe, and the United States. Amsterdam: European Association of International Education.

de Wit, H. (2002). *Internationalization of higher education in the United States of America and Europe: A historical, comparative, and conceptual analysis.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Dirkx, J. M., Janka Millar, K., Sinclair, J., & Vizvary, G. (2016). Short-term study abroad in graduate education: How to make sense of international experience. In D. Vellaris & D, Coleman-George (Eds.), *Handbook of research on study abroad programs and outbound mobility,* (pp. 514-539). Hershey, PA: IGI Global Publishing.

Dolby, N., & Rahman, A. (2008). Research in international education. *Review of Educational Research, 78*(3), 676-726.

Dwyer, M. M. (2004). More is better: The impact of study abroad program duration. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 10,* 151–164.

Englander, M. (2012). The interview: Data collection in descriptive phenomenological human scientific research. *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology, 43* (1):13–35.

Engle, L., & Engle, J. (2003). Study abroad levels: Toward a classification of program types. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 9,* 1-20.

Fabregas Janeiro, M. G., Fabre, R. L., & Rosete, R. T. (2012). Developing successful international faculty led programs. *U.S.-China Education Review, 4,* 375-382.

Festervand, T. A., & Tillery, K. R. (2001). Short-term study-abroad programs: A professional development tool for international business faculty. *Journal of Education for Business, 77*(2), 106-111.

Finlay, L. (2008). A dance between the reduction and reflexivity: Explicating the 'phenomenological psychological attitude'. *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology, 39*(1), 1-32.

Finlay, L. (2009). Debating phenomenological research methods. *Phenomenology and Practice. 3*(1), 6-25.

Finkelstein, M. J., Walker, E., & Chen, R. (2013). The American faculty in an age of globalization: Predictors of internationalization of research content and professional networks. *Higher Education: The International Journal of Higher Education and Educational Planning, 66*(3), 325-340.

Forum on Education Abroad. (2019). Resource glossary. Retrieved from: https://forumea.org/resources/glossary/

Forum on Education Abroad. (2018). *State of the field 2017.* Carlisle: PA. The Forum on Education Abroad.

Forsyth, D. R. (2010). Group processes and group psychotherapy: Social psychological foundations of change in therapeutic groups. In J. E. Maddux & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *Social psychological foundations of clinical psychology* (pp. 497–513). The Guilford Press.

Friesen, R. (2013). Faculty member engagement in Canadian university internationalization: A consideration of understanding, motivations and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 17*(3), 209-227.

Fry, J. P. (2016). A descriptive phenomenological study of independent midwives' utilisation of intuition as an authoritative form of knowledge in practice. (Doctoral Dissertation). Available from ProQuest.

Gearing, R. (2004). Bracketing in research: A typology. *Qualitative Health Research, 14*(10), 1429-1452.

Gillespie, J. (2009). Applying standards to creative programming in education abroad. *Association of American Colleges and Universities Peer Review, Fall 2009,* 16-18.

Giorgi, A. P. (1985). *Phenomenology and psychological research*. Pittsburg: Duquesne University Press.

Giorgi, A. P. (2009). *The descriptive phenomenological method in psychology: A modified Husserlian approach*. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.

Giorgi, A. P, Giorgi, B. M., & Morley, J. (2012). The descriptive phenomenological psychological method. *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology, 43*(1), 3-12.

Giorgi, A. P., & Giorgi, B. M. (2003). Chapter 13: The descriptive phenomenological psychological method. In P. M. Camic, J. E. Rhodes & L. Yardley (Eds.), *Qualitative research in psychology: Expanding perspectives in methodology and design* (pp. 243-273). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Glass, C. R., & Lee, J. (2018). When internationalization funding feels tight: Satisfaction with funding and campus internationalization strategies. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 22*(4), 302-316.

Goode, M. L. (2008). The role of faculty study abroad directors: A case study. *Frontiers: The Disciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 15*(Fall/Winter), 149-172.

Goode, M. L. (2013). 'Bridging the gaps': A case study of faculty and student expectations, perceptions, challenges, and responses in the Chinese 'teach-abroad' learning environment. (Doctoral dissertation). University of Minnesota, Minnesota.

Goodwin, C., & Nacht, M. (1991). *Missing the boar: The failure to internationalize American higher education.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Green, M. F. & Olson, C. (2003). *Internationalizing the campus: A user's guide.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Green, M. F., & Schoenberg, R. (2006). *Where faculty live: Internationalizing the disciplines.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Green, M., Luu, D. T., & Burris, B. (2008). *Mapping internationalization on U.S. campuses: 2008 edition.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Green, M. (2013). Acting as global citizens: A challenge to U.S. colleges and universities. *International Educator*, *22*(6), 52.

Harman, G. (2005). Internationalization of Australian higher education: A critical review of literature and research. In P. Ninnes & M. Hellsten (Eds.), *Internationalizing higher education: Critical explorations of pedagogy and policy*: Comparative Education Research Center, The University of Hong Kong: Springer.

Hay, C. (2009). Globalization and public policy. In M. Moran, M. Rein, & R. E. Goodwin (Eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Public Policy* (ebook ed.).

Heely, M. E. (2005). *The contribution of international work and study experience to the professional life and practice of adult and higher education faculty*. Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations and Theses. (305010137).

Heidegger, M. (1962). *Being and time*. (Trans. J. Macquarrie and E. Robinson). New York, NY: Harper & Row. (Original work published 1927).

Hoffa, W. W., & DePaul, S. C. (2010). *A history of U.S. study abroad: 1965-present.* Carlisle, PA: Forum on Education Abroad.

Hovey, R., & Weinberg, A. (2009). Global learning and the making of citizen diplomats. In R. Lewin (Ed.), *The handbook of practice and research in study abroad: Higher education and the quest for global citizenship* (pp. 33-48). New York, NY: Routledge.

Huang, F. (2007). Internationalization of higher education in the developing and emerging countries: A focus on transnational higher education in Asia. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11*(3-4), 421-432.

Hudzik, J. K. (2011). *Comprehensive internationalization: From concept to action.* Washington, DC: NAFSA Association for International Educators.

Hudzik, J. K, & McCarthy, J. S. (2012). *Leading comprehensive internationalization: Strategy and tactics for action.* Washington, DC: NAFSA Association for International Educators.

Hulstrand, J. (2009). Attracting faculty to education abroad. *International Educator, 18*(5), 48-51.

Hummer, J., Pedersen, E., Mirza, T., & Labrie, J. (2010). Factors associated with general and sexual alcohol-related consequences: An examination of college students while studying abroad. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice, 47*(4), 427-444.

Husserl, E. (1931). *Ideas: a general introduction to pure phenomenology*. London: Allen and Unwin. *Philosophy: First book.* K. Kersten (Trans.). New York: Springer.

Husserl, E. (1991). *On the phenomenology of the consciousness of internal time (1893–1917).* (Trans. J. B. Brough). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers. (German original, 1966).

Husserl, E. (2008). *Ideas pertaining to a pure phenomenology and to a phenomenological philosophy: First book.* K. Kersten (Trans.). New York: Springer.

Husserl, E. (2014). *Ideas for a pure phenomenology and phenomenological philosophy. First Book. General Introduction to Pure Phenomenology.* [Trans]. D.O. Dahlstrom, Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company.

Hustvedt, G., & Dickson, M. (2011). The challenges of internationalizing FCS faculty activity. *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences, 103*(4), 22-29.

Institute of International Education. (2014). *Open doors: Report on international educational exchange.* New York: Institute on International Education.

Institute of International Education. (2015). *Open doors report on international education* Washington, D.C.: Institute of International Education.

Institute of International Educators. (2017). *Open doors report on international educational exchange*. Retrieved from http://www.iie.org/en/Research-andPublications/Open-Doors.

Jiang, N., & Carpenter, V. (2011). Market entry dynamic framework for higher education internationalization. *Journal of International Education in Business, 4*(2), 141- 158.

Kehm, B. M., & Teichler, U. (2007). Research on internationalization in higher education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3/4), 260-273.

Kelsey, K. D., & Dormody, T. J. (1995). College faculty motives and barriers for participating in international activities. *Journal of Agricultural and Extension Education, 2*, 49–56.

Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 8*, 5-31.

Knight, J. (2015). Meaning, rationales and tensions in internationalization of higher education. In S. McGrath and Q. Gu (Eds). *Routledge Handbook on International Education and Development.* London: UK. Taylor Francis pp 325-339.

Koernig, S. K. (2007). Planning, organizing, and conducting a 2-week study abroad trip for undergraduate students: Guidelines for first-time faculty. *Journal of Marketing Education*, *29*(3), 210-217.

Kolb, D. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Kreber, C. (2009). Different perspectives on internationalization in higher education. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 2009*(118), 1-14.

Kuh, G. D. (2008). *High-impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter.* Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Langdridge, D. (2008). Phenomenology and critical social psychology: directions and debates in theory and research. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass 2,* 1126-1142.

Lattuca, L. R., & Stark, J. S. (2009). *Shaping the college curriculum: Academic plans in context*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Lewin, R. (2009). Introduction: The quest for global citizenship through study abroad. In R. Lewin (Ed.), *The handbook of practice and research in study abroad: Higher education and the quest for global citizenship* (pp. xiii-xxii). New York, NY: Routledge.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Loebick, K. (2017). *Internationalizing graduate education through education abroad: The pedagogy of short-term, faculty-led, education abroad experiences,* (Doctoral Dissertation). Available from ProQuest.

Li, B., & Tu, Y. (2016). Motivations of faculty engagement in internationalization: A survey in China. *Higher Education: The International Journal of Higher Education Research, 71*(1), 81-96.

Lopez, K., & Willis, D. (2004). Descriptive versus interpretive phenomenology: Their contributions to nursing knowledge. *Qualitative Health Research, 14*(5), 726-735.

Lowe, M. R., Byron, R. A., & Mennicke, S. (2014). The racialized impact of study abroad on US students' subsequent interracial interactions. *Education Research International, 2014*,1-9.

Lucas, J. (2009). *Where are all the males? A mixed methods inquiry into male study abroad participation.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from UMI Microfilm.

Lutterman-Aguilar, A., & Gingerich, O. (2015). Experiential pedagogy for study abroad: Educating for global citizenship. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 8*(2), 41-82.

Matross Helms, R. (2013, April). *Internationalization in action: Engaging faculty in internationalization, Part 1.* Retrieved from http://www.acenet.edu/newsroom/Pages/Intlz-in-Action-2013-April.aspx.

McCallon, M., & Holmes, B. (2010). *Faculty-led 360 guide to successful study abroad.* Chicago, IL: Agapy LLC.

Merriam, S. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Moran, D. (2003). *Introduction to phenomenology*. London: Routledge.

Morley, J. (2011). Phenomenological psychology. In S. Luft and S. Overgaard (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Phenomenology* (pp. 586–595). NY: Routledge Press.

Morse, J.M. (1994). Designing funded qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 220-235). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Moseley, W. (2009). Making study abroad a win-win opportunity for pre-tenure faculty. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 18*, 231.

Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods.* London: Sage.

Mullens, J. B., & Cuper, P. (2012). *Fostering global citizenship through faculty-led international programs.* Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

NAFSA: Association of International Educators. (2011). *Internationalizing the campus: Profiles of success at colleges and universities* (J. Steiner, Ed.). New York, NY: Author.

NAFSA: Association of International Educators. (2013). *Internationalizing the campus: Profiles of success at colleges and universities* (J. Steiner, Ed.). New York, NY: Author.

NAFSA: Association of International Educators. (2016). *Internationalizing the campus: Profiles of success at colleges and universities* (J. Steiner, Ed.). New York, NY: Author.

National Defense of Education Act of 1958. (P.L. 85-864; 72 Stat. 1580).

Niehaus, E., Reading, J., Nelson, M., Wegener, A., & Arthur, A. (2018). Faculty engagement in cultural mentoring as instructors of short-term study abroad courses. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 30*(2), 77-91.

Nyangau, J. Z. (2018). Motivations of faculty engagement in internationalization: An agenda for future research. *FIRE: Forum for International Research in Education 4*(3): 7-32.

Ogden, A. (2010). *Education abroad and the making of global citizens: Assessing learning outcomes of course-embedded, faculty-led international programming*. (Doctoral Dissertation) Available from ProQuest.

Olson, C., Green, M., & Hill, B. (2006). *A handbook for advancing comprehensive internationalization: What institutions can do and what students should learn*. American Council on Education: Washington D.C.

Paparella, P. D. (2018). *Learning to lead: Faculty learning on short-term study abroad programs*.

Passarelli, A., & Kolb, D. A. (2012). Using experiential learning theory to promote student learning and development in programs of education abroad. In M. Vande Berg, R.M. Paige, K.H. Lou (Eds.), *Student Learning Abroad: What Our Students Are Learning, What They're Not, and What We Can Do About It* (pp. 137-161). Stylus, Sterling, VA.

Ponds, R. (2009). The limits to internationalization of scientific research collaboration. *The Journal of Technological Transfer, 34*(1), 76-94.

Proctor, D., & Rumbley, L. (2018). *The future agenda for internationalization in higher education next generation insights into research, policy, and practice*. Abingdon, Oxon, United Kingdom: Routledge.

Raby, R. L. (2007). Internationalizing the curriculum: On- and off-campus strategies. *New Directions for Community Colleges. 138*, 57-66.

Raczkosk, B. M., & Robinson, J. S. (2019). Faculty motivations for leading short-term study abroad courses. *NACTA Journal, 63*(1), 108-116.

Rasch, D. (2001). *Faculty voices from the field: Perceptions and implications of study abroad* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from UMI Microfilm. (3020250).

Rhoads, R. A., & Torres, C. A. (2006). *The university, state, and market: The political economy of globalization in the Americas*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Rhoads, R. A., & Szelényi, K. (2011). *Global citizenship and the university*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Ritz, A. A. (2011). The educational value of short-term study abroad programs as course components. *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism, 11,* 164-178.

Roberts, T. G., Conner, N. W., & Jones, B. L. (2013). An experiential learning framework for engaging learners during study abroad experiences. *North American Colleges and Teachers of Agriculture (NACTA) Journal,* 28-35.

Rollins, H. (2009). Georgia Tech's comprehensive and integrated approach to developing global competence. In R. Lewin (Ed.), *The Handbook of Practice and Research in Study Abroad* (pp. 423-444). New York, NY: Routledge.

Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2012). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data*. (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Savishinsky, M. (2012). *Overcoming barriers to faculty engagement in study abroad* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from UMI Microfilm. (1151846901).

Scharff, R. (2012). Becoming a philosopher: What Heidegger learned from Dilthey, 1919–25. *British Journal for the History of Philosophy, 21*(1), 1-21.

Scherrer, J., Olcoń, K., Butterfield, A., & Kebede, W. (2016). Bringing experiential educational groups to the United States: An analysis of group development in an international travel and study program. *Social Work Education, 35*(6), 693-705.

Schmidt-Rinehart, B. C., & Knight, S. M. (2004). The homestay component of study abroad: Three perspectives. *Foreign Language Annals, 37*(2), 254-262.

Schwandt, T.A., 2000. Three epistemological stances for qualitative enquiry. In N. K. Denzin & Y, Lincoln (Eds.)., *Handbook of qualitative research.* 2nd ed. (pp. 189-214). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Schwandt, T.A., 2015. *The Sage dictionary of qualitative inquiry*, 4th ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Schwietz, M. S. (2006). *Internationalization of the academic profession: An exploratory study of faculty attitudes, beliefs and involvement at public universities in Pennsylvania.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Seidman, I. E. (2006). *Interviewing as a qualitative researcher*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Program Act of 2019, S. 1198, 116th Cong. (2019).

Strang, H. (2006). *Characteristics of faculty leaders in a study abroad experience*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado at Denver).

Siaya, L. & Hayward, F. M. (2003). *Mapping internationalization on U.S. campuses*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Soria, K., & Troisi, J. (2014). Internationalization at home alternatives to study abroad: Implications for students' development of global, international, and intercultural competencies. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 18*(3), 261-280.

Spring, J. (2008). Research on globalization and education. *Review of Educational Research, 78*(2), 330-363.

Starkes, H., & Brown, S. (2007). Choose your method: A comparison of phenomenology, discourse analysis, and grounded theory. *Qualitative Health Research, 17*(10), 1372-1380.

Stebleton, M. J., Soria, K. M., & Cherney, B. T. (2013). The high impact of education abroad: College students' engagement in international experiences and the development of intercultural competencies. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad,* 22, 1-34.

Steger, M. B. (2008). *The rise of the global imaginary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stiglitz, J. E. (2002). *Globalization and its discontents*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Stohl, M. (2007). We have met the enemy and he is us: The role of the faculty in the internationalization of higher education in the coming decade. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11*(3-4), p. 359-372.

Thirolf, K. (2013). How faculty identity discourses of community college part-time faculty change over time. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice: Council for the Study of Community College (CSCC) Research 2012, 37*(3), 177-184.

Todres, L. (2005). Clarifying the life world: Descriptive phenomenology. In I. Holloway (Ed.) *Qualitative Research in Health Care* (pp. 104-124). Buckinghamshire: Open University Press.

Todres, L., & Galvin, K. (2008). Embodied interpretation: a novel way of evocatively re-presenting meanings in phenomenological research. *Qualitative Research, 8*(5), 568-583.

Todres, L., & Holloway, I. (2004). Descriptive phenomenology: Life world as evidence. *In:* Rapport, F. (Ed,). *New Qualitative Methodologies in Health and Social Care Research.* London: Routledge, 79-98.

Twombly, S. B., Salisbury, M. H., Tumanut, S. D., & Klute, P. (2012). *Study abroad in a new global century: Renewing the promise, refining the purpose.* Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

van Manen, M., 2015. *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy.* New York, New York: Left Coast Press.

van Manen, M. (1990). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Viers, C. J. (2003). *Faculty engaged in international scholarship: A study of when, how, and why.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (3116059).

Watts, K. (2015). *Directing short-term study abroad programs at a public flagship university: Exploring the faculty experience.* (Doctoral dissertation). Johnson & Wales University, Rhode Island.

Wenner, D. (2009). Study abroad and language: From maximal to realistic models. In R. Lewin (Ed.), *The Handbook of Practice and Research in Study Abroad* (pp. 81-98). New York, NY: Routledge.

Wertz, F. (2011). A phenomenological psychological approach to trauma and resilience. In F. J. Wertz, K. Charmaz, L. M. McMullen, R. Josselson, R. Anderson, and E. McSpadden (Eds.), *Five ways of doing qualitative analysis: Phenomenological psychology, grounded theory, discourse analysis, narrative research, and intuitive inquiry* (pp. 124–164). New York: Guilford Press.

Zahavi, D. (2003). Husserl's phenomenology. Stanford, CA: Stanford University.

Zemach-Bersin, T. (2007). Global citizenship & study abroad: It's all about U.S. *Critical Literacy: Theories and Practices, 1*(2), 16-28.

Zemach-Bersin, T. (2009). Selling the world: Study abroad marketing and the privatization of global citizenship. In R. Lewin (Ed.), *The Handbook of Practice and Research in Study Abroad: Higher Education and the Quest for Global Citizenship* (pp. 303-320). New York: Routledge.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: INVITATION EMAIL

Dear Faculty,

As a doctoral candidate in the Higher Education program at Old Dominion University, I am conducting a research study on the lived experiences of faculty who have led short-term education abroad program in the social sciences.

Education abroad has become the focus of a growing body of scholarship. Many researchers have explored the ways students experience education abroad; yet, the experiences of other members of the academic community—particularly faculty—remain largely unexamined. It is important to address this gap in the literature, because faculty are pivotal in internationalization efforts and can help maximize university internationalization strategies.

I am inviting you to participate in this study because of your experience leading a program abroad. If you agree to participate, you will discuss your experiences with education abroad during three different interviews. The first interview should last about 30 minutes, the second about 60 minutes, and the final interview lasting about 45, for a total of approximately 135 minutes. You may participate in the interview face-to-face or via video streaming technology. I am asking you to participate in this study because your responses can provide meaningful data for this inquiry. The decision to participate in this study is completely voluntary.

While participating in this study, you will encounter no foreseeable risks or discomforts. The benefits of participating in the study include the opportunity to reflect upon, articulate, and discuss your experience leading an education abroad program. As a result, the interview and reflection done in this study may lead to a deeper understanding of your experience. Your involvement in this study will be handled in a confidential manner. Any reports or publications based on this research will use only group data and will not identify you or any individual as being affiliated with this project.

Please feel free to contact me at 703-965-4360 or rndan001@odu.edu should you have any questions about this research study. If you have any concerns about this study or if any problems arise, please contact my Dissertation Committee Chair, Dr. David Ayers at Old Dominion University, at dayers@odu.edu. If you have any questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant, please contact Dr. Laura Chezan, Chair of the Human Subjects Review Committee for the Darden College of Education at 757 683 7055, or the Old Dominion University Office of Research, at 757 683 3460.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Best,
Rodin Ndandula, Doctoral Candidate, Old Dominion University

APPENDIX B: INFORMED CONSENT FORM

PROJECT TITLE: *Internationalization: A Phenomenological analysis of the experiences of faculty who have led a short term-education abroad program.*

INTRODUCTION

The purposes of this form are to give you information that may affect your decision whether to say YES or NO to participation in this research, and to record the consent of those who say YES. You are being asked to participate in a research project. Researchers are required to provide a consent form to inform you about the study, to convey that participation is voluntary, to explain risks and benefits of participation, and to empower you to make an informed decision. You should feel free to ask the researchers any questions you may have.

RESEARCHERS

Primary Investigator: David Ayers, Ed.D., Associate Professor, College of Education and Professional Studies, Department of Educational Foundations and Leadership, Old Dominion University.

Investigator: Rodin Ndandula, Doctoral Student, College of Education and Professional Studies, Department of Educational Foundations and Leadership, Higher Education, Old Dominion University.

PURPOSE OF RESEARCH

Education abroad has become the focus of a growing body of scholarship. Many researchers have explored the ways students experience education abroad, including learning outcomes, language acquisition and cultural competency; yet, the experiences of other members of the academic community—particularly faculty—remain largely unexamined. It is important to address this gap in the literature, because faculty—through teaching, research, and service—are pivotal in internationalization efforts. Given their important roles in education abroad, faculty can help maximize university internationalization strategies.

The purpose of this study is to understand the lived experiences of faculty who have led a short-term education abroad program in the social sciences. I examine faculty experiences through a phenomenological framework. Phenomenology is defined as a systematic attempt to uncover and describe the internal meaning structures of the living experience. A phenomenological approach to research gives voice to the people who experienced the phenomenon while also clarifying the meanings of phenomena through analysis of the descriptions. Furthermore, it delineates things known tacitly but not articulated in depth.

WHAT YOU WILL DO

In this study, you will be interviewed three times, totaling 135 minutes. Interviews will occur either face-to-face or via video streaming technology (i.e. Skype, Adobe Connect, WebEx, etc.). The first interview will last 30 minutes, the second 60 minutes, and the third 45 minutes. The sequence of the three interviews will allow you to describe the context, details, and meaning of the experience of leading an education abroad as it relates to your academic work and

professional lives, as well as how you envision this effort contributing, or not, to institutional internationalization efforts. All interviews will be conducted in an informal, conversational manner with open-ended questions that allow participants to talk about their experiences candidly. You may agree to be digitally recorded, or you may choose not to be digitally recorded during our conversations. Your identity will be held in strict confidence throughout the entirety of the study.

EXCLUSIONARY CRITERIA

In this study, faculty participants must meet the following criteria:

- Faculty must be tenure-line faculty of any rank, lecturer, or part-time faculty in the social sciences field from a public doctoral research institution.

- Faculty must have led or co-lead at least one short-term education abroad program in the social sciences field within the past five years. This will ensure that each faculty, not only is familiar with the host country, but has up-to-date information on how to lead such a program. Additionally, it demonstrates the faculty's commitment to the promotion of global education.

Participants will also be asked to provide their Curriculum Vitae (CV) which will be used for the sole purpose of verifying their adherence to the selection criteria.

RISKS AND BENEFITS

While participating in this study, you will encounter no foreseeable risks or discomforts. The benefits of participating in the study include the opportunity to reflect upon, articulate, and discuss your experience leading an education abroad program. As a result, the interview and reflection done in this study may lead to a deeper understanding of your experience

PRIVACY AND CONFIDENTIALITY:

Your confidentiality will be protected to the maximum extent allowable by law. Any direct identification information, including your name, will be removed from data when responses are analyzed. All data will be secured in locked file cabinets and password protected server space. The data will be accessible only to the researchers associated with this study and the Institutional Review Board. A pseudonym of your choosing will be assigned to represent your name throughout the study. Other distinguishing factors (i.e. institutions, other names brought up, etc.) will also be masked by pseudonyms to protect your identity.

The results of this study may be published or presented at professional meetings, but the identities of all research participants will remain confidential. Although every attempt will be made to keep your identification private, some distinguishing responses shared, and other comments may reflect your identity.

All data will be stored for at least five years after the project closes. Five years after the conclusion of the study, the data (digital audio files, transcripts, all researcher notes, and other documents related to the study) will be destroyed.

RIGHTS TO PARTICIPATE, SAY NO, OR WITHDRAW:

Participation is completely voluntary. It is OK for you to say NO. Even if you say YES now, you are free to say NO later, and walk away or withdraw from the study – at any time. You may choose not to participate at all, or to answer some questions and not others. You may also change your mind at any time and withdraw as a participant from this study with no negative consequences. Your decision will not affect your relationship with the University, or otherwise cause a loss of benefits to which you might otherwise be entitled.

COSTS AND PAYMENTS

You will receive no compensation for participating in this study.

CONTACT INFORMATION FOR QUESTIONS AND CONCERNS:

If you have any questions later on, then the researchers should be able to answer them; please contact the researchers:

- David Ayers, Ed.D., Associate Professor, College of Education and Professional Studies, Department of Educational Foundations and Leadership, Old Dominion University. dayers@odu.edu

- Rodin Ndandula, Doctoral Student, College of Education and Professional Studies, Department of Educational Foundations and Leadership, Higher Education, Old Dominion University. rndan001@odu.edu

If at any time you feel pressured to participate, or if you have any question about your rights or this form, then you should call Dr. Laura Chezan, Chair of the Human Subjects Review Committee for the Darden College of Education) at 757 683 7055, or the Old Dominion University Office of Research, at 757 683 3460.

By signing below, you are indicating your voluntary participation in this study and acknowledge that you may: 1) choose not to participate in the study; 2) refuse to answer certain questions; and 3) discontinue your participation at any time without any penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You are saying that you have read this form or have had it read to you, that you are satisfied that you understand this form, the research study, and its risks and benefits. The researchers should have answered any questions you may have had about the research. The researcher will give you a copy of this form for your records.

Signature of Participant _____ Date _____

I hereby agree to abide by the participant's instructions as indicated above.

Signature of Researcher _____ Date _____

Rodin Ndandula
rndan001@odu.edu

APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

This study is designed to understand the experiences of faculty members who have led short-term education abroad program in the social sciences as part of their institution's internationalization efforts. In this study, I seek to answer the following research question: How do faculty, at a public research institution, describe their experiences leading an education abroad program?

Introduction:

- Explain purpose of the study
- Introduce self and rationale behind wanting to study the faculty experience
- Discuss duration of interview. With your consent, this interview will be audio recorded for the purpose of transcription and analysis. This is a voluntary interview and you can elect to refrain from answering a question at any time. Do you have any questions before we begin?
- Review and complete the consent form.

Interview #1: Life History/Pre-Education Abroad

1. Please tell me about yourself.
2. How and why did you to get involved education abroad program?
3. What does an education abroad experience mean to you?
4. What were your planning strategies before leading this education abroad program?
5. What were your expectations for this education abroad program?

Interview #2: Day-to-Day/During Education Abroad

1. What did a day-to- day looked like during your education abroad program?
2. What was the dynamic between you and your students during the education abroad program?
3. What would you describe as a highlight moment of your education abroad program?
4. What would you describe as a low moment of your education abroad program?
5. What challenges, if at all, did you encounter during your education abroad program?

Interview #3: Reflection/Post Education Abroad

1. How did you process your experience abroad?
2. How did you feel once your education abroad program ended?
3. How has this experience impacted you as a faculty member?
4. What advice would you give to a colleague interested in coordinating a program for the first time?

Final Question

1. Is there anything you would you like to share about your experience leading an education abroad program that we did not discuss today?

Closing Remarks

- Thank the interviewee for participating and restate the confidentiality of the information shared.
- Notify the participant that all transcriptions from the interview will be available for member checking purposes.

APPENDIX D: FACULTY PROFILE BREAKDOWN

Table 3

Expanded Faculty Profhile Breakdown

Participants	Region/Country of Education Abroad	Length of Recent Education Abroad	Years Leading Education Abroad	Academic Discipline	Program Type	Program Size	Native of Host Country?
Dr. Ellison	Europe/Italy	2 weeks	10+	Early Childhood Education	Spring	20-30	No
Dr. Graham	Europe/UK, Ireland Asia/Hong Kong	2 weeks	20+	Higher Education	Spring	15-20	No
Dr. Howard	Europe/Ireland South America/Guatemala	2 weeks	10+	Nursing/Global Health	Spring	20-30	No
Dr. Williams	Asia/Thailand	3 weeks	10+	Higher Education	Spring	15-20	Yes
Dr. Flynn	Africa/South Africa	2 weeks	10+	Sociology/Women's Studies	Spring	10-15	No
Dr. Carson	Europe/Italy	2 weeks	5+	Early Childhood Education	Spring	20-30	No

APPENDIX E: IRB APPROVAL MEMO

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH

Physical Address
4111 Monarch Way, Suite 203
Norfolk, Virginia 23508
Mailing Address
Office of Research
1 Old Dominion University
Norfolk, Virginia 23529
Phone(757) 683-3460
Fax(757) 683-5902

DATE:	October 25, 2019
TO:	David Ayers, EdD
FROM:	Old Dominion University Education Human Subjects Review Committee
PROJECT TITLE:	[1446745-1] Internationalization: A phenomenological analysis of the experiences of faculty who have led a short term education abroad program
REFERENCE #:	
SUBMISSION TYPE:	New Project
ACTION:	DETERMINATION OF EXEMPT STATUS
DECISION DATE:	October 25, 2019
REVIEW CATEGORY:	Exemption category # *2*

Thank you for your submission of New Project materials for this project. The Old Dominion University Education Human Subjects Review Committee has determined this project is EXEMPT FROM IRB REVIEW according to federal regulations.

We will retain a copy of this correspondence within our records.

If you have any questions, please contact Laura Chezan at (757) 683-7055 or lchezan@odu.edu. Please include your project title and reference number in all correspondence with this committee.

This letter has been electronically signed in accordance with all applicable regulations, and a copy is retained within Old Dominion University Education Human Subjects Review Committee's records.

VITA

RODIN NDANDULA
Old Dominion University
Darden College of Education
Education Foundations and Leadership
4301 Hampton Boulevard, Norfolk, VA 23529

EDUCATION

Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia — December 2020
Ph.D. Higher Education
Dissertation: *Internationalization: A phenomenological analysis of the experiences of faculty who have led a short-term education abroad program*
Committee: David F. Ayers (Chair), Chris Glass (Member), Kim Bullington (Member)

Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia — May 2015
M.E.M., Engineering Management

Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia — May 2013
B.S. Biology

WORK EXPERIENCE

Assistant Director of Assessment & Planning; Old Dominion University — 2015 - Present

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Graduate Teaching Assistant (Fall 2019). Assessment, Evaluation, Research in Higher Education; Old Dominion University.