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Abstract

Study abroad programs allow undergraduate students to experience international learning outside the classroom. Increased globalization makes it easier for students to travel internationally (Chieffo & Griffiths, 2004). Universities utilize international study to help students experience other cultures, become more comfortable around diverse populations, increase their global perspective experientially. The literature suggests such travel abroad programs yield positive outcomes (Carlson & Widaman, 1988; Juhasz & Walker, 1988; Sell, 1983). In the past, studying abroad meant the student remained in the host country from 6 months to a year. However, short-term study programs are less than a semester long and are becoming more popular (Institute of International Education, 2003). This may be in part because these excursions require less time, are more conducive to students’ schedules, and are less expensive (Cheiffo & Griffiths, 2004).
George Fox University (GFU) is a private institution that encourages global awareness and multicultural appreciation. One way it does this is through the short-term Juniors Abroad Program, which sends approximately 200 junior students on multiple destinations for a 3-week period each year. Prior to the trip, students study pertinent curriculum about their destination site throughout spring semester. The program objective is to promote global and multicultural awareness in participating students.

This author sent surveys to 207 students in the George Fox Juniors Abroad program asking about their level of global and multicultural awareness, religious commitment, and demographic information. Responses from 22 participants that sufficiently completed both rounds of data collection were used for analysis. It was hypothesized that individuals would have more global and multicultural awareness after studying abroad for 3 weeks. It was further hypothesized that individuals who were higher in religious commitment would experience more change in global and multicultural awareness. Findings indicated no statistically significant changes in global and multicultural awareness before and after the 3-week trips. One exception was interaction confidence. Students felt more confident when interacting with people of differing cultures and backgrounds. Regarding religious commitment, the findings did not suggest that high or low religious commitment impacted change in global and multicultural awareness. Study limitations and implications for future research are discussed.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

The recognition of increased diversity in the United States has prompted more colleges and universities to pay attention to multicultural issues. The current multicultural movement proposes formal training that emphasizes an awareness of one's own cultural assumptions, values, and biases, knowledge of other worldviews, and the development of cross-cultural communication skills (Sue et al., 1982).

The importance for students to learn about cultural histories, languages and social norms impacts professional development (Pickert, 1992). More and more employers hire student graduates with international experience that demonstrate a greater fund of global knowledge, and who can adapt in cross-cultural situations (Herberger, 2002; Kitsantas, 2004). For this reason study abroad programs are deemed beneficial to achieve such purposes and help their students be more competitive candidates in the job market (Carlson, Burn, Useem, & Yachimowicz, 1990; Herberger, 2002).

Study Abroad

The term study abroad is defined as all educational programs that take participants beyond the geographical boundaries of the original country (Carlson, Bum, Useem & Yachimowicz, 1991). Within the past two decades, universities have designed and promoted study abroad programs as a large component of learning, specifically toward student global
exposure (Vande Berg, 2004). Increased travel opportunities, global telecommunication, and international trade make it easier for students to travel between countries (Chieffo & Griffiths, 2004). This in part, makes studying abroad an ideal modality in which students can be exposed to diversity and globalization. With this in mind, it is important to have an understanding of what global and multicultural awareness means.

Global awareness was described early on as being mindful of emerging world conditions. One that exhibits global awareness is able to acknowledge multiple worldviews, and can appreciate the global impact of social, environmental, economic, and political changes (Hanvey, 1982; Olson & Kroeger, 2001). With globalized struggles such as war, terrorism, economic struggles, poverty, and natural disasters, it is more important than ever for students to understand how such issues impact our neighbors across oceans and national borders.

Multicultural awareness is seen as one’s ability to appreciate how another culture feels from the perspective of the insider (Stohl, 1996), which fosters a position of openness to diverse cultures. One that appreciates multiculturalism demonstrates acceptance of many ethnic groups. Chen and Starosta (1996) highlighted that interactions with minority populations is becoming the norm versus the exception. Therefore understanding between group differences is essential.

Under the umbrella of the term study abroad, there are different programs that range from total immersion, to programs that are one to three-weeks long (Donahue, 2009). Such programs are best described as long-term versus short-term study abroad, both with research that offers insight into their efficacy and usefulness.
Long-Term Study Abroad

Traditionally study abroad ranged between 6 to 12 months or greater, and the student was expected to come away with a richer understanding of the host culture, and an appreciation for broader issues that impact it. Outcome research showed that long-term international study positively impacted the participants. Individuals reported having a greater appreciation for diverse cultures, and enhanced awareness pertaining to their own culture (Anderson, Lawton, Rexeisen, & Hubbard, 2006; Hadis, 2005). They further endorsed an increased global perspective, positive self-esteem (Juhasz & Walker, 1988), increased intercultural development (Carlson & Widaman, 1988; Sell, 1983), and global perspective (King & Young, 1994; McCabe, 1994).

Carlson and Widaman’s (1988) found this to be true when they studied a sample of 450 students that completed questionnaires designed to measure student levels of global and cross-cultural awareness prior to their trip and upon their return. Participants who studied abroad reported a greater global perspective and worldview as a result of their experience overseas. Similarly Carlson and colleagues later (1991) compared 488 students who participated in long-term study abroad to 157 that did not. The authors found that students who studied abroad experienced increased concern for political issues and cross-cultural interest after returning to the United States. It is apparent long-term study abroad is a rich experience for participating students.

Short-Term Study Abroad Trips

To date, short-term study is a more popular route for promoting student global knowledge and multicultural sensitivity. International trips vary anywhere from 1 to 12 weeks (Jurgens &
McAuliffe, 2004). Statistics show short term trips are on the rise. Nearly 90% of college students spend less than a semester abroad, of which 40% are junior students (Open Doors, 2005). Glencross and Willis (2009) studied 600 freshman students from the University of Florida, and found that two thirds preferred a 4- to 6-week travel duration, with approximately one half of those respondents specifying that summer or spring break trips were most preferably. Chieffo and Griffiths (2004) further suggested this was due in part because the trips were less expensive and flexible for students’ schedules. With increased participation in short-term travel, researchers questioned outcome and efficacy when the duration changed.

To date, research findings on this topic are mixed. Olson and Kroeger (2001) completed a curriculum evaluation specific to an east coast university, and reported study abroad programs were effective if participants remained in the host culture greater than three months. Fisher (2009) indicated that skeptics of short-term study abroad programs described it as merely cultural tourism, or international vacations (Glencross & Willis, 2009). They speculated participants spent much of their time with other Americans. They missed out on the interacting within the host culture itself. Short-term study has also been described as a construction of “mini- Americas” within the host country. Such experiences did not compel students to experience the host country’s day-to-day living patterns (Bikson & Law, 1994).

Chieffo and Griffiths (2004) challenged this idea, and examined a sample of 2,300 students that participated in a three-week trip associated with a Junior Year Abroad program at the University of Delaware. Findings showed participants had indeed experienced increased international and global awareness. Sindt and Pachmayer (2007) later found similar results. A sample of students from Arizona State University (ASU) who spent 12 weeks abroad reported
having increased global competence, academic development, difference in attitudes toward diverse peoples, and personal development.

To summarize, it is apparent that positive outcomes exist for study abroad participants. Whether the trips are longer (Glencross & Willis, 2009; Olson & Kroeger, 2001) or shorter, they are shown to be worthy endeavors (Chieffo, 2001; Chieffo & Griffiths, 2004) that allow opportunity for students to expand their beliefs about other cultures. However, there is question of predictive factors. What variables are predictive of positive or negative experience abroad? Are there traits about a student that makes them more likely to study abroad than their peers? There are a number of studies that attempt to tackle such questions.

Predictive Factors for Studying Abroad

Schroth and McCormack (2000) examined sensation seeking and need for achievement among study abroad students. They found that students with greater need for new experiences and sensations were more likely to learn their subject when able to do so internationally. It was also suggested that self-determined motivation and autonomous goal setting predicted students’ academic success while studying abroad. Those with a self-determined standard in mind reported having a stronger sense of investment in the learning process (Chirkov, Safdar, de Guzman & Playford, 2008; Kitsantas, 2004; Kitsantas & Zimmerman, 2009).

Goldstein and Kim (2005) hypothesized that study abroad participants travel internationally because they believe it to be beneficial for completing their major. Other suggested possibilities involved students’ expectation about the experience, having lesser levels of ethnocentrism and prejudice, and seeking to develop proficiency speaking another language (DuFon & Churchill, 2006). Previous international travels, higher socio-economic status, parents
with secondary education or greater, personal academic success, and adequate access to financial aid appear to play a role in predicting study abroad participation (Carlson et al., 1990; Salisbury, Umbach, Paulsen, & Pascarella, 2009).

Briefly, developing global and multicultural awareness involves expanding one’s worldview, perspective taking, and openness to new experience. As seen above, studying abroad is one way that is achieved. Research indicates individuals that study abroad appear to be autonomous, self-motivated, and seek to increase their understanding of environments foreign to them.

While there is much effort put into looking at predictive factors to studying abroad, there is one variable that is absent in the literature, that being religious commitment. A review of past research reveals this topic remains largely unexplored. There is much work to be done if the field is to better understand what factors prompt students to participate in study abroad programs. How might religiosity contribute to developing more global and multicultural awareness?

**Religiosity**

Worthington (1988) described religious commitment as something that can directly impact one’s worldviews. It is the degree to which individuals use and exercise their values, beliefs and religious practices. He proposed that individuals with higher degrees of religious commitment make decisions based upon their faith based beliefs and value systems. Such decisions include the way they perceive and treat other people.

Research has shown religious commitment plays a positive role in multiple domains of one’s quality of life. Several studies revealed connections between religiosity and physical health, mental health (Francis, Robbins, Lewis, Quigley, & Wheeler, 2004), college adjustment
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(Low & Handal, 1995), lower sexual risk (Zaleski & Schiaffino, 2000), as well as body image (Boyatzis & McConnell, 2006).

Harris, Schoneman, and Carrera (2002) found that college students with higher religious commitment and religious behaviors (e.g., prayer, church attendance) were more likely to have lower trait anxiety than those who endorsed less religious commitment. When religious behaviors were correlated with suicidal ideation, students with more religious, existential, and total spiritual well-being reported they were less likely to consider suicide (Taliaferro, Rienzo, Pigg, Miller, & Dodd, 2000).

In contrast, there are some studies suggesting that students’ religious behaviors decrease when beginning their first year of college. It is possible this is a reflection of the student’s possible newfound freedom to question their spirituality and reasons why they participate in religious behaviors (Johnston, Bachman, & O’Malley, 1995).

Recently, Stoppa and Lefkowitz (2010) replicated these findings. They conducted a longitudinal study using an ethnically and religiously diverse sample of first year emerging adult students. They measured religious affiliation (Catholic, Evangelical, Protestant, Atheist / Agnostic), beliefs, and behaviors (e.g., church attendance, frequency of prayer, frequency of Bible reading). Their results showed that over three semesters the students reported significant decreases in religious service and activity attendance. Nevertheless, they maintained their faith beliefs even though their religious practices appeared to decrease.

Although the research is mixed regarding religious behaviors and commitment, it is apparent individuals develop religious beliefs and behaviors during their college years, As noted
by Worthington (1988), this can involve expanding worldviews, and discovering a sense of personal values and morals.

As seen in past research, global and multicultural awareness involves openness to unique experiences, participation in diverse traditions, and one’s ability to think outside existing worldviews to name a few. With that in mind, how might an individual’s level of global and multicultural awareness be impacted by religious commitment? Is it possible religious commitment encourage global and multicultural awareness?

**George Fox University Juniors Abroad Program**

The author set out to investigate this important question by examining the efforts of a Juniors Abroad program affiliated with a small liberal arts university. George Fox University is a private institution that encourages spirituality and academic integration as well as appreciation for diversity. One way the university promotes diversity appreciation is to provide its students with the opportunity to travel internationally and experience other cultures first hand.

In 1989, George Fox University implemented the Juniors Abroad Program that continues today. Over 200 undergraduate students participated in 2008, and program administrators expect approximately the same number to participate in the years to follow. With 11 groups total, each comprised of approximately 20 participants, students travel to destinations such as Egypt, Italy, France, Germany, and Ireland. Prior to the trip, students prepare for their experience abroad by studying concepts pertinent to their journey during the previous term. To date, the program utilizes qualitative student feedback evaluations to gauge if the program was helpful. Students comment on the organization of the trip, curriculum relevance, interaction with faculty chaperones, and their overall enjoyment of the experience. While qualitative information from
students is helpful for directors to plan from year to year, quantitative feedback provides a holistic assessment when gauging the program’s impact on student global and intercultural awareness.

**Importance of This Study**

The goal of George Fox University is to enrich their students’ college experience with international exposure to other cultures. The Juniors Abroad program has contributed to this goal for twenty years. George Fox University faculty wants to send their students into the work place as competent and critical thinkers that are at ease with cultural diversity and have a working knowledge of what is going on in the world around them. It would be helpful for the university to know if their efforts to achieve this objective are effective. Do students report increased global and multicultural awareness after participating in the Juniors Abroad program?

On a broader level, links between religiosity and study abroad outcomes have yet to be examined. This study will contribute more information to the arena of religious commitment and its impact on student changes in multicultural and global awareness. Additionally, it can yield important information to the George Fox University Juniors Abroad program directors in regards to the program’s effectiveness and impact on students.

**Research Purposes and Hypotheses**

As universities continue to utilize international study to enhance student learning, it is important to know what factors might precipitate or hinder student multicultural and global awareness. This study had two purposes. First, this author sought to evaluate student self-reported levels of multicultural and global awareness after participating in a Juniors Abroad 3-
week study program specific to George Fox University. Second, this author examined if highly religious students showed greater changes in multicultural and global awareness.

Hypothesis 1: After reviewing research on short-term excursions, this author hypothesized that college participants’ global awareness and multicultural awareness would increase after a three-week international trip.

Hypothesis 2: This author hypothesized that individuals who are more religious also have a greater sense of openness to new cultures and people. As a result, students who are more religious would show a greater increase of global and multicultural awareness after participating in the 3-week Juniors Abroad program than their less religious counterparts.
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Methods

Participants

This author sent questionnaires to 207 undergraduate students who took part in the Juniors Abroad program at George Fox University. Those eligible for participation were students enrolled at George Fox University, accepted for the Juniors Abroad program, over 18 years of age, and could read and understand English. Students’ contact information was obtained from the program director. Participants received an email that contained an Internet link directing them to a survey.

One hundred and thirty-seven participants responded to the online survey prior to their departures. Upon return from their respective trips, 67 responded to the online survey. However, due to incomplete pre and post surveys, the final sample consisted of 22 sources of usable data yielding a response rate of 11%.

The average age of participants was 20 years old ($M = 20.95$, $SD = .72$), with 64% being males ($n = 14$), and 36% being females ($n = 8$). Ethnically, the sample was 95% ($n = 21$) European American, and 5% were bi-racial ($n = 1$). The mean grade point average was 3.36 ($SD = .46$).

Regarding trip destinations, five participants traveled to Rwanda and Uganda; four traveled to China and Tibet; three traveled to Ghana; two traveled to Amsterdam and Paris; one traveled to Ireland and Scotland; one traveled to New Zealand; and one traveled to Egypt. Five
participants did not report their designated trips. The average number of destinations participants went to prior to the current trip was 4.14 ($SD = 6.20$). The average number of days students accessed the Internet was 6.21 ($SD = 5.92$).

**Procedure**

This author received approval to complete the study through the George Fox University Human Subjects Research Committee. Prior to beginning the survey, the students were provided with an informed consent statement (see Appendix A) indicating that students’ participation was voluntary, and they could withdraw at any time. To protect confidentiality, each student was assigned a number for the analysis phase. The pre-test survey provided a description of the study, the informed consent mentioned above, this author’s contact information, the three scales, and a demographic questionnaire.

Participants were asked to complete the 24-item International Sensitivity Scale (ISS), the Global Competency Survey, Adapted Version (GCS), RCI-10, and a demographic questionnaire prior to departure. These scales and survey were sent to each student via email using Survey Monkey; attached was information about the study indicating that their participation was voluntary, and did not influence their final grade in the class. Three follow up emails with the survey link were sent out again to ensure a good response rate. After the students returned home, they were sent the ISS and GCS scales in the same way, using Survey Monkey. As before, the students were sent three follow up emails with the survey. The collected data was analyzed using SPSS software.
Instrumentation

The four instruments used included the Global Competency Survey (GCS) adapted for this study, the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale, the Religious Commitment Inventory-10, and a demographic questionnaire.

**Global Competency Survey, Adapted Version.** Olson and Kroeger (2001) drafted the Global Competence Survey (GCS; see Appendix B) to examine relationships between international experience, intercultural sensitivity and global competence among faculty at New Jersey City University. They administered 25 global competence survey questions asking staff and faculty about their level of ease in an ethnically and culturally diverse milieu. Example items from the survey included the following: “I want to continue to learn about the world’s peoples, cultures, and issues;” “I recognize my worldview is not universal;” and “I believe the world has become economically, environmentally, and politically interdependent.”

After the authors analyzed the data, 23 of the 25 questions strongly clustered together within the following domains: (a) Substantive Knowledge, (b) Perceptual Understanding, and (c) Intercultural Communication. Substantive Knowledge is defined as knowledge of cultures, languages, world issues, and global dynamics (Wilson, 1996). Perceptual Understanding describes the process by which one experiences in the world and perceives it through his or her worldviews. Intercultural Communication is defined as interacting effectively with others.

The authors provided the 23 items pertinent to each domain; the other two items were not included (Olson & Kroeger, 2001). This author used these items and subgroups for this study, and adapted the survey by re-organizing the 23 items in chronological order for easier administration.
**Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (ISS).** This measure was constructed from Chen and Starosta’s (1997) argument that intercultural communication competence was comprised of three components: cognition, behavior, and affect. They proposed all three needed to be assessed separately using different measures specifically designed for each: cognition, behavior, and affect. Chen and Starosta (2000) developed the ISS to measure the affective component of intercultural communication. This included self-esteem, self-monitoring, open-mindedness, empathy, interaction involvement, and suspended judgment (see Appendix C).

This author felt the ISS was appropriate for measuring multicultural awareness, as past research suggests it contains affective components such as being open-minded, appreciating one’s unique experiences of the world (Stohl, 1996), being able to take another’s perspective (Hanvey, 1982), and feel empathy toward individuals from diverse cultures. Even though the focus of this present study was not specifically designed to measure affect in intercultural communication in and of itself, this author still felt the ISS was appropriate.

The Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (ISS) is comprised of 24 items that are scored according to a 5-point Likert scale; nine items are reversed scored (Chen & Starosta, 2000; Chen, 1993). The ISS has five subscales: Interaction Engagement, Respect for Cultural Differences, Interaction Confidence, Interaction Enjoyment, and Interaction Effectiveness. Items include statements such as, “I enjoy interacting with people from different cultures,” “I respect the values of people from different cultures,” and “I am open-minded to people from different cultures.”

Authors Dong, Day, and Collaco (2008) found the 24-item scale had good internal consistency ($r = .88$). It demonstrated good concurrent validity with five related scales that measured intercultural communication and sensitivity. The scales were the 7-item Interaction
Attentiveness scale (Cegala, 1981), the 10-item Impression Rewarding Scale (Wheeless & Duran, 1982), the 10-item Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965), a 13-item Self-Monitoring Scale (Lennox & Wolfe, 1984) and a 14-item Perspective Taking Scale (Davis, 1996). Significant correlations ranged from $r = .17$ to $r = .52$. Chen (1993) developed the Intercultural Effectiveness Scale and Intercultural Communication Attitude Scales. The ISS had good predictive validity when correlated with these two scales.

**The Religious Commitment Inventory-10.** Worthington and colleagues (2003) developed the Religious Commitment Inventory-10 (RCI-10), a psychometrically sound 10-item measure of religious commitment constructed to be both a brief screening assessment of religious commitment and an ecumenical assessment of religious commitment (Richards & Bergin, 1997; see Appendix D). The coefficient alphas for the RCI-10 and subscales are reported as .93 for the full scale, .92 for Intrapersonal Religious Commitment, and .87 for Interpersonal Religious Commitment. The 3-week test–retest reliability coefficients for the full-scale RCI-10 instrument, the Intrapersonal Religious Commitment subscale, and Interpersonal Religious Commitment subscale are reported as .87, .86, and .83, respectively.

**Demographic Questionnaire.** Students also completed a demographic questionnaire that was developed by the author (see Appendix E). This questionnaire asked participants to describe their age, gender, ethnicity, current major, GPA, the trip they were going on, and the extent to which they had previously traveled outside the U.S. Students were also asked to report the number of days they used the internet. This author was interested to see if access to familiar information significantly impacted change in global and multicultural awareness.
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Results

Two hypotheses guided this research: (a) participants would report increased levels of multicultural and global awareness after their three-week international trip; and (b) Students with higher religious commitment would show more change in global and multicultural awareness.

Hypothesis 1

Global Awareness was operationalized as one being mindful of emerging world conditions, and able to appreciate the global impact of social, environmental, economic, and political changes. Global Competency Survey (GCS) measured global awareness in three subscales: (a) Substantive Knowledge, (b) Perceptual Understanding, and (c) Intercultural Communication. Using a repeated-measures paired samples t-test, there was no significance found among the scale means before and after the Juniors Abroad international trips. Scale means and t-test values are reported in Table 1.

Multicultural Awareness was operationalized as one’s ability to appreciate how another culture feels from the perspective of the insider (Stohl, 1996). The Intercultural Sensitivity Scale measured this construct with five subscales: (a) Interactive Engagement, (b) Respect for Cultural Differences, (c) Interaction Confidence, (d) Interaction Enjoyment, and (e) Interaction Attentiveness. A paired samples t-test revealed no significant differences between the two means
with one exception. Students reported having more interaction confidence ($M = 3.50$, $SD = .44$) than before the trip ($M = 3.17$, $SD = .52$, $t(21) = -2.26$, $p < .05$). See Table 1 for more details.

**Hypothesis 2**

Participants were separated into two categories based upon a 5-point Likert scale used on the RCI-10. Those with mean scores between 3.1 and 5.0 were considered high in religious commitment. Those with mean scores between 1.0 and 3.0 were considered low in religious commitment. It was hypothesized that those with higher religious commitment would show greater levels of global and multicultural awareness. A mixed model analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used, with pre and post scores as the within groups variable, and high or low religious commitment as the between groups variable. The hypothesis predicts an interaction effect, where with high religious commitment show more increased cultural and global awareness over time than those with low religious commitment. There were no significant interaction effects. See Table 2 for detailed results. The same was true between pre and post scores for each scale on the Global Competency Survey (GCS). There were no significant interactions between the above-mentioned scales, and scores on the Religious Commitment Inventory. See Table 3 for detailed results.

While this project examined interactions between levels of religious commitment and rates of change in global and multicultural awareness, participants were also asked how many days they accessed the Internet while on their trip. The mean amount of days was 6.2 ($SD = 4.14$). Internet use was measured using a Pearson Correlation statistic. There were no significant correlations between Internet use and student change in global and multicultural awareness. See Tables 4 and 5 for details.
### Table 1

**Descriptive Statistics for Global and Multicultural Awareness Before and After the Trips**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Pretest Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Posttest Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>T-test Value</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GCS Mean</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCS Subst. Knowledge</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>- .6</td>
<td>.530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCS Percept. Understanding</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>- .8</td>
<td>.709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCS Intercultural Communication</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISS Mean</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISS Interactive Engagement</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISS Respect for Cult. Differences</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISS Interaction Confidence</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISS Interaction Enjoyment</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISS Interaction Attentiveness</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>.271</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Significant was at the $p < .05$.*
Table 2

*Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (ISS) Scores Related to High and Low Religious Commitment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multicultural Awareness Scales</th>
<th>ISS Scale Scores, Before and After Trip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low RCI, Pretest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Intercultural Sensitivity</td>
<td>3.7 (0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction Engagement</td>
<td>3.9 (.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for Cultural Differences</td>
<td>4.1 (.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction Confidence</td>
<td>3.1 (.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction Enjoyment</td>
<td>3.0 (.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction Attentiveness</td>
<td>3.6 (.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* All mixed model ANOVAs had degrees of freedom of 1, 19. The low RCI group contained 12 respondents, and the high RCI group contained 9 respondents. None of the main effects or interaction effects was statistically significant.
Table 3

*Global Competency Survey (GCS) Scores Related to High and Low Religious Commitment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Awareness Scales</th>
<th>GCS Scale Scores, Before and After Trip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low RCI, Pretest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Global Awareness</td>
<td>3.5 (.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantive Knowledge</td>
<td>3.3 (.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptual Understanding</td>
<td>4.0 (.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Communication</td>
<td>3.5 (.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* All mixed model ANOVAs had degrees of freedom of 1, 19. The low RCI group contained 12 respondents, and the high RCI group contained 9 respondents. None of the main effects or interaction effects was statistically significant.

Table 4

*Correlations Between Internet use and Change in Global Awareness*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Competence Scale</th>
<th>GCS Total</th>
<th>Substantive Knowledge</th>
<th>Perceptual Understanding</th>
<th>Intercultural Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internet Use</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* None of these correlations are statistically significant at $p < .05$. 
### Correlations Between Internet use and Change in Multicultural Awareness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intercultural Sensitivity Scale</th>
<th>ISS Total</th>
<th>ISS Interactive Engagement</th>
<th>ISS Respect for Cultural Differences</th>
<th>ISS Interaction Confidence</th>
<th>ISS Interaction Enjoyment</th>
<th>ISS Interaction Attentiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internet Use</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* None of these correlations are statistically significant at $p < .05$. 
Chapter 4

Discussion

Within the past two decades, universities have designed and promoted study abroad programs as a large component of learning, specifically toward student global exposure (Vande Berg, 2004). Traditionally, study abroad ranged between 6 to 12 months or greater, and the students were expected to come away with a richer understanding of the host culture. Studies showed such trips yielded desired positive outcomes for the participants such as greater self-esteem and an overall awareness of themselves and the society they live in. Statistics show short term trips are on the rise. Nearly 90% of college students spend less than a semester abroad (Open Doors, 2005). Outcome research on short-term study trips varies with regard to trip efficacy. Some propose shorter trips can be just as effective as long-term trips. This was one of the proposed questions specific to the George Fox University Juniors Abroad program. Did students’ three-week experiences increase their global and multicultural awareness?

Summary of Findings

The primary interest of this study was to see if a three-week study abroad trip enhanced student global and multicultural awareness. This study suggested students experienced a statistically significant increase in their levels of interaction confidence. This idea is consistent with the afore mentioned studies that suggest short-term study abroad can increase students’ exposure to the world around them and enhance confidence as well as one’s appreciation for
diverse cultures (Chieffo & Griffiths, 2004; Glencross & Willis, 2009; Sindt & Pachmayer, 2007). However, there was no significant difference before and after the trip in other aspects of multicultural awareness such as being interactive with people from another culture, appreciating cultural differences, interaction enjoyment, and attentiveness to such interactions. The same was true for global awareness.

These are findings are interesting. In theory, according to available research, students should come away with a greater awareness of their environment and issues that impact it. In fact, students who travel abroad on their own volition, with formulated goals to experience another culture, come away with increased awareness of their own culture, identity, and global understanding (Kitsantas, 2004). Individuals that participated in the sample that was used all went of their own accord; one might conclude that they had a directed goal in mind; something that mediated or directed their desire to study abroad.

It is worth considering that students visit a foreign culture, but remain with peers who are not that different from themselves. Perhaps Glencross and Willis (2009) reported observation that short-term study abroad trips turn into “mini-Americas” was potentially accurate. Students who remain with their American peers do not experience the host culture fully.

On the other hand, this author questions if the locations where students traveled had large components of American culture synthesized within it. Clarke (2004) proposed that post-industrial business interactions between nations have created opportunity for cultures to create and engage in common interests. This has come about through political exchanges, economic investments, and diplomacy. While each country has their respective traditions, they are not
necessarily unique in and of themselves. With this in mind, there is reason to believe that it might not have been that difficult for students to experience a culture similar to their own.

In addition to this author’s interest in global and multicultural awareness change in student trips, the secondary interest involved religious commitment. Would those who were higher in religious commitment demonstrate an increase in global and multicultural awareness? The results are suggestive that religious commitment did not play a significant role. Increase in multicultural and global awareness was not significantly different in individuals who scored higher in religious commitment versus those who scored lower in religious commitment.

These findings were unexpected. Why no significant relationship was observed in the results of the study is not fully understood. However, there are some ideas worth considering.

Previous studies suggest religiosity was shown to be a significant factor that impacts mental and physical health, college adjustment, sexual practice, and body image (Francis et al., 2004; Harris et al., 2002; Low & Handal, 1995). With this in mind, this author wondered if having a preferred faith tradition and corresponding religious behaviors would be a significant mediator in experiencing more global and multicultural awareness. One might wonder if those who have higher levels of religious commitment would be more open to engaging with other people of different worldviews and personal experience.

This author recognizes that it is presumptuous to assume that persons of faith would automatically seek out new ways to experience peoples of other cultural traditions with a focused intent of developing a greater understanding of global issues and multicultural differences. However, because this particular sample came from a private institution that encourages growth according to a specific faith tradition, this author’s hypothesis came out of the idea that students
who participated in this program were both religious and open to diverse experiences with intent to grow in understanding of others.

On the other end of the spectrum, it is possible to think that individuals who participate in Juniors Abroad do so because they have experienced such positive experiences in the past that they keep participating. If that is the case, one might question if the repeat participants have developed a level of multicultural and global awareness already to the point that change would not be detected.

Taking a step back and looking at this study from a social psychology perspective, it is possible students over-reported their religious behaviors according to a social desirability bias. With items asking about one’s level of faith commitment, there could have been certain levels of discomfort if they did not answer in a positive way. Therefore it may have prompted students to respond in a more favorable manner easing that discomfort (Bradburn, Sudman, Blair & Stocking, 1978). Even though all students were informed prior to the survey that their responses were kept anonymous, it is possible participants ultimately responded according to what they perceived this researcher would expect to see.

**Measuring Global and Multicultural Awareness**

When considered how the constructs were measured, it is possible the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (ISS) was not the most appropriate measure for detecting increased multicultural awareness. The scale has demonstrated “strong reliability and appropriate concurrent and predictive validity (Chen & Starosta, 2000)” for measuring intercultural sensitivity. Past samples included college students and international counselors (Chen & Starosta, 2000; West, 2009). Each study only administered the scale to the subjects once
However, upon review, to date the scale has not been administered in a pre-test / post-test design. Therefore, future studies may consider using a different scale more sensitive to detecting change in short time periods.

On a practical level, in spite of statistically insignificant findings, one might question if the Juniors Abroad program is worth the time, money and energy that is invested into it. The literature shows students prefer study abroad trips during spring or summer breaks (Chieffo & Griffiths, 2004). However, is it possible this might compromise the goals of the program? Another consideration touched on in the above paragraphs is the possibility that some of the countries chosen for the program are not markedly different from American culture. As a result, students might not experience as much exposure to global and multicultural issues than their other peers.

**Study Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research**

Several study limitations arose, and the results are far from definitive. A primary limitation is academic coursework. For five months prior to the trips, students participated in classes that provided education specific to the host country. This complicates the findings; it is possible participants experienced an increase in global and multicultural awareness by simply completing the coursework infused within the Juniors Abroad program. This author did not collect data before the classes began. It is possible such data would have provided a “baseline,” or potentially a more accurate reflection of students’ existing global and multicultural awareness before the trip. This author cannot be certain to what degree the classes impacted student’s global and multicultural awareness.
Another limitation was the poor response rate resulting in a small sample and low statistical power. It is probable the results did not reflect significant interactions between religious commitment, global awareness, and cultural awareness that were actually there. Given the number of inferential tests used in this study, it is also possible the one significant finding between interaction confidence before and after the trip is not actually significant, but rather is reflective of a Type I error.

In regards to the response rate, it was likely attributable to the time this study was conducted. Data was collected approximately one week before the students’ departures. When the second round of data was collected, students were departing for summer break. Future research should take timing into consideration. There may be a better response rate if data collection is not taking place near or during a major school break (summer or spring break) or recognized holiday (Christmas, Easter, Thanksgiving, etc.). In addition to the time issue, this author did not offer any incentives for the subjects, which possibly impacted participation.

Another study limitation was the sample. The homogeneity of the participants prevents one from generalizing the findings of this study across other short-term study programs. This researcher used surveys for data collection. Other forms of data collection could be utilized to gather richer information such as using a control group, using focus groups, and conducting personal interviews. In order to understand if social desirability played a role in the data collection process, future researchers on this topic might consider using a scale or questionnaire to examine if this construct is present.

In regards to Internet use and change in global and multicultural awareness, it would be worthwhile to conduct a study using an experimental design. Having a control group could shed
light on whether or not students’ use of electronic devices and Internet access interacts with change in global and multicultural awareness.

In conclusion, this study demonstrated that global and multicultural awareness did not significantly increase over a three week period abroad among college students. The same was true among those that endorsed high or low religious commitment. There were a number of study limitations, however, this author sees these limitations as areas where more research can improve methods of contributing to an answer of religious commitment, and its impact on student global and multicultural awareness.
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Appendix A

Informed Consent
March 4, 2009

Dear George Fox University Juniors Abroad participants:

For my dissertation in the Clinical Psychology graduate program at George Fox, I am asking participants of the Juniors Abroad Program to answer several questions about their experience in the Juniors Abroad program. I would like to know the impact Juniors Abroad has on students’ intercultural and global awareness as a result of going on these trips. This survey will help directors of Juniors Abroad see how their program is beneficial to its participants.

This survey should only take about 10-15 minutes of your time, but it is important that you fill it out completely. You are being asked to complete this survey now, and again when you return from your trip in addition to the evaluation your program director asks you to complete.

Completing this survey will not affect your grade in the class. Although I would really like you to complete the survey, you may stop at any time without any negative consequences. Any answers on your survey will be grouped with other students’ answers to look for significant findings, and therefore none of your specific answers will be shared or connected with your identity.

In this survey you will be asked some questions about your feelings around different cultures outside of the U.S., and your familiarity with issues that impact the world. You will also be asked to provide basic demographic information, but not your name. By continuing with this online survey, you agree to participate in this research conducted to look at how Juniors Abroad impacts students and their awareness of the world around them.

If you have any questions about this survey, please contact Clark D. Campbell, PhD at 503-554-2375.
Appendix B
Global Competency Survey, Adapted Version
GLOBAL COMPETENCY SURVEY, Adapted Version
(retrieved from Olson & Kroeger, 2001)

Below are some items that describe global and intercultural opinions. Please rate each item according to the following scale:

1. Strongly Disagree
2. Moderately Disagree
3. Neither Agree Nor Disagree
4. Moderately Agree
5. Strongly Agree

1. I find people from other places exotic and unusual. ______
2. I feel uncomfortable when I am with people who are speaking a language I do not know. ______
3. I believe the world around me has become economically, environmentally, and politically interdependent. _____
4. I appreciate how people from other cultures are different from me. _____
5. I try to learn about people from other cultures so that we can work and socialize together. _____
6. I incorporate the attractive aspects of other cultures into my own way of doing things. _____
7. I have learned how to produce work with people from other places in the globe. _____
8. I have substantive knowledge about at least one other culture outside of the United States, and I apply this knowledge with confidence in my professional work. _____
9. I feel self-confident and comfortable socializing with people from other cultures. _____
10. I am linguistically and culturally competent in at least one language and culture other than my own. _____
11. I use a language other than my native language at least 25% of the time. _____
12. I am interested and spend considerable time working on global issues. _____
13. I am conscious of my own perspectives and culture. _____
14. I have lived abroad and experienced intense interaction with a variety of people from this other culture. _____
15. I have long-term friendships with several people from other cultures. _____
16. I am currently engaged in professional work with at least three people in other countries. _____
17. I want to continue to learn about the world’s peoples, cultures, and issues. _____
18. I question my own prejudices as well as all national and cultural stereotypes. _____
19. I have the ability to deal flexibly with and adjust to new people, places, and situations. _____
20. I have the ability to psychologically put myself into another person’s shoes. _____
21. I can act as a cultural mediator and serve as a bridge between people and different cultures. _____
22. I recognize that my worldview is not universal. _____
23. I have substantive competence in analyzing global issues and a working knowledge of concepts and methods that can describe, explain, and predict changes in global systems. _____
Appendix C

Intercultural Sensitivity Scale
Intercultural Sensitivity Scale

Below is a series of statements concerning intercultural communication. There are no right or wrong answers. Please work quickly and record your first impression by indicating the degree to which you agree or disagree with the statement. This scale should be completed before and after the spring academy. Please fill it in and send it right away.

Thank you for your cooperation.

5 = strongly agree
4 = agree
3 = uncertain
2 = disagree
1 = strongly disagree

Please put the number corresponding to your answer in the blank before the statement.

____ 1. I enjoy interacting with people from different cultures.
____ 2. I think people from other cultures are narrow-minded.
____ 3. I am pretty sure of myself in interacting with people from different cultures.
____ 4. I find it very hard to talk in front of people from different cultures.
____ 5. I always know what to say when interacting with people from different cultures.
____ 6. I can be as sociable as I want to be when interacting with people from different cultures.
____ 7. I don’t like to be with people from different cultures.
____ 8. I respect the values of people from different cultures.
____ 9. I get upset easily when interacting with people from different cultures.
____ 10. I feel confident when interacting with people from different cultures.
____ 11. I tend to wait before forming an impression of culturally-distinct counterparts.
____ 12. I often get discouraged when I am with people from different cultures.
____ 13. I am open-minded to people from different cultures.
____ 14. I am very observant when interacting with people from different cultures.
____ 15. I often feel useless when interacting with people from different cultures.
____ 16. I respect the ways people from different cultures behave.
17. I try to obtain as much information as I can when interacting with people from different cultures.
18. I would not accept the opinions of people from different cultures.
19. I am sensitive to my culturally-distinct counterpart’s subtle meanings during our interaction.
20. I think my culture is better than other cultures.
21. I often give positive responses to my culturally different counterpart during our interaction.
22. I avoid those situations where I will have to deal with culturally-distinct persons.
23. I often show my culturally-distinct counterpart my understanding through verbal or nonverbal cues.
24. I have a feeling of enjoyment towards differences between my culturally-distinct counterpart and me.
Appendix D

Religious Commitment Inventory-10
Religious Commitment Inventory-10

Please respond to each statement below according to the following descriptions:

1 = Not at all true of me
2 = Somewhat true of me
3 = Moderately true of me
4 = Mostly true of me
5 = Totally true of me

1. I often read books and magazines about my faith. ________
2. I make financial contributions to my religious organizations. ________
3. I spend time trying to grow in understanding of my faith. ________
4. Religion is especially important to me because it answers many questions about the meaning of life. ________
5. My religious beliefs lie behind my whole approach to life. ________
6. I enjoy spending time with others of my religious affiliation. ________
7. Religious beliefs influence all my dealings in life. ________
8. It is important to me to spend periods of time in private religious thought and reflection. ________
9. I enjoy working in the activities of my religious organization. ________
10. I keep well informed about my local religious group and have some influence in its decisions. ________
Appendix E

Demographic Questionnaire
Demographic Questionnaire

What is your age? ________

What is your gender? Female  Male

Which ethnicity best describes you?

Caucasian / European American

Hispanic

African American

Native American

Asian American

Bi-racial

Other ______________

What is your current GPA? ____________

What is your current Major? ____________________________________________

How Many Times have you traveled outside the U.S. before? ________________
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Curriculum Vitae
Curriculum Vitae

Melissa J. Stromberger, MA

Graduate Student of Clinical Psychology
414 N. Meridian Street
Box # V334
Newberg, Oregon 97132

Email: mstromberger06@georgefox.edu
Phone: (503) 507-7808

EDUCATION

2006 - present
Student in Doctorate of Clinical Psychology Program
Graduate Department of Clinical Psychology, APA Accredited
George Fox University, Newberg, OR

April 2008
George Fox University, Newberg, OR
Masters of Arts, Clinical Psychology

May 2004
Western Baptist College, Salem, OR
Bachelor of Science: Psychology

PRACTICUM TRAINING

2009-Present: Oregon State Hospital, Salem, Oregon
Provided individual therapy and comprehensive assessment for developmentally delayed patients found guilty by reason of insanity. Co-facilitated a DBT group with fellow psychology student and a licensed psychologist. Received 1 hour individual and group supervision with a licensed psychologist. Attended didactic trainings on various topics (e.g., risk assessment, cognitive / neuropsychological assessment, therapeutic interventions). Also participated in interdisciplinary treatment planning.

Training Coordinator: Carlene Schultz, Psy.D.
Primary Supervisor: Michael Kraemer, Psy.D.
Secondary Supervisor: Jason Quiring, Ph.D.

2008–2009 Portland State University Health and Counseling, Portland, Oregon
Conducted clinical interviews, comprehensive assessment for, and ruled out differential diagnoses for learning disabled traditional and non-traditional undergraduate students. Batteries included cognitive, academic, personality, neuropsychological and ADD / ADHD screening assessment tools. Wrote integrative reports and provided client feedback. Received 2 hours individual supervision, and 2 hours of group supervision weekly.
Supervisor: Karen Ledbetter, PsyD

2007-2008 Multnomah County Inverness Jail, Portland, OR
Role included providing individual and group therapy for pre-trial incarcerated adults. Participated in weekly multidisciplinary meetings. Received weekly 1 hour group and individual supervision.
Completing treatment planning with patient present, increased competence in differential diagnoses between co occurring disorders and Axis I / Axis II disorders.

**Primary Supervisor:** Stephen Huggins, Psy.D

**2006-2007 George Fox University Health & Counseling Center, Newberg, OR**

Provided simulated psychotherapy with undergraduate students; sessions were taped and reviewed with supervisor. Responsibilities included completing chart notes, diagnosis and treatment planning. Received 2 hours group and individual supervision weekly.

**Secondary Supervisor:** Tami Hoogestraat, MA  
**Primary Supervisor:** Clark Campbell, Ph.D

---

**ADDITIONAL PROFESSIONAL TRAINING**

**Outcome Measures, Reimbursement, and the Future of Psychotherapy**

Sponsored by Annual Northwest Assessment Conference  
June, 2010; Newberg, OR

**The Wechsler Memory Scale-4th Edition: Overview and Use**

Sponsored by Annual Northwest Assessment Conference  
James Holdnack, Ph.D.  
June, 2010; Newberg, OR

**Assessment of the PCL-R and PCL-SV**

Sponsored by Oregon State Hospital  
Gina M. Vincent, Ph.D.  
October, 2009; Salem, Oregon

**Annual Oregon Psychology Association Conference**

Sponsored by Oregon Psychological Association  
May, 2009; Eugene Oregon

**MMPI-2, Revised**

Sponsored by Annual Northwest Clinicians’ Conference  
Yossef S. Ben-Porath, Ph.D.  
June, 2009; Newberg, OR

**Mental Health In Corrections Conference**

Sponsored by The Professional School of Psychology at Forest Institute  
Paul Gendreau, OC, PhD / Pete Earley, Author
April, 2009; Kansas City, Missouri

**Annual American Psychological Association Conference**

Sponsored by American Psychological Association
August, 2008; Boston MA

a. **Parenting Stress in Incarcerated Men and Women**

Sponsored by American Psychological Association
Danielle Horvath Dallaire, Ph.D
August, 2008; Boston, MA

b. **Cognitive Assessment in Minorities**

Sponsored by American Psychological Association
August, 2008; Boston, MA

**The Bio-Psycho-Social Impact of Methamphetamines**

Sponsored by Oregon Psychological Association
May, 2007; Eugene, OR

**Motivational Interviewing**

Sponsored by Annual Northwest Clinicians’ Conference
William Miller, Ph.D.
October, 2006; Newberg, OR

**Behavior Support Planning in a Correction Population**

Sponsored by Oregon State Hospital
March, 2010; Salem, OR

---

**EMPLOYMENT**

2004-2006  **Specialized Instructional Assistant, Salem-Keizer School District**
Salem, Oregon

Worked as a one-on-one assistant for Junior High students with Autism Spectrum Disorder. Duties involved managing behaviors, curriculum development, and helping my assigned student complete school work utilizing a behavioral positive / negative reinforcement approach.

2002-2006  **Autism Trainer, Employer Leslie Pitchford, Ph.D., Salem, Oregon**

Worked as a one-on-one after school Applied Behavioral Analysis (ABA) trainer for a 16-year-old girl with Autism Spectrum Disorder. Duties involved using positive / negative reinforcement
schedules for behavior modification / management; completed designated homework and worked on social skills by going for outings within the community.

2002-2004  Office Assistant, Leslie Pitchford, Ph.D.
Worked as an office assistant in a private practice setting. Duties included transcribing and filing comprehensive reports.

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS

2006 to present: American Psychological Association, Student Affiliate
2007 to present: Oregon Psychological Association, Student Affiliate
2009 to present: International Association for Correctional and Forensic Psychology

VOLUNTEER EXPERIENCE

2005-2007  Senior Engagement, Salem Hospital, Salem, Oregon
Visited elderly patients with various forms of Dementia.

2004-2006  Committed to Kids Nutritional Support Group, Salem Rehabilitation Center, Salem, Oregon
Assisted a licensed clinical psychologist in weekly group therapy and behavior management for morbidly obese children and adolescents.
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2007-2010

Research Vertical Team
Attend bi-weekly research meetings comprised of team members from different cohorts. Roles include collaborative research and dissertation completion.

Proposed Dissertation: Short-term Study Abroad and Religious Commitment

Research Chair:
Clark Campbell, Ph.D., ABPP

Committee Members:
Mark McMinn, PhD
William Buhrow, Jr., PsyD