

Initial Steps Toward An Outcome Assessment of Overseas Programs: Measuring Student Development in the Hijiya Overseas Program & Experience

Damon E. Chapman

Abstract

This paper is the first step in the development of an effective means to assess learner development in overseas programs at Hijiya University (HOPE; the *Hijiya University Overseas Program and Experience*). To do that, this paper first summarizes the current HOPE programs, including goals and current requirements used for outcome “assessment.” Following that is a discussion of the merits of joining an overseas program. It is necessary to understand the goals of overseas programs in order to develop an effective measurement of learner outcome, which leads to a discussion of the need for an assessment program at Hijiya University. Next, standards of good practice for maintaining overseas programs are given, including possible areas for outcome assessment. Lastly, ideas are given as the first steps needed to develop learner outcome assessment of the HOPE programs.

Introduction

An overseas experience can be invaluable for university students. Universities across Japan, and indeed all over the globe, have developed and promoted overseas experiences for a variety of reasons because there are so many perceived benefits. Whether an institution sponsors an overseas program for interdisciplinary reasons (it is required as part of the curriculum), for second-language acquisition (or improving other specific skills that are part of a student’s personal growth), or for intercultural development (improving one’s intercultural understanding, awareness and/or finding “one’s place in the world”), overseas programs are widely seen as adding to a well-rounded higher education. There is little doubt that universities who sponsor overseas programs (regardless of their goal) do so because they see how important international experiences are for students who are about to enter the global society (cf. Braskamp & Engberg, 2011).

Research has shown that students who join an overseas program have improved academic performance at their home school, improved knowledge of cultural practices (of their host culture) and have overall higher rates of graduation when compared to students who do not join an overseas program (see Sutton & Rubin, 2004; Redden, 2010; GLOSSARI, 2010). Well-run overseas programs can have specific benefits for students in their educational and professional growth, including gains in intercultural understanding, improving language and intercultural communication skills, enhancing discipline-specific learning; and developing a greater tolerance for ambiguity (Tucker, Gullekson, &

McCambridge, 2011). Added to this list could be personal growth and development in the areas of leadership skills, self-confidence, “service orientation [and] maturity” (Lashbrooke, et al., 2002, cited in Tucker, Gullekson, & McCambridge, 2011).

Some of these results are encouraging, but instead of finding a wealth of research focusing on specific goals (cf. Tucker, et al., 2011), program results often measure very vague goals (e.g. such as program satisfaction or increases only in levels of *disciplinary* knowledge, etc.). Similar to the reasons given above for why overseas programs are so prevalent on campuses worldwide, the work being done on learner outcomes from living and studying overseas ranges from second-language learning and personal development, to intercultural growth and learners’ behavioral and attitudinal changes. While admirable, trying to assess such broad areas of learner outcome is daunting. The difficulty arises when schools want to know which *specific* skills or knowledge were acquired and/or improved as a result of the program. How is learner progress assessed? How do institutions of higher learning know the students are benefiting, especially outside of disciplinary learning (i.e. course work)? In which specific areas are such improvements measurable?

This paper should be considered a first step toward learner outcome assessment in current overseas programs being offered to students at Hijiya University. The goal of this paper, then, is to examine the current status of overseas programs, including the stated goals of the programs and how, if at all, learner progress is assessed. To begin, the paper will briefly review the current programs at Hijiya, their “stated” goals, as well as what students are expected to accomplish during or upon completion of the program (the “assessment”).

The HOPE Programs: An Overview

Hijiya University has been conducting overseas study programs for several years. Since 2010, these overseas programs have been under the name *HOPE*, which stands for the Hijiya Overseas Program and Experience (比治山大学海外留学プログラム). Those programs are summarized here (and it should be noted that the titles given below are translations of the Japanese-language program titles). In order for outcome assessment to be developed, it is also important to understand the goals of each program. This summary is not meant to be exhaustive, but does give the reader an idea of the objectives of each program. (Goals given here are taken from written HOPE promotional materials, the student handbook for overseas programs and/or the memorandum of understanding between Hijiya University and the host institution.)

Exchange Programs (交換留学) (6-12 months)

Inje University, Gimhae City, Korea

Stated goal(s): *To understand the culture of Korea through first-hand experience, including intensive Korean-language studies; to better understand foreign cultures in general; to compare Japanese culture with foreign culture (s) and to see how Japanese culture is viewed by other countries.*

University of Hawaii, Hilo (UHH), Hawaii, U.S.A.

Stated goal(s): *To understand the culture of Hawaii through first-hand experience, including intensive English-language studies; to better understand foreign cultures in general; to compare Japanese culture with foreign culture (s) and to see how Japanese culture is viewed by other countries.*

Australian Catholic University (ACU) (Multiple Locations in Australia)

Stated goal(s): *To understand the culture of Australia through first-hand experience, including intensive English-language studies; to better understand foreign cultures in general; to compare Japanese culture with foreign culture(s) and to see how Japanese culture is viewed by other countries.*

Overseas “Training” Programs (研修プログラム) (2-3 weeks)

Sydney University,* Sydney, Australia (*Two programs are held at this institution)

The Language Immersion Program

Stated goal(s): *To improve intercultural understanding; to understand how Japanese culture is perceived abroad; and to support Australian students in their studies of Japanese-as-a-second-language.*

The International House Program

Stated goal(s): *To learn about the history, culture and society of Australia from the perspective of multiculturalism and cultural diversity, plus improve basic English-language and communicative skills.*

Short-Term “Training” Programs (短期研修) (3-4 weeks)

Udayana University, Denpasar, Bali, Indonesia (The Japanese Language & Cultural Exchange Program)

Stated goal(s): *To learn the importance and benefits of overseas experience; to learn the unique culture, traditions and values of the island of Bali, and Indonesia as a whole; to support Indonesian students and help them improve Japanese language skills; to introduce Japanese culture to Indonesian students; and to improve communication skills.*

Australian Catholic University (Multiple Locations in Australia)

Stated goal(s): *Gain basic knowledge of the culture and history of Australia; to practice basic English-language skills; and through different experiences, to develop a cross-cultural understanding.*

Caledon Language House, Edinburgh, Scotland, U.K.

Stated goal(s): *To improve English skills and deepen intercultural understanding, including Scottish and British life.*

Short Cultural “Experience” (文化交流 / 文化体験) (9 days)

This is called the “Summer Abroad” or “プチ留学 Program,” and the host school changes each year, as noted:

Singapore	2009 & 2013	National University of Singapore
Indonesia	2010	Udayana University, Denpasar, Bali
Thailand	2011	Ayutthaya University, Ayutthaya
Vietnam	2012	Sakura Japanese Language School, Ho Chi Minh

Stated goal(s): *Students get an introduction to overseas life, including use of a second-language and highlights from a foreign culture.* This short program strives to be the “first step” in increasing student awareness of foreign cultures so that after they join this short program, they may join other, longer, programs during their stay at Hijiya.

Note: It should be added that there is a 2-week program given by the Hijiya University Junior College only to students in the Department of Fine Art. In this program, junior college students go to Italy to study the art of the Italian Renaissance (イタリア ルネッサンス美術研修). Because this is a Junior College program it is not included in this research paper.

Given the stated, although brief, goals Hijiya currently defines for its overseas programs, the reader would not be mistaken to wonder that with such vague goals, how can learner outcomes from

such goals be assessed? It is a valid concern. To improve upon assessing learner outcomes, the current “assessment” system of HOPE participants is summarized.

Current Learner Assessment of the HOPE Programs

At present, there are only minimal requirements that must be fulfilled by participants in the HOPE programs. This does not include teacher evaluations for individual courses taken abroad. Evaluations of individual courses within the overseas program are class grades, embedded in the curriculum requirements, and are not considered part of the *overall* outcome assessment. For long-term programs that offer class credit within the Hijiyma curriculum (where students transfer credits from those 6 or 12-month programs at UHH, Inje or ACU into their equivalent courses at Hijiyma), students do three things: 1) hand in a “midterm” report roughly halfway into their overseas program (中間レポート; in English for students at UHH and ACU, in Japanese for students at Inje); post-program, 2) write a 1-page report (短期研修レポート) in Japanese expressing their overseas experiences; and 3) fill out the “participant survey” (参加者アンケート) related to the program.

For students in the summer “training” programs, which also grant course credit and are taken as a regular course (e.g. the Indonesia program, taken as異文化間コミュニケーションI, or ACU and Scotland summer “training” programs taken as異文化間コミュニケーションII), students only 1) write a 1-page report (短期研修レポート) in Japanese expressing their overseas experiences; and 2) fill out the “participant survey” (参加者アンケート) related to the program, both of which occur post-program. For students joining non-credit overseas programs (the “Summer Abroad” Program, a.k.a. プチ留学プログラム) and the Sydney University programs, only the “participant survey” (参加者アンケート) is required.

From this current learner outcome assessment, and the previously described goals of HOPE, two things become very clear: 1) the stated goals as they are now are so vague that finding any means to accurately and effectively assess specific, non-disciplinary learner outcome is difficult; and 2) with the minimal assessment program currently being used, it is hard to “measure” anything from participants other than, perhaps, how much they enjoyed themselves. There are no systematic ways to measure growth in second-language acquisition or in the areas of intercultural learning. The only thing in the current system that “measures” what students learned overseas are interdisciplinary (grades students receive for satisfactorily completing a course within the overseas curriculum). That may be standard and effective for measuring learner outcome in *one class*, but it does not apply to overall learner outcome from the program as a whole. Interdisciplinary learning is only one facet of the broader program.

Given this state of affairs, there is clearly a need for a specific and well-defined assessment program for learner outcomes from HOPE programs. Any assessment program must come from the goals of the program (what can students expect to learn from the program?). But where the goals are vague, it may help to understand why people join and what perceived merits come from such programs in the first place. Reasons for joining and the potential benefits of overseas programs are summarized next.

Let's Study Abroad! Reasons for and Benefits of Joining Overseas Programs

Joining an overseas experience can help a student grow not only personally and intellectually, but professionally as well. At the most basic level, a student who joins a short term program should be able to: a) appreciate people from different backgrounds, and b) function effectively in a new environment or culture (such as in the プチ program or short summer programs). Students who join longer programs (6-month and/or 1-year programs), should benefit from those experiences as well as be able to c) show an improved ability to communicate with people from other ethnic, cultural and/or linguistic backgrounds; d) show an increase in the cultural knowledge or awareness of the host society (e.g. social customs and practices, traditions, what makes the culture unique); and e) describe the basic social aspects of the host country (e.g. the type of government, various ethnic groups that exists, the main religion(s), etc.). But summarizing the merits of overseas study programs so briefly does a disservice to the experience. There can be so much more to a well-run program that adds invaluable experience to the students' education.

Research on the perceived merits of overseas programs is abundant. Some authors have summarized the top three reasons for why students choose to go abroad as 1) to experience another country/culture; 2) to travel, and 3) for personal growth (Berdan, Goodman, & Taylor, 2013), with "secondary" reasons being learning another language and doing it to increase job opportunities. Steinberg (2007) notes that there are five general categories of benefits that may come from student experiences abroad: a) make progress in school and one's intellectual development; b) changes in one's overall perspective, including personal attitudes and beliefs; c) development of specific skills such as a second-language, intercultural communication, etc.; d) get a better appreciation of one's home culture and society and its place in the global community, and e) increase job/career opportunities. Using this categorization as a basis, below is a discussion of how students can improve their overall educational experience by studying overseas. This discussion is given as a step toward a better clarification of the goals in overseas programs such as HOPE. Through clearly defined goals it is hoped a better learner assessment can be established.

Changes in Personal Growth, Attitudes and Cultural Awareness

Research has suggested over and over again that students who join overseas programs report a higher level of independence and more personal confidence in their abilities. Students also report that not only did their academic skills improve, but they gained a new "intellectual energy" and "a more sophisticated view of the world" (cf. Bolen, 2007; Braskamp, Braskamp, & Merrill, 2009; Paige, 2010;). They also have an improved knowledge of cultural practices (Redden, 2010). Learning about differences between cultures means more than spotting the most visible differences of a culture outside of Japan, such as language, food, fashion or music. It means knowing the deeper aspects of people in that culture, their family values, their personal beliefs or even religion, among other things.

A person's culture is based on so much, including personal and family history, social customs and values. Students who can experience these various cultural differences first-hand can have a much deeper understanding than if they simply learn those differences through a classroom presentation. Students come home from overseas with a more informed and much less biased viewpoint toward other cultures and peoples, with new ideas and perspectives about themselves and their own country. Being abroad can challenge them to rethink what is important for them, and, possibly, nudge them to look

again at their own values. Such a reevaluation can encourage students to strengthen those values or, for other students, it may cause them to change and start living by new concepts and perceptions they acquired from their experience abroad. In short, an overseas experience gives people the chance to see their own culture through a changed set of eyes, and it can be profound.

Joining an overseas program can help a student become “a global citizen.” That means being interconnected with the world outside Japan through real, face-to-face interactions (not simply chatting online with someone who lives abroad!). To experience life abroad (even for brief periods) is to improve one’s “global competence,” also called intercultural competence. Intercultural competence, simply stated, can be understood as the enhancement of appreciation of differences among cultures (Anderson, Lawton, Rexeisen & Hubbard, 2006), and this is best done while immersed in the host country.

In the overseas classroom, students study and experience a wide area of subjects in depth and from different cultural perspectives. Outside the classroom, student’s personal education is enhanced through daily interactions with host country members on campus, in the host family or with roommates (in a dorm or apartment) and with others in the local community. In this sense, the benefit comes from students’ ability to understand one’s self *within* the socio-cultural context of the host country. That also means they can demonstrate “a commitment to social responsibility” in the global community (Marquette University, 2013). Students should know that part of his/her role abroad is as a representative of Japan and what they do can give people in the host country impressions (both positive and negative) of Japanese culture and society. As a student abroad, then, s/he is a kind of “ambassador” for Japan. Salisbury (2012) describes this feature of an overseas program as something that helps increase student “self-awareness and strengthen a commitment to civic engagement.” Similarly, upon return home to Japan, the student can bring back ideas about how non-Japanese see their country in the world community. This has been described as “seeing my culture and country from the outside.” All of these factors can positively affect personal growth and cultural awareness.

Development of Specific Skills

As a university-sponsored program, very often the first reason students give for joining HOPE is to learn or improve a second language (usually English, but Korean is the target language at Inje University). If students want to speak a second language, being immersed in a culture that speaks it is invaluable. Students are surrounded by the target language daily! Learning a language under these circumstances is ideal, since in order to accurately use a second language, it must be used. Doing that within Japan is very limited, yet when living abroad there is total and complete immersion in the target language. This immersion can lean to different objectives, one as clear cut as the goal of an increased TOEIC score (for ESL students), or on a more pragmatic level, the goal for communicative fluency in daily life. But there are other personal skills that can be honed while abroad besides language. Living and studying abroad helps students discover new strengths and abilities they did not know they had. They can learn to accept new and difficult challenges and solve new problems. By experiencing situations (and other languages) unfamiliar to them, they increase their ability to adapt and respond successfully. One way to describe living abroad is “negotiating a new culture” (cf. Anderson, et al., 2006). Doing this while abroad helps students learn about themselves, their potential and their limitations. Examples of such personal skills include increased self-confidence and motivation, presentation skills, improved critical thinking and problem solving, among others.

Related to these skills is the ability to understand and practice intercultural communication. People need the skills to interact between and within multiple cultures, including the ability to analyze social issues. What happens in Japan does not only affect life here in Japan, but can affect the world as well! Similarly, what happens in Australia, Europe or the U.S. can affect life in Japan. Students must know this and going abroad to see how their own country fits into the global society is an excellent way to improve students' understanding and grasp of this reality. It should be noted that this ability to practice intercultural *communication* is different from having an increased understanding of a foreign culture (intercultural *awareness*, noted earlier). The former requires the ability to learn and practice communicative abilities *within* the host culture. The latter requires learning more *about* and being *aware* of the host culture (and its place within the global community). Intercultural communication is not the same as intercultural awareness and competence, but is one part of it.

Increase Career Opportunities

From the perspective of a potential employer, a student who has studied abroad has more self-motivation, is more independent and open to new challenges, and able to cope with diverse problems and situations. The experience of living and studying in a foreign country can set someone apart from the other job applicants. There are many different skills that students gain from overseas experiences which employers find desirable: teamwork, critical thinking and problem solving, adaptability, motivation and leadership, creativity, presentation skills and self-confidence (not only in a second language, but in group discussions and presentations, etc.).

If none of these reasons explain why some students choose an overseas program, the simplest reason may be travel. For students interested in travel but can't do it on their own, study abroad programs may be the students' only means of getting overseas. Yes, they are expected to participate in the academic aspects of a program but outside of class time, students are encouraged to visit local places of historical and cultural interest. Often, such excursions are planned and included in the program curriculum. But if not, students have weekends and break times free to explore nearby areas of interest. That may be the simplest reason of all.

Regardless of the reasons students get interested in overseas programs, getting students to join is the first hurdle. Joining an overseas program can often be preceded by a lengthy planning process. There are numerous factors that affect a student's decision to join an overseas program ranging from financial ("Do I have enough money?") to academic ("Will I get credit for the program?" or "Will my second language ability improve?") as well as attitudinal ("What's in it for me?") and situational factors ("Will my parents let me go? Will I miss classes and therefore be unable to graduate in four years, as planned?"). Where time and money are key factors, short programs are often the best solution. Short-term programs greatly expand study abroad participation "by attracting students from groups that are less likely to study abroad for a semester or full year, whether for financial, academic or personal reasons" (*The Forum on Education Abroad*, 2009, p.1). Joining a HOPE program within the first year at Hijiya can affect whether or not students go abroad in later years. Research has suggested that the "amount of diverse and integrative learning experiences" that a student has within the first year of college has a big impact on whether or not s/he joins a program later on (Salisbury, 2012). To help influence a freshman's thinking, the プチ留学 program (mentioned earlier) was first implemented in 2009 (in Singapore). One of the main reasons for originating that program was to increase students initial interest in going overseas so that, in later years of their

academic career, they may join a longer program. Being the shortest program in length, the プチ program is also the cheapest in terms of cost. “Well designed short-term programs can have a profound impact on participants and may provide students with an initial experience that encourages them to consider future study or work overseas” (*The Forum on Education Abroad*, 2009, p.2).

Regardless of whether a student joins a short or long program, the experience adds to a student's credibility as a member of the global community. There is little doubt of the need for people who have experience outside their home country. Whether it is due to globalization and an interconnected global economy for future business leaders and politicians, or the increased ease with which we can communicate with people in other countries, making increased intercultural communication and/or awareness more important, students need overseas experience! As Salisbury (2012) notes, there is a long and “growing list of economic, environmental and technological challenges [that] underscore our need for a more globally savvy and culturally interconnected” student body. Having a well-run overseas program, then, is of vital importance to Hijiya. Clearly there are numerous perceived benefits to joining an overseas program, yet how do we know what students gain from such programs? Tucker, Gullekson and McCambridge (2011) note that “assessment of learning in study abroad programs lags in consistent research on student growth and effectiveness.” So a simple question is posed: what are students getting out of it? To answer that, a program must have the means to assess learner outcome.

The Need for HOPE Assessment

As noted earlier, there are very minimal requirements that students must meet upon completing the current HOPE programs. The goals of HOPE programs are vague and varied, so specifying which ones to assess is only the beginning. We need to know much more about “what learning outcomes can realistically be expected from study abroad” students (Salisbury, 2012). This paper aims to help do just that through the implementation of an outcome assessment program for the HOPE program. Many academics have said that “the ideal way to gain crucial cross-cultural skills” is to join an overseas program, but finding evidence of how these programs benefit students is hard to come by (Salisbury, 2012). Here at Hijiya University, there has been little follow-up with students after they come home from an overseas program. A successful and well-run overseas program should have standards in place that allow the institution “to assess and improve programs by ensuring that they include those essential elements that will maximize students' learning and personal development” (*The Forum on Education Abroad*, 2009, p.2).

There are also pragmatic reasons for having an assessment system. Joining an overseas program, even a short one, is not cheap. So as in any “investment,” which is how many parents and students see the money spent on such a program, the “investor” wants to know what to expect from that investment. News stories in the popular press have also called for institutions of higher learning to be more accountable and to specify how they measure the outcome of such programs (see Cruz, 2010). This pragmatic reason for having better learner assessment relates to the parents. If they seek more information from the institution about what goals and outcomes were achieved via a program, data based on outcome assessment can prove what occurred in their student's experience. As Deardorff (2007) confirms, assessment data “provide documentation, beyond anecdotes” of the value of learner

outcomes of overseas programs (p. 223). Administrators of overseas programs must develop and maintain their programs in order to “maximize student learning opportunities and make every moment count” (*The Forum on Education Abroad*, 2009, p.2), and having an assessment of the students’ learning outcome is part of this.

The goal of this proposal is to focus on the learner progress and advances made while abroad. Yet, the area in which that progress is made can be different for each individual who goes abroad! Some students will significantly improve their second-language ability (“I can understand English so much better after six months in Hawaii”). Others may come home with improved self-confidence and an increased sense of independence or self-sustainability (“I can take care of myself now”) with no connection to the language or culture of the host country they experienced. In short, not all programs will produce the same results for all students. So how to make an effective overseas program with appropriate and accurate learner outcome assessment? Research has offered specific steps that must be addressed when doing just that. They are referred to as “standards of good practice,” and they are briefly introduced here.

Standards of Good Practice for Short-Term Education Abroad Programs

Under research on the standards for overseas programs, nine areas have been clarified which can help any short-term program improve both its management and measurement of student outcomes. The standards described below have been catered to Hijiyyama University HOPE Programs. Where the information is not applicable, such as when it refers to work abroad programs, which Hijiyyama University does not currently offer, it has been omitted. (This information was summarized from *The Forum on Education Abroad*, 2009, pp. 3-9. It should also be noted that “short term” means any program 8 weeks or shorter in length, though this author believes these standards can also be applied to 6- or 12-month HOPE programs.) In order to ensure the success of short-term overseas programs, these steps should be taken:

Mission, Objectives and Purpose Must be Defined: The HOPE program should 1) make sure the overseas program is held in accordance with the overall mission and policies of Hijiyyama University; 2) should have a clearly-stated purpose with defined academic goals; and 3) the emphasis of the program must be “appropriate” to the site chosen (the host institution). Asking if the program is aimed at intercultural awareness or second-language acquisition is one first question that can be asked, which leads to the next standard.

Student Learning and Development Goals Must be Clear: Each individual HOPE program should clearly state its educational purpose for “fostering student learning and development.” This means giving specific goals that students are aware of in order to grow in these areas:

Student Development: Students must have ample chances at personal development, including leadership skills, maturity, cultural awareness, etc.

Learning Outcomes: The program must have “discipline-specific and/or interdisciplinary learning outcomes” that are tailored to the curriculum at Hijiyyama as well as the site (host school) itself. For example, in Scotland, Hijiyyama students have several excursions that take them to culturally and historically significant sites in the country. Similarly, in Indonesia, there are 4-5 excursions a week that highlight the significant cultural and social norms that make Indonesian (and Balinese) society and

culture unique. Learning outcomes in these cases could take the simplest form of a quiz after the excursion is completed, or a required written report where the students summarize what they feel they learned from that situation/excursion. Regardless of the form of the outcome, it is something the students will know they have learned because the outcome is “measured” (see *Student Assessment* below). But this learning outcome only relates to the discipline.

Language and Intercultural Development: With the possible exception of the “Summer Abroad” Program (プチ留学), and Sydney University programs, all HOPE programs have a strong emphasis on language learning. Inclusive in these language classes is how a culture uses its language, leading to intercultural development based on the mission of the program (Korean language and culture at Inje, English and/or Hawaiian language and culture at UHH; Indonesian and/or Balinese language culture at Udayana University, etc.)

Intrapersonal Development (emphasis added by the author): This is the idea that an overseas program influences the student in such a way that s/he is “changed from the inside.” Maybe his/her worldview has been affected, or s/he sees Japan from a new perspective having “seen it from outside” Japan’s borders. Regardless of the hoped-for change, students should have “opportunities for reflection during and after the experience” based on the changes within themselves.

Environmental and Cultural Responsibility: All HOPE programs must be managed in a way that increases awareness of and minimizes any “harmful individual and program-related environmental and social-cultural impacts.”

Student Assessment: Based on clear learning outcomes, overall student experiences both in and out of the classroom must be assessed. Research has suggested that this be done upon completion of the program, but this paper suggests assessment both during and after the program’s conclusion. This is the area most lacking in the HOPE programs at present. With the exception of assessment by teachers in for-credit courses (at UHH, Inje and ACU), no direct student assessment is done for Hijiya students. Noted earlier, only short written “self assessment” reports (中間レポート, 短期研修レポート) highlighting student experiences, as well as a brief standardized “participant survey” (参加者アンケート) are required by the Student Affairs office.

Academic Framework Must be Clear: Applicable to HOPE programs offering course credit toward a degree, Hijiya should have clearly stated (and public) policies on all academic matters related to the programs. This includes *academic credit* (and how it is awarded and evaluated at Hijiya); *program length*, the program’s integration into the *overall curriculum*; any type of *field study* (based on learning experiences at *host* locations); internships (these should have appropriate supervision both at Hijiya and the host institution); and any *on-site advising*. For the most part, academic frameworks have had few problems in the past due to the interdisciplinary requirements of the for-credit HOPE programs. In cases where there are no formal classes to take (e.g. プチ留学 Program), there is no need for clarification of the academic framework.

Define A Non-Academic (“Out of Class”) Framework: Since all overseas programs involve travel within the host country, policies on non-academic matters must be clarified. Organizers of travel excursions in the host country must consider how many different places students visit and for how long. It is not how many places students see, but the quality of time spent there. The emphasis should be on in-depth experiences at each site instead of visiting multiple sites with only short amounts of time at each site. That is, organizers should justify the amount of travel proposed.

Prepare Students for the Learning Environment Abroad: All HOPE programs should offer students advice and orientation based on the needs of students. Such preparation must include pre-departure orientation; on-going orientation during the program (i.e. adjustment issues, etc.); both academic and non-academic advising before and during the overseas stay; and student support upon returning home, when needed.

Clarify Student Selection and Code of Conduct: The HOPE program must maintain a “commitment to fair and appropriate policies regarding student selection and conduct” (*The Forum on Education Abroad*, 2009, p. 6). This includes a transparent and fair student selection process; a process that is diverse and affordable; maintaining a code of conduct (which all students are aware of and which explains disciplinary action for violations) before and during the program; as well as staff enforcement of disciplinary issues.

Have Strong Organizational Resources in Place: The HOPE program should have adequate financial and personnel resources, including: on-site administrative personnel with the qualifications and knowledge needed to ensure its success, including non-academic advising of students; and academic personnel (to support learning both in and out of the classroom). All personnel should know what steps should be taken when problems arise (“protocols”). Guidelines should be established for communication between the host and the home institution. The home institution must guarantee the financial resources needed, accommodation of “special needs” students, safe and clean student housing (and housing orientation), awareness of the environmental and cultural responsibility, and, lastly, an assessment of personnel and finances *after* completion, to improve future programs.

Strive for Health, Safety, and Security: Any program must maintain effective health, safety, security and risk management policies, including faculty/staff training. This includes the safety and health of participants (prior to and during the program); knowledge of local resources in the host country; maintaining necessary insurance; organizing risk management and emergency communications (tested at regular times); having preparation for both student emergencies and group emergencies with all students and on-site staff aware of these procedures; and, lastly, an assessment of these procedures after each program so improvements are made.

Operate with Ethics and Integrity: The program should be organized based on ethical principles and practices. This includes the program operation and staff (who advise students in a responsible way); practicing cultural sensitivity; avoiding conflicts of interests; following all applicable local and host country laws; and marketing the program to students accurately and in good faith.

The ideas given here are those needed from all perspectives of the institution: what is best for students, for administrative staff, for the instructors and for upper management. Many of these necessary steps are things that must be done outside of the realm of teachers and students. While this information is clearly important for the overall management of a program, this researcher is focused on learner outcome assessment, or knowing what progress learners made. Given that, the most important “standards of good practice” for this research can be summarized as follows: 1) mission, objectives and purpose must be defined; 2) student learning and development objectives should be developed; and both 3) academic and 4) non-academic frameworks must be in place. When these standards are in place, the next question can be addressed: how will learner outcomes be assessed?

Areas of Learner Outcome Assessment

Students have many reasons for going abroad, yet it is the goals of the program that lead to the targeted area of assessment. Having many varied goals, then, makes accurate assessment that much more challenging. Well-documented research (cf. Bolen, 2007; Deardorff, Pysarchik, & Yun, 2009) has offered ideas where outcome assessment of students can be done after they return from an overseas excursion. They are summarized here:

Disciplinary Knowledge: Can students synthesize academic/disciplinary concepts with real world phenomena? Did they improve critical thinking skills? Do they now have an international perspective of their career or discipline?

Social and Emotional Growth: Did they build independence and self-confidence? Were they able to develop self-awareness, empathy and an increased tolerance for ambiguity?

Increased Global Awareness: Did students develop or increase their awareness of the social, political and economic situation of the host community? Are they more aware of social issues outside their home culture? Do they now have an increased tolerance for living in places geographically different from Japan?

Improved Cultural Consciousness: Do they better understand the general concept of culture, as well as an improved understanding of their own culture? Do they know their own cultural perspective (who am I in the world)? Did they engage in “diverse expressions” of culture and belief while abroad? Did they practice international goodwill and global citizenship? Lastly, did they adapt effectively to cross-cultural settings while abroad?

Language Learning: Did they improve second-language competency in all areas: speaking, listening, reading as well as writing? Did students interact with others in the target language, and understand the importance of language in the host society?

Lifelong Learning (post-program) : Once home, will they aim for continuous learning? Did they seek out international opportunities after coming back to Japan and, once settled back home, did they put to use the knowledge gleaned from abroad? How?

Engagement: Can students better express a basic understanding of the different world-view of the host culture on a variety of social issues? Do they know and can they explain what it means “to be the other, to be a stranger in a strange land?” Can they demonstrate a better tolerance and respect for the cultural differences between Japan and the cultural values of the host culture?

These questions are daunting. While each and every one of them is worthy of valiant efforts, it would be impossible to measure a students’ progress in all of these areas. This author does not believe that is the intention of Bolen (2007). It is the idea of this author that the institution matches its program goals with the desired outcomes, such as those suggested above. Simplifying the domains that can be assessed even further is one step toward doing that.

Evidence of Learner Outcome: Interdisciplinary, *Intrapersonal* or *Interpersonal* Development?

As the above discussion shows, there are many different ways to approach learner outcome assessment. On a simple level, one could look at two approaches: interdisciplinary (course based content, on-campus work, etc.) or intercultural learning outcomes (measuring functional knowledge of

cultural practices, usage of intercultural communication, etc.). But that approach does not take into account personal growth. Braskamp, Braskamp and Merrill (2009) did research on three domains of developmental processes that may be assessed: cognitive (awareness of and an increase in knowledge), *intrapersonal* (identity, attitudes, etc.) and interpersonal (skills and social responsibility). Specifically, the cognitive domain focuses on one's "knowledge and understanding of what is true and important to know." The *intrapersonal* domain is centered on one becoming "more aware of and integrating one's personal values and self-identity into one's personhood" and how one becomes "more self-aware of one's strengths, values, and personal characteristics." The third domain, the interpersonal one, is about a student's "willingness to interact with persons with different social norms and cultural backgrounds, acceptance of others, and being comfortable when relating to others" (Braskamp, Braskamp, & Merrill, 2009, pp. 105-106).

To test these ideas, they wanted to learn how students' self-reports in these three areas changed over the course of a six-month period abroad. Results of data analysis from 245 American university students (spring semester) showed gains in how students viewed themselves differently after their time abroad in all three domains. For example, their level of self-confidence improved (*intrapersonal* domain), as well as how they see their relationships with others, being more comfortable with people not like them, and they reported an increased sense of social responsibility toward others (all *interpersonal* factors). The greatest gains in student self-reports (post-program) came in the cognitive domain, specifically knowledge of international affairs and cultural understanding. Overall, research based on data in this study from host institutions across several countries showed students had clear and measurable progress in their knowledge of foreign culture(s), their sense of self as well as their overall relationships with others while abroad (Braskamp, Braskamp, & Merrill, 2009, p. 111; also see Braskamp, Braskamp, Merrill, & Engberg, 2012).

Using three domains as this research did is just one perspective that can be taken when doing student outcome assessment. The options for evaluating outcomes are many and varied. There are numerous surveys and methodologies available that have had success in evaluating learner outcomes. The trouble with this body of research is the lack of "*consistent* [emphasis added] research on the outcomes of such programs on both student growth and the effectiveness of the programs in meeting stated learning objectives" (Tucker, Gullekson, & McCambridge, 2011, p. 2). The reason for little *consistent* research is that there are so many programs with so many different goals that a "one-size-fits-all" assessment tool is nearly impossible. So choosing the best assessment tool(s) is one, if not the most, important step in creating a successful assessment program. This paper now offers suggestions for how that could be done in the Hijiya University HOPE programs.

"Hoping" for an Effective Assessment of Learner Outcome in HOPE Programs

Based on the previous discussion, this paper believes there are simple steps any overseas program must take if learner outcome is to be successfully measured: 1) make specific statements that describe what the learner is expected to learn; 2) find (or develop) the most appropriate measuring tools to do the assessment; 3) cater the programs to meet the proposed outcomes; and 4) use the resulting assessment to improve learner outcomes. In line with these steps, this researcher makes the following four suggestions for assessing the HOPE programs.

Step 1: Make Clear, Well-Defined Goals and Learning Objectives for All HOPE Programs

One problem with having so many differing objectives across so many programs is that some programs don't even have the goals clarified. That is, on what objectives of a program is assessment done? If the goals and objectives are unclear, assessing them is nearly impossible. So step 1 in this proposal is to make the goals and objectives of each individual HOPE program clear and delineated. Inherent within the stated goals of each individual program must be the specific experiences and "assignments" given to participants of that program (cognitive outcomes). Are the goals of the program academic (e.g. improved second-language comprehension or communicative ability), or more intercultural (e.g. an increase in the level of intercultural understanding or global awareness, such as his/her place in the world or how Japan is viewed in the larger world)? Or perhaps the goals are based on personal growth (e.g. such as improved self-confidence, tolerance, etc.). Research supports this seemingly obvious step. According to Tucker, Gullekson and McCambridge, "the effectiveness of study abroad programs would be better evaluated if clearly-stated program objectives were identified and assessed" (2011, p. 4). Other research by Black and Duhon (2006) done on students from Britain who joined a summer overseas program set specific objectives for students, saying that they would "become 1) more cross-culturally tolerant and empathetic, and 2) more self-confident and independent (p. 141). Using measures that focused on cross-cultural tolerance and personal growth, results showed increases in cultural awareness and personal growth.

Regardless of the goals strived for, they must be student-centered and they must be defined. This researcher hopes one aspect of assessment is done in ALL programs regardless of the target language and class content: intercultural learning. If Hijiya is to call itself a member of the global community, then measuring how our students benefit from excursions into that community can only help us realize the benefits of all current and future HOPE programs. This paper suggests that program assessment focus on intercultural learning outcomes as opposed to interdisciplinary (course-based content such as ESL, etc.). Research by Braskamp, Braskamp and Merrill (2009) on the three domains of developmental processes (described earlier) is a good place to start. This researcher suggests measuring *interpersonal* areas such as cultural awareness and intercultural sensitivity. To put it in different terms, this research wants to measure increased intercultural communicative ability, increased cultural awareness and engagement *within* the host culture as well as between that culture and Japan itself.

In this initial assessment of learner outcomes in the HOPE programs, the author will focus on the Japanese Language and Cultural Exchange Program between Hijiya University and Udayana University, Bali, Indonesia. In its current form, the stated goals are as follows: *To learn the importance and benefits of overseas experience; to learn the unique culture, traditions and values of the island of Bali, and Indonesia as a whole; to support Indonesian students and help them improve Japanese language skills; to introduce Japanese culture to Indonesian students; and to improve communication skills.* Knowing now that one of the biggest hurdles to effective learner outcome assessment is having clear and well-defined goals, this study will focus on one specific goal: improving student's intercultural communicative activity. For the sake of this research, intercultural communicative ability will be defined as a person's "willingness to interact with persons with different social norms and cultural backgrounds, acceptance of others, and being comfortable when relating to others" (Braskamp, Braskamp, & Merrill, 2009, pp. 105-106). The ability to practice intercultural *communication* is

different from having increased knowledge of a foreign culture (that is intercultural *awareness*, noted earlier). In the case of HOPE programs, intercultural communication requires the ability to learn and practice communicative abilities with members *within* the host culture. Intercultural awareness, on the other hand, requires learning more *about* and being *aware* of the host culture. If researchers wanted to assess intercultural *awareness*, there are ample tools available to do so. This researcher is focusing on whether or not learners' improved their intercultural communicative ability.

Step 2: Match Appropriate Measuring Instruments with Learner Goals in HOPE Programs

Once clear goals and learner objectives are in place, the appropriate tool(s) must be found that accurately assesses the students' learning outcome. The simplest example for a student going to UHH or ACU to improve English-language skills is to measure TOEIC, scored both before and after the program is completed. (As another example focused on language learning, Australia uses a test called the *Australian Second Language Proficiency Ratings* test (ASLPR) to measure language proficiency in Australia (see Fantini, 2009). But if the goal is more culture-driven, which this paper aims for (that is, increasing student's intercultural learning, including intercultural communication and awareness), then a measure designed to gauge that aspect of student learning must be utilized. Noted earlier, it should be clear that this does not equate to disciplinary learning (coursework and evaluations embedded within a class, such as in the Scotland program when studying Scottish and British culture). This is about using a measure to find differences in intercultural learning via the entire overseas experience.

It is important that an assessment plan uses a variety of tools and methods, not just one. Why? Because using multiple assessment tools and methods leads to "a better validation" of the evidence (Deardorff, Pysarchik, & Yun, 2009). Within the classroom, this is done by "embedding assessment in the course itself" (Deardorff, Pysarchik, & Yun, 2009, p. 27) and collecting the work necessary to measure the successful completion of the stated objectives. That system is already in place at UHH, Inje and at ACU. Upon returning to Japan, students from these schools must submit their class syllabi and course grades to Hijiya as one step toward verification that those courses meet university requirements, but that is the only step in place now to measure *disciplinary* progress. To measure intercultural awareness, for example, other measures must be used and those assessment methods can include both direct evidence of student learning (tests, papers, diaries, etc.) and indirect evidence, such as student perceptions of their learning experience (as recorded by questionnaires or self-report instruments, focus groups, interviews, etc.). Self-report surveys are widely used (including here at Hijiya), but they are only one part of the overall assessment.

When selecting appropriate assessment tools the following questions should be considered. What does the tool actually measure and how does it align with the stated goals? Is the tool valid and reliable? Is the tool based on a theoretical framework? What are the limitations and biases of the tool? (Deardorff, Pysarchik, & Yun, 2009, p. 27). Most basically, is it manageable? For a thorough list of questions that should be addressed when selecting assessment tools, see **Appendix A**. To give the reader an idea of what assessment tools are available, **Table 1** gives a list of some measures that have been widely used.

Table 1: Available Measures To Assess Learner Outcome
(listed in alphabetical order)

- Assessment of Intercultural Competence (Fantini, 2009)
- Beliefs, Events and Values Inventory (BEVI) (see Redden, 2010)
- Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory [CCAI] (Kelly & Meyers, 1995)
- Generalized Ethnocentrism Scale (Neuliep & McCroskey, 1997a)
- Global Competency and Intercultural Sensitivity Index [ISI] (Olsen and Kroeger, 2001)
- Global Engagement Survey (see Redden, 2010)
- Global Mindedness Scale (Kehl & Morris, 2007)
- Global Perspective Inventory (Braskamp, Braskamp, Merrill, & Engberg, 2012)
- Intercultural Communication Apprehension Scale / Personal Report of Intercultural Communication Apprehension (PRICA) (Neuliep & McCroskey, 1997b; McCroskey, 2013)
- International Awareness and Activities Survey (Chieffo & Griffeths, 2004)
- Intercultural Development Inventory [IDI] (Hammer & Bennett, 2001)
- Intercultural Learning Outcomes (Sutton & Rubin, 2004)
- Intercultural Sensitivity Inventory [ICSI] (Bhawuk & Brislin, 1992)
- Multicultural Personality Questionnaire (Van der Zee & Van Oudenhoven, 2001)
- Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (Neuliep & McCroskey, 1997b)
- Personal Report of Interethnic Communication Apprehension (*PRECA*) (Neuliep & McCroskey, 2013)
- Study Abroad Goals Scale (Kitsantas, 2004)
- Trait EI Questionnaire (Petrides, 2009)

The goal is to match learner outcomes with program goals. Only when the goals of the learner are defined can assessment be done. Assuming that is done, one must pick which measure is suitable. Tucker, Gullekson and McCambridge (2011) suggest various measures for assessing short-term study abroad programs based on specific objectives. Based on short-term overseas programs, some program objectives and their appropriate measure are given in Table 2. (Sources given in the table below may be original sources of the measure, or studies that have incorporated the measure into their research. Also see Table 1 above.)

Table 2: Matching Objectives to Measuring Instruments

<u>Measurable Objectives:</u>	<u>Available Measures:</u>
Cultural Awareness	<i>Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory</i> (Kelly & Meyers, 1995)
Communication Apprehension	<i>Personal Report of Communication Apprehension</i> (Pribyl, et al., 1998)
Global Awareness (also called International Awareness, Global Understanding, Global Mindedness)	<i>International Awareness and Activities Survey</i> (Chieffo & Griffeths, 2004) <i>Global Mindedness Scale</i> (Kehl & Morris, 2007) <i>Generalized Ethnocentrism Scale</i> (Neuliep & McCroskey, 1997a)

	<i>Global Perspective Inventory</i> (Braskamp, Braskamp, Merrill, & Engberg, 2012)
Intercultural Sensitivity (also called Intercultural Appreciation and Awareness)	<i>Intercultural Development Inventory</i> (Hammer & Bennett, 2001) <i>Global Competency and Intercultural Sensitivity Index</i> (Olsen and Kroeger, 2001)
Intercultural Communication Apprehension	<i>Intercultural Communication Apprehension Scale</i> (also known as the <i>Personal Report of Intercultural Communication Apprehension</i> , PRICA) (Neuliep & McCroskey, 1997b; McCroskey, 2013)
Ethnocentrism	<i>Generalized Ethnocentrism Scale</i> (Neuliep & McCroskey, 1997a)
Study Abroad Goals and the Development of Cross-Cultural Skills	<i>Study Abroad Goals Scale</i> (Kitsantas, 2004) <i>Cultural Intelligence Scale</i> (Ang, Van Dyne, Koh, Yee Ng, Templer, Tay, & Chandrasekar, 2007)
Personal Growth/Development	<i>Trait EI Questionnaire</i> (Petrides, 2009)

In general, the surveys listed above are used to measure changes in attitudes, beliefs or differences in awareness as a result of studying abroad. In line with the author's intention, they mostly relate to measures in the area of intercultural learning (i.e. cross-cultural skills, cultural awareness or intercultural competence). This list does not include ways to measure progress in skills such as second-language acquisition, although many of those are readily available (e.g. the *Oral Proficiency Interview* and the *Simulated Oral Proficiency Interview*; see Redden, 2010; the *Assessment of Language Development*, see Fantini, 2009, etc.). It is the goal of this paper to focus on assessing intercultural learning outcomes. When focusing on that area, however, there is an even greater number of measures available to choose from. Besides the few mentioned above that can measure global awareness or global mindedness, Fantini (2009) lists a total of 44 different measures available that focus on various aspects of intercultural learning and intercultural competence (also see Wattiaux, 2013). Of that large number, however, not all are aimed at higher learning. Some focus on business settings (cf. Black & Duhon, 2006) and cross-cultural workplaces, cross-cultural counseling, organizations working with children and families, or expatriates, etc..

For this initial step towards evaluating the HOPE programs, the researcher chooses to measure the goal of improving student's intercultural communicative activity. To assess whether or not that goal is achieved, students will be administered the *Personal Report of Intercultural Communication Apprehension* (PRICA), developed by Neuliep and McCroskey (1997b; also see McCroskey, 2013). This survey originated in research that led to the *Personal Report of Communication Apprehension* (PRCA-24), also by McCroskey (1982), which measures communication anxiety in situational contexts. Intercultural communication anxiety is considered a subcategory of general communication apprehension, and this survey measures the fear people experience when interacting with other people from different cultural groups. When developing this measure, the authors came to believe that because intercultural interaction in the United States is unavoidable, communication apprehension

from an intercultural (or interethnic) context is more severe than other types of communication-based fear. The PRICA is a 14-item instrument that is designed to be more suitable to intercultural aspects of communication and, as a result, is considered more specific in its definitions than the original PRCA on which it is based. The validity of this scale is widely accepted (see Berry & Woods, 2006), and the 14 statements on the survey (half written positively and half negatively), represent comments people frequently make when interacting with people from other cultures. A full copy of the English-language survey is in **Appendix B**, while the Japanese-language version (translated and cross-translated by two native-Japanese speakers) is found in **Appendix C**.

Step 3: Do Pre- and Post-Program Learner Assessment

The most thorough assessment comes from taking measures before, during and after the completion of the program (Bolen, 2007). So for the most thorough analysis of changes and improvements in learner outcomes, it is stressed that Hijiya conduct surveys of participants before and after the overseas excursion. Research by Anderson, et al., (2006) did just that. They measured American students' level of intercultural sensitivity both before and after they joined a 4-week program abroad. Results showed that even a short program resulted in noticeable increases in the intercultural sensitivity of participants. In the area of intercultural learning, GLOSSARI (2010) showed that in multiple testing (both before and after the program) students who went abroad showed greater knowledge than non-study abroad students in measures related to "functional knowledge of cultural practices." They also grew in the area of "cultural context." Explaining the results of GLOSSARI, Redden (2010) notes that participants knew more about "how different cultural settings affect one's own reactions and interactions with others" (p. 3). But there would have been no way to gauge the progress made if pre-departure assessment were not done. More importantly, post-program follow-up is stressed as a way of assessing what the student accomplished abroad and should be used not only by administrators of their programs. Students also need to know how their experiences changed them. The results can also be used to show parents the "rewards" of having sent their offspring abroad. If time and resources are available, other post-program ideas may be something as thorough as a "reentry and reintegration course" (Berdan, Goodman, & Taylor, 2013). This is usually done, however, only when students participate in longer programs (usually 1 year or more), of which there are few at Hijiya at present.

In this initial study, participants in the Bali program will be administered the Personal Report of Intercultural Communication Apprehension (PRICA) (Neuliep & McCroskey, 1997b; McCroskey, 2013) two separate times: 2 weeks prior to departure to Indonesia, and within 2 weeks of returning home to Japan. Results will be shared with the students, as well as with both academic and administrative staff. Related to step 4 below (doing both quantitative and qualitative measurements), it is worth noting that both pre-departure and post-program interviews of participants will be conducted. Those interviews will be designed to measure students' expectations of and experiences with the program. For example, a pre-program question may look like "What aspects of Balinese culture are you expecting to learn about in this program?" After return to Japan, the student will ask for his opinions related to that, using a likert scale to answer, the question could read "Do you feel you learned about the aspects of Balinese culture you expected to learn about prior to this program?" Such questions are related to global/cultural awareness (not communication), as one part of a broader evaluation, and they can render direct qualitative feedback about the program.

Step 4: Use Both Quantitative *and* Qualitative Measurements in the Assessment

Don't limit assessment of overseas programs to either quantitative or qualitative only. Regardless of which quantitative measure is used to assess the learning outcomes, those results can be added to qualitative analyses (such as journals, reports, interviews, etc. with program participants.) Staff at universities often hear from students how much they enjoyed being abroad and that they learned a lot about the culture they were immersed in, but programs must not only assess what students "learned" but *how they think* as a result of joining the program. For example, even if cultural differences as seen by students are known, "they may not be internalized sufficiently to have them affect students' perspectives on knowledge" (Braskamp, Braskamp, & Merrill, 2009, p. 112). Quantitative assessments of learner outcomes are excellent resources to use for follow-up studies of overseas programs. Quantitative data, however, should be combined with qualitative evaluations. With data proving measurable gains in learner outcomes, qualitative research can then be done to learn why students feel they made the progress they did. Conducting follow-up interviews with students can help them internalize how they have changed their thinking as a result of the program. Deardorf, Pysarchik, and Yun (2009) go further than suggesting mere interviews, adding ideas such self-report surveys, focus groups, interviews and observations by others including host families and program administrators (supervisors) which can all add to an effective qualitative assessment. The key question that a good program must ask is what evidence can be collected that shows successful student learning based on the program's *stated* goals and objectives? Evidence suggests both quantitative and qualitative research is required.

In the case of the HOPE program at Udayana University, Bali, as noted, the quantitative measure used to assess learner outcomes in the area of intercultural communication will be the Personal Report of Intercultural Communication Apprehension (PRICA; Neuliep & McCroskey, 1997b; McCroskey, 2013). In addition to that, qualitative assessment will be done via both a pre- and post-program interview. These will be conducted only between the student participant and the accompanying instructor (in other HOPE programs where an instructor does not join the students, the program manager should do the interviews). Qualitative follow-up must seek to learn two things: *how* students made progress and *why* they think they did so. First, learning *how* means seeking feedback about what part of the overseas experience led the student to make progress. It could be from interdisciplinary (in-class) learning, from off-campus cultural excursions, or from the daily interaction with people from another cultural background (and practice of intercultural communication). If we can assess how students made progress, further improvements can be made to ensure other programs practice the same effective process. Secondly, qualitative assessment should ask students *why* they think they made that progress. Through feedback, instructors (and program facilitators) can learn if the students felt the program met the stated goals, if the classroom learning had more value than the off-campus environment or vice versa. Were the students given enough time for independent activities, possibly leading to increased self-confidence and possible leadership activities (where the teacher was absent, causing a leader to "emerge")? Only through interviews can such specific feedback be gleaned from program participants.

To end, it should be noted that the in-place report that all student participants are required to write upon return to Japan, a 1-page report (短期研修レポート, in Japanese) expressing their overseas experiences, and the "participant survey" (参加者アンケート) will stay in place for administrative

purposes. They will not, however, be considered part of the learner assessment this study aims for.

Conclusion

A successful overseas programs, like HOPE, should be able to “achieve powerful learning outcomes if it is designed around specific learning goals and linked to on-campus learning” both before as well as after the student participates (Salisbury, 2012). Knowing what outcomes resulted from the HOPE programs will help institutions “design programs that meet diverse students’ needs and make a plausible, more inclusive, and likely more compelling case for participation” (Salisbury, 2012). In sum, research has shown the general patterns that institutions are following as a means of effective assessment of global learning outcomes (Deardorff, Pysarchik, & Yun, 2009, pp. 34-35). They include:

- Using different means to assess before, during and after the overseas experience;
- Well-planned and intentional preparation, as well as intervention in student learning during and after the experience. This is absolutely necessary in order for students to articulate learning outcomes.
- Course assessments are being adapted to glean specific evidence of student learning, not just the basic satisfaction surveys (such as the “participant survey” used at Hijiya).
- Because assessing global learning outcomes is complex, adequate support from the home institution must be provided for efforts to be successful.

Based on research suggesting frameworks from which to approach assessment (i.e. developmental growth in cognitive, interpersonal and intrapersonal areas, see. Braskamp, Braskamp & Merrill, 2009), it is hoped this paper initiates the assessment of learner development in the HOPE programs at Hijiya. This paper aims to add to the growing research on learner outcome that is going on elsewhere in higher education. Therefore, as outlined in steps one to four above, this ongoing research project will conduct learner outcome assessment before, during and after one of the HOPE programs: the Japanese Language & Culture Exchange Program (バリ島インドネシア日本文化交流プログラム) held annually between Udayana University, Bali, Indonesia and Hijiya University. This is an original program which was developed by the author (although a successful assessment system as suggested above can be tailored to any of the HOPE programs). The initial program assessment proposed here will focus on intercultural learning outcomes as opposed to interdisciplinary (course-based content, etc.). In the initial assessment, as noted earlier, the Personal Report of Intercultural Communication Apprehension (PRICA) will be used to gauge quantitative results in student growth in intercultural communication. In addition, qualitative feedback will be gathered via interviews with participants (pre- and post-program). Results from student participants in the next HOPE program in Indonesia will follow.

References

- Anderson, P. H., Lawton, L., Rexeisen, R. J., & Hubbard, A. C. (2006). Short-term study abroad and intercultural sensitivity: A pilot study. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 30(4), 457-469.
- Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., Koh, C., Yee Ng, K., Templer, K.J., Tay, C., & Chandrasekar, N.A. (2007). Cultural Intelligence: Its Measurement and Effects on Cultural Judgment and Decision Making, Cultural Adaptation and Task Performance. *Management and Organization Review* 3(3): 335-371

- Berdan, S., Goodman, A.E. & Taylor, O. (2013). A Student Guide to Study Abroad. New York: Institute of International Education
- Berry, S. & Woods, R. (2006). Personal Report of Intercultural Communication Apprehension. In Reynolds, A., Woods, R., & Baker, J.D. (Eds.), Handbook of Research on Electronic Surveys and Measurements, pp. 364-366.
- Bhawuk, D. P. S., & Brislin, R. (1992). The measurement of intercultural sensitivity using the concepts of individualism and collectivism. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 16, 413-436.
- Black, H. T., & Duhon, D. L. (2006). Assessing the impact of business study abroad programs on cultural awareness and personal development. The Journal of Education for Business, 81(3), pp. 140-144.
- Bolen, M. C. (Ed.). (2007). A Guide to Outcomes Assessment in Education Abroad. Carlisle, PA: The Forum on Education Abroad.
- Braskamp, L.A., Braskamp, D.C. & Merrill, K.C. (2009). Assessing Progress in Global Learning and Development of Students with Education Abroad Experiences. Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, (18), 101-118. Retrieved October 5, 2013: <http://www.frontiersjournal.com/documents/FrontiersXVIII-Fall09BRaskampBRaskapMerrill.pdf>
- Braskamp, L.A. & Engberg, M.E. (2011). How Colleges Can Influence the Development of a Global Perspective. Liberal Education, 97, (3/4). Retrieved October 7, 2013: <http://aacu.org/liberaleducation/le-sufall/braskamp.cfm>
- Braskamp, L.A., Braskamp, D.C., Merrill, K.C. & Engberg, M.E. (2012). Global Perspective Inventory (GPI). Retrieved October 17, 2013: <https://gpi.central.edu>
- Chickering, A. & Braskamp, L.A. (2009). Developing a Global Perspective for Personal and Social Responsibility. Peer Review, 11 (4): 27-30.
- Chieffo, L., & Griffiths, L. (2004). Large-scale assessment of student attitudes after a short-term study abroad program. Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 10, 165-177.
- Cruz, G. (2010). Holding colleges accountable: Is success measurable? Time. Retrieved October 22, 2013: <http://www.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,1948175,00.html>
- Deardorff, D. K. (2007). How and why to use results of outcomes assessment. In Bolen, M. C. (Ed.). (2007). A Guide to Outcomes Assessment in Education Abroad. Carlisle, PA: The Forum on Education Abroad.
- Deardorff, D.K., Pysarchik, D.T. & Yun, Z.S. (2009). Towards effective international learning assessment: principles, design and implementation. In H.D. Wit (Ed.), Measuring Success in the Internationalization of Higher Education. Amsterdam; European Association for International Education. Retrieved October 20, 2013: http://aplicaciones2.colombiaaprende.edu.co/mesas_dialogo/documentos/mesa80/2057MeasuringinternacionalisationEAIE.pdf
- Fantini, A.E. (2009). Assessing Intercultural Competence: Issues and Tools. In D.K. Deardorff (Ed.), The Sage Handbook of Intercultural Competence. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications
- The Forum on Education Abroad (2009). Standards of Good Practice for Short-Term Education Abroad Programs. Retrieved October 15, 2013: <http://www.forumea.org/documents/ForumEAStandardsShortTermProg.pdf>
- GLOSSARI (2010). Georgia Learning Outcomes of Students Studying Abroad Research Initiative.

Retrieved September 23, 2013: <http://glossari.uga.edu/>

Hammer, M. R., & Bennett, M. J. (2001). The Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI). Portland, OR: Intercultural Communication Institute

Huba, M. E., & Freed, J. E. (2000). Learner-centered assessment on college campuses: Shifting the focus from teaching to learning. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Kehl, K. & Morris, J.M. (2007). Differences in Global-Mindedness between Short-Term and Semester-Long Study Abroad Participants at Selected Private Universities. Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 67-80.

Kelley, C., & Meyers, J. (1995). Cross-cultural adaptability inventory. Minneapolis, NV: National Computer Systems.

Kitsantas, A. (2004). Studying abroad: The role of college student's goals on the development of cross-cultural skills and global understanding. College Student Journal, 38(3), 441-452.

Marquette University (2013). Office of International Education. Marquette University Website. Retrieved September 24, 2013: <http://www.marquette.edu/oie/>

McCroskey, J.C. (1982). An Introduction to Rhetorical Communication. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

McCroskey, J. (2013). PRICA: Personal Report of Intercultural Communication Apprehension. Author Website. Retrieved October 22, 2013: <http://www.jamescmccroskey.com/measures/prica.htm>

Neuliep, J.W. & McCroskey, J.C. (1997a) The development of a US and generalized ethnocentrism scale. Communication Research Reports, 14(4), 385-398.

Neuliep, J.W. & McCroskey, J.C. (1997b). The Development of Intercultural and Interethnic Communication Apprehension Scales. Communication Research Reports, 14(2), 145-156.

Neuliep, J. W., & McCroskey, J. C. (2013) . Personal Report of Interethnic Communication Apprehension (PRECA) . Measurement Instrument Database for the Social Science. Retrieved October 24, 2013: www.midss.ie

Northeastern University (2013). Office of International Study Programs. Outcomes Assessment. Northeastern University Homepage. Retrieved September 29, 2013: <http://www.northeastern.edu/studyabroad/about/outcomes-assessment/>

Oslon, C.L. & Kroeger, K.R. (2001, Summer). Global competency and intercultural sensitivity. Journal of Studies in International Education, 5, 116-137.

Paige, M.R. (2010). Key Issues in the Assessment and Evaluation of International Education Programs. Symposium on Evaluation of International Education Programming, U.S. Department of Education, June 11, 2010. Retrieved October 20, 2013: <http://iris.ed.gov/iris/ieps/conferences/2010ew/presentations/paige.pdf>

Petrides, K. V. (2009). Technical manual for the Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaires (TEIQue). London: London Psychometric Laboratory.

Pribyl, C.B., Keaten, J.A., Sakamoto, M., & Koshikawa, F. (1998). Assessing the cross-cultural content validity of the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension scale (PRCA-24). Japanese Psychological Research (40), 47-53.

Redden, E. (2010). Academic Outcomes of Study Abroad. Inside Higher Ed (Online Journal). Retrieved October 4, 2013: <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2010/07/13/abroad>

Salisbury, M. (2012). We're Muddying the Message on Study Abroad. Chronicle of Higher

Education. Retrieved October 6, 2013: <http://chronicle.com/article/Were-Muddying-the-Message-on/133211/>

Spitzberg, B.S. & Changnon, G. (2009). Conceptualizing Intercultural Competence. In D.K. Deardorff (Ed.), The Sage Handbook of Intercultural Competence. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications

Steinberg, M. (2007). The place of outcomes assessment in higher education today. In Bolen, M. C. (Ed.). (2007). A Guide to Outcomes Assessment in Education Abroad. Carlisle, PA: The Forum on Education Abroad

Sutton, R. C. & Rubin, D. L. (2004). The GLOSSARI Project: Initial findings from a system-wide research initiative on study abroad learning outcomes, Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 10, 65-82.

Tucker, M.L., Gullekson, N.L. & McCambridge, J. (2011). Assurance of learning in short-term study abroad programs. Academic and Business Research Institute, Online Manuscript. Retrieved October 7, 2013: <http://www.aabri.com/LV11Manuscripts/LV11040.pdf>

Van der Zee, K. I., & Van Oudenhoven, J. P. (2001). The multicultural personality questionnaire: Reliability and validity of self- and other ratings of multicultural effectiveness. Journal of Research in Personality, 35, 278-288.

Wattiaux, M. (2013). Global Cultural Knowledge and Awareness Aptitude Tools. University of Wisconsin Webpage. Retrieved October 29, 2013: <https://dairy nutrient.wisc.edu/isif/page.php?id=850>

Key Words: learner assessment, learner outcome, exchange program assessment, overseas (exchange) programs

Appendix A: A Checklist for Analyzing a Learner Assessment Program

(Adapted from Deardorff, Pysarchik & Yun, p. 27)

When making an assessment, research has suggested some important questions that should be asked to make the assessment as effective as possible. Any assessment should address these questions:

- Are goals, objectives and assessment measures articulated?
- Is assessment realistic?
- Have assessment issues been analyzed *before* implementation?
- Is assessment done continually (not only pre- or post-program)?
- Is assessment shared (with others on and off campus)?
- Is upper management supportive of the assessment?
- Is there adequate time and funding for it?
- Have administrators (or support staff) received training or knowledge of assessment and/or get ongoing professional development?
- Have the assessment tools been evaluated?
- Will the results be evaluated? Will they be communicated to all parties?
- Will results be used for both learner feedback *and* program improvement?
- Will the assessment process be reviewed and improved upon regularly?

Appendix B: The Personal Report of Intercultural Communication Apprehension (PRICA)

(Source: McCroskey, 2013; Neulip & McCroskey, 1997b)

The 14 statements below are comments frequently made by people with regard to communication with people from other cultures. Please indicate how much you agree with these statements by marking a number representing your response to each statement using the following choices:

- 1 Strongly Disagree
- 2 Disagree
- 3 Neither / Neutral
- 4 Agree
- 5 Strongly Agree

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Generally, I am comfortable interacting with a group of people from different cultures. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. I am tense and nervous while interacting with people from different cultures. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. I like to get involved in group discussion with others who are from different cultures. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. Engaging in a group discussion with people from different cultures makes me nervous. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. I am calm and relaxed with interacting with a group of people who are from different cultures. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. While participating in a conversation with a person from a different culture, I get nervous. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. I have no fear of speaking up in a conversation with a person from a different culture. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. Ordinarily I am very tense and nervous in a conversation with person from a different culture. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. Ordinarily I am very calm and relaxed in conversations with a person from a different culture. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. While conversing with a person from a different culture, I feel very relaxed. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. I am afraid to speak up in conversations with a person from a different culture. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. I face the prospect of interacting with people from different cultures with confidence. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. My thoughts become confused and jumbled when interacting with people from different cultures. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. Communicating with people from different cultures makes me feel uncomfortable. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

**Appendix C: Japanese-Language Version of
The Personal Report of Intercultural Communication Apprehension (PRICA)
(translated and cross-translated)**

異文化間コミュニケーションにおける不安に関するアンケート

以下の1～14の項目は、異文化間におけるコミュニケーションに関して度々述べられる意見です。それぞれの項目を読み、自分の気持ちに最も近いものを1～5の回答肢を使い数字で表して下さい。

- 1 全く同意しない
2 同意しない
3 やや同意する
4 同意する
5 非常に同意する

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. 多くの場合、異なる文化を持つ国の人達との交流を心地良く感じる。 | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2. 異なる文化を持つ国の人達と交流している時、とても緊張する。 | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 3. 異なる文化を持つ国の人達とのグループディスカッションに加わるのが好きだ。 | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 4. 異なる文化を持つ国の人達とグループディスカッションするのは緊張する。 | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 5. 異なる文化を持つ国の人達と交流する時は落ち着いてリラックスしている。 | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 6. 異なる文化を持つ国の人との会話に加わる時はとても緊張する。 | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 7. 異なる文化を持つ国の人との会話で自分の意見をはっきり述べることに不安は感じない。 | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 8. 通常、異なる文化を持つ国の人との会話はとても緊張する。 | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 9. 通常、異なる文化を持つ国の人との会話では、とても落ち着いてリラックスしている。 | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 10. 異なる文化を持つ国の人と会話している時にとてもリラックスできる。(くつろぎを感じる。) | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 11. 異なる文化を持つ国の人との会話で自分の思いをはっきり述べるのは怖い。 | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 12. 異なる文化を持つ国の人達と自信を持って交流できる。 | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 13. 異なる文化を持つ国の人達と交流している時、思考が混乱してくる。 | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 14. 異なる文化を持つ国の人達と会話するのは気詰まりだ。 | 1 2 3 4 5 |

Damon E. Chapman (言語文化学科国際コミュニケーションコース)
(2013. 10. 31 受理)