Research Article

Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad

Volume 36, Issue 3, pp. 140-177
DOI: 10.36366/frontiers.v36i3.856
www.frontiersjournal.org

Does International Service-Learning Deliver? A Study with Control Groups of One University's Experience with Canada's Queen Elizabeth Scholars Internship Program

Andrew M. Robinson[1], Robert Kwame Ame[1]

Abstract

This study assesses the extent to which a medium-term international service learning (ISL) project led by a Canadian university in partnership with sub-Saharan African universities achieves five objectives with respect to the interns: increasing local and global community engagement, activating leaders, developing global citizens, personal and professional growth, and enhancing Canadian and international networking. The study relies on 250 completed online surveys of alumni who graduated between 2012 and 2020. ISL alumni responses are controlled for BA-related maturation effects by comparison to alumni who did not participate in any International Educational Experiences (IEEs) and for selection bias by comparison to students who participated in other IEEs. The study finds that ISL promotes all five objectives, that it has net impacts vis-à-vis the BA alone for all objectives except leadership activation, and that it has net impacts vis-à-vis other forms of IEE with respect to community engagement activation, global knowledge, and development of problem-solving skills.

1 Wilfrid Laurier University, Brantford, Canada

Corresponding author: Andrew Robinson, arobinson@wlu.ca

Date of Acceptance: June 24th, 2024

Abstract in French

Cette étude évalue dans quelle mesure un projet d'apprentissage par le service international (ISL) à moyen terme mené par une université Canadienne en partenariat avec des universités d'Afrique subsaharienne atteint cinq objectifs vis-à-vis des stagiare: accroître l'engagement communautaire local et mondial, activer les dirigeants, développer des citoyens du monde, croissance personnelle et professionnelle, et améliorer du réseautage canadien et international. L'étude s'appuie sur 250 sondages en ligne complétés auprès d'anciens élèves de 2012 à 2020. Les réponses des anciens élèves de l'ISL sont contrôlées pour les effets de maturation liés au BA par rapport aux anciens élèves qui n'ont participé à aucune expérience éducative internationale (IEE) et pour le biais de sélection par rapport aux étudiants qui ont participé à d'autres IEE. L'étude révèle que l'ISL promeut les cinq objectifs, qu'elle a des effets nets par rapport au BA seul pour tous les objectifs, à l'exception de l'activation qualités des dirigeants, et qu'elle semble avoir des effets nets par rapport aux autres formes d'IEE en ce qui concerne activation de l’engagement communautaire, aspects de la citoyenneté mondiale et développement de compétences en résolution de problèmes.

Keywords

Assessment; community engagement; global citizenship; international service learning; professional development

1. Introduction

International Educational Experiences (IEEs) are not created equally. International service learning (ISL), study exchange, and other types of IEE all provide students with international exposure. But, ISL can require much greater commitment on the part of international office staff and academic faculty, especially when compared to study exchange, with its typically well-established procedures. Rebecca Tiessen (2013) raises an important concern when she notes that participants in medium-term ISL programs recognized “that much of what they learned abroad could be learned in Canada and this raises questions about the value of international service learning" (p. 86). Expressing similar concerns about value, others have assessed the effectiveness of internationalization at home (Soria & Troisi, 2014) and

online participation in study abroad experiences (Howard et al., 2017) as alternatives for developing skills associated with IEEs.

So, does ISL deliver on its objectives? And, does it do so more effectively than other, often less onerous and sometimes cheaper, alternatives? In an oft-quoted passage, Humphrey Tonkin (2011) indicates the wide range of stakeholders who should be interested in answers to such questions:

> more needs to be known about whether present ISL practices are achieving their objectives, or indeed achieving any objectives at all. Not only are ISL practitioners and researchers accountable to funders, institutions, and students, they are also accountable to their hosts and the public good. Thus, research is more than an academic exercise: it is an ethical imperative (p. 215).

As the literature on IEEs is characterized by competing and overlapping terminology, it will be useful to clarify how some key terms are used in this study. The following definitions are inspired by the Canadian Bureau for International Education's (2022) lexicon. *International Educational Experience* (IEE) is an umbrella term for all organized educational activities that take place in foreign locations. *International Service Learning* (ISL) refers to for-credit "experiential learning experience abroad whereby student activities are aimed at ameliorating a community problem or issue." Given the nature of this study's case, ISL is limited here to medium-term experiences, which, loosely following Tiessen (2018), are defined as two to six months in duration (Tiessen's typology was non-exhaustive, as short-term was defined as 1-2 weeks and medium term as 3-6 months, p. 15). *Study abroad* is a type of IEE that involves for-credit learning at a foreign educational institution, usually through study exchange or letter of permission. Study abroad is limited to IEEs of one or more terms, as this is how it is practiced at the university under study. *Other IEE* is a catch-all for IEEs that do not fit the definitions of ISL or study abroad (for example, field courses shorter than two months, reading week field trips). *All Other IEE* is a collective term which combines Study Abroad and Other IEE in contrast to ISL.

This article assesses whether ISL programs can achieve their objectives by focusing on the case of a university in Ontario, Canada's eight

years of experience with a medium-term ISL summer internship program in a sub-Saharan African country. Since the summer of 2012, 61 undergraduates have engaged in 60-100 day internships with local development and human rights-focused nongovernmental and governmental organizations. Host organizations and their clientele benefitted from the interns' unpaid performance of tasks like service provision, grant-writing, and research as well as from the opportunity to develop "international relationships" with the interns (Lough & Tiessen, 2018, p. 108). The interns benefitted from the practical work experience (largely in office settings), the opportunity to test career aspirations, and the intercultural experience. Interns also earned required academic credit in related courses that, among other things, usually required them to reflect on their intercultural learning inside and outside their workplaces. The program was funded in a variety of ways between 2012 and 2019 before it was suspended in 2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic. From 2012 to 2013 it received funding from the Canadian International Development Agency-funded Students for Development (SfD) program. After government cuts prematurely ended the SfD, 60-day placements were supported in 2014 with one-time internal university funding. Then, the Queen Elizabeth II Diamond Jubilee Scholarships program (QES), which was jointly financed by the federal and provincial governments and the private sector, funded the program from 2015-2018 (QES-2015) and 2019-2023 (QES-2017). Internships and housing were arranged through partnerships between the Canadian university and host-country university partners. In every year, interns received support to help with the costs of the unpaid internships. Most recently, the QES program provided C$6,000.

Finally, the article's central question, "Does ISL Deliver?", requires clarification. While some research focuses on advancing critical practice and challenging the status quo as objectives of ISL (Langdon & Agyeyomah, 2013) and other research emphasizes impacts on local communities (Larsen, 2016), this article focuses on five broadly applicable program objectives of the QES-2015 and QES-2017 programs (Universities Canada, 2018). The article asks if ISL advances the following student-centric objectives and if it does so more effectively than less expensive alternatives: increase local and global community engagement, activate leaders, develop global citizens, facilitate personal and professional growth, and enhance Canadian and

international networking (henceforth, enhanced networking). The article leaves to others the task of assessing the value of ISL's contributions in light of negative externalities like impacts on climate change (Huish, 2021).

The remainder of the article is organized into five sections. The second section highlights previous findings and methodological issues from the literature. The third section explains the study's methodology. The subsequent section describes the study's findings with respect to each of the five objectives under consideration. This is followed by a discussion of the implications of the results for the study's two key questions. The final section presents a brief conclusion and discusses limitations and possibilities for further research.

2. Literature Review

Development of literature on ISL's impacts has been influenced by two larger and related literatures that predate it. One concerns domestic service learning (Eyler, 2011; Tonkin, 2011) and the other concerns study abroad (Tonkin, 2011). Some contributors to the ISL literature note its relative lack of development (Chan et al., 2018) and call for more studies to evaluate mobility programs (Grantham, 2018) and to learn more about longer term outcomes, including employment and career trajectories (Paige et al., 2009; Tiessen et al., 2018). While, as Chan et al. (2018) note, qualitative approaches have tended to dominate studies on ISL, others have responded to Bringle et al.'s (2011) call for more quantitative studies.

This section draws upon these literatures as it reviews findings relevant to each of the five objectives and considers important methodological issues.

2.1. Global/Civic Engagement

As Sherraden et al. (2013) note, it is widely understood that "international service tends to motivate students to continue to engage in volunteer service when they return home" (p. 23). Assessment of global/civic engagement is often embedded in studies of global citizenship. For example, both Morais and Ogden's (2011) and Lough et al.'s (2009) global citizenship scales (discussed below) include subscales that address engagement. The assumed link between IEEs and civic engagement finds support in DeGraaf

et al.'s (2013) finding, based on an online survey with 354 respondents from a Midwestern liberal arts college, that those who had studied abroad were statistically significantly more civically engaged with respect to eight self-reported behaviors than those who had not. Other studies have asked about prospective intentions. For example, when Chan et al. (2018) surveyed over 300 undergraduate ISL participants drawn from a wide variety of disciplines at a university in Hong Kong, 36.5% said they definitely intended to continue engagement in community service, while 57.5% said quite likely (p. 26).

2.2. Activating Leaders

Leadership, which Northouse defined as "a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal" (cited in Millius, 2019, p. 22), has been assessed in a variety of ways. Some have focused on leadership as expressed in the development of certain skills, abilities, and orientations. Neil C. Brown (2011), former president of the International Partnership for Service Learning and Leadership, suggested that ISL can develop such leadership skills as adaptability, resourcefulness, and looking at old problems in new ways through the experience of working collaboratively with other students and community members. In a study using pre- and post-test surveys of “over two-thousand students enrolled in 150 senior level service-learning courses” at a large urban American university, Cress et al. (2010, p. 4) found that students’ self-reported answers “indicated that the service-learning course increased their leadership ability, interest in developing leadership in others, commitment to civic responsibility, view of themselves as active citizens, and their desire to become community leaders” (p. 5). Based on interviews with eight students and alumni at a mid-sized university in North Carolina, Wurr and Hamilton (2012) suggested that service-learning, like volunteering in general, helps students hone leadership skills “by providing enough space for students to take ownership of a project” (p. 225) that, ideally, they care about and makes them feel like “part of something larger” (p. 226). And, in a PhD dissertation focused on leadership outcomes and study abroad, Milius (2019) reported that students believed 1-3-week IEEs helped them improve their leadership capacities by expanding related skills. Others have used obtaining leadership positions as a proxy for activating leadership. Geyer et al. (2017) did so when analyzing the results of an online survey of American students

who had participated in study abroad and concluded that "studying abroad may increase the possibility of students taking on leadership roles" (pp. 1045-1046). The Erasmus Impact Study, which surveyed thousands of mobile (those who engaged in educational activities outside their home state) and nonmobile European students and alumni, treated working in management as a proxy for leadership when it reported that ten years after graduation, mobile "alumni were 44% more likely to hold managerial positions than non-mobile alumni" (European Commission et al., 2014, p. 18).

2.3. Global Citizenship Development

Chan et al. (2018) noted that while there is no accepted definition of global citizenship, there is general agreement that it is a "multidimensional concept covering awareness, responsibility, and engagement on a global scale" (pp. 9-10). Similarly, Morais and Ogden (2011) associated it with social responsibility, global competence, and global civic engagement. Since scales for measuring and comparing students' levels of global citizenship continue to be developed and no scale has achieved dominance, it can be difficult to compare results.

Two prominent scales in the literature are Morais and Ogden's (2011) Global Citizenship Scale, which has been used to evaluate grade K-12 global citizenship education (Ahmed & Mohammed, 2022) as well as undergraduate students (Massaro, 2022), and Lough et al.'s (2009) International Volunteer Impacts Survey. McBride et al. (2012) applied the latter in a study that compared survey responses of 221 students who had participated in international service programs to a control group of 145 nonparticipants who had "inquired about or initially enrolled in the same international service programs" (p. 973) to show that participants demonstrated statistically significantly greater increases over a pre-experience baseline for international awareness, international social capital, and international career intentions, but not intercultural relations.

How and whether ISL can contribute to global citizenship seems to turn, in part, on which aspects of global citizenship a study addresses. Some studies are quite optimistic about the potential contribution of ISL to promote global citizenship. For instance, Santulli (2018) emphasized that ISL immerses students in a community for extended periods, focuses upon

reflection, and has a "relationship-building nature… [that can lead] to more cohesive, empathetic, and mutually supportive relationships" (p. 106). Other studies, however, provided support for Tiessen's questioning whether students need to go abroad to learn ISL-related skills (quoted in the introduction). Using seven global, international, and intercultural (GII) competencies, Soria and Troisi (2014) asked 15,807 students drawn from nine large American public universities about their pre-college and current skills and found both that "traveling abroad for service learning/volunteerism" was not "significantly associated with students' self-reported development of GII competencies" (p. 274) and that "participating in some on-campus global/international activities may benefit students' development of GII competencies more than participation in study abroad" (p. 273). Comparing pre-/post-test scores on a short-scale version of the Global Citizenship Scale, Chan et al. (2018) found that ISL participants showed a statistically significant gain in Global Competence (from 3.62 to 3.87 out of 5), but not in Social Responsibility or Global Civic Engagement and concluded there was "little evidence...to support the idea that ISL will invariably facilitate students' global citizenship development" (p. 54).

2.4. Personal and Professional Growth

Discussions of impacts of IEEs on personal and professional growth tend to focus on further education, career choice, location of post-graduation employment, and skills development. While Tiessen (2018) is certainly correct to criticize such measures as "individualistic and egoistic" (p. 75), these are the measures that have drawn the most attention.

Findings with respect to further education tend to focus upon whether students pursued post-BA studies. For instance, of 138 Canadian students who had participated in 3-6 month learning and volunteering abroad programs who Tiessen (2018) engaged in semi-structured interviews before, immediately after, and 2-3 years after their experience, 19% expressed an interest in post-BA studies “as a result of their experience abroad” (p. 67). Similarly, when Paige et al. (2009) surveyed 6,391 study-abroad alumni of 22 American institutions, 59.7% indicated their decision to enroll in an advanced degree was influenced to a large or to some degree by their study abroad experience. Demonstrating the value of control groups, however, Franklin (2010) found that while 54% of 52 study-abroad alumni

of a selective American liberal arts college she surveyed 10 years after graduation had "attained a degree beyond their B.A.", university career center data indicated that this was the same percentage as alumni overall. On this basis, she concluded: "This suggests that study abroad participation had no bearing on additional degree attainment" (pp. 173-174).

Concerning impacts on career choices, DeGraaf et al. (2013) observed that study abroad alumni they interviewed credited their experience with impacting their career choice or major. Similarly, 56.3% of Paige et al.'s (2009) survey respondents indicated that their study abroad experience influenced their career choice to a large or to some degree. And 42% of Franklin's (2010) survey respondents strongly agreed that studying abroad affected their choice of career.

The literature also suggests that most students who participate in IEEs do not end up working internationally. In fact, Tiessen (2013) reported that 53% of the 100 former Canadian ISL participants she interviewed learned that they wanted to work in Canada. Ten years after graduation, only 13.5% of Franklin's (2010) study-abroad respondents reported they had ever lived abroad for work. The Erasmus Impact Study found that after five years, 18% of Erasmus alumni and 13% of nonmobile alumni "had moved abroad for their work" (European Commission et al., 2014, p. 119) And, noting that some studies have expanded the definition of international work to include work that involves international travel, Felker and Gianecchini (2015) found that for American and European studies the average was below 20%.

With respect to skills, it is generally understood that participation in ISL, like other internships, helps students "develop new skill sets that cannot be learned in a classroom setting" such as "teamwork, communication, self-management and problem-solving" (Tiessen et al., 2018, pp. 26-27). For instance, the Erasmus Impact Study reported that over 90% of study abroad alumni said the experience had helped them improve such employment-relevant skills as the "ability to adapt and act in new situations", "ability to work with people from other cultures", "intercultural competences", and "communication skills" (European Commission et al., 2014, p. 105).

2.5. Enhanced Networking

To the extent the literature addresses IEEs and networking, the outcomes are mixed. While Amin (2015) notes that Cameroonian hosts of American study-abroad students reported that a “particularly frustrating aspect of the immersion experience was that students ceased communication after they departed" (p. 190), other studies report more positive results. Discussing a survey of 707 alumni who participated in an American educational consortium’s study-abroad program between 1950 and 1999, Norris and Gillespie (2009) noted that between 19% and 28% said they maintained contact with friends they had made during their experience. Similarly, many of 17 American ISL alumni Tonkin and Quiroga (2004) engaged in interviews and focus groups, indicated that they had maintained contact with host agencies. Finally, the Erasmus Impact Study indicated that 51-56% of alumni report having "new friends who live abroad" (European Commission, 2014 et al., p. 112).

2.6. Methodological Issues

An important theme in the impacts-of-ISL literature concerns methodological issues. One type of concern questions what is being measured in some studies (Rubin & Matthews, 2013). For instance, in answering researchers' questions, students may "romanticize their experiences” (Tonkin & Quiroga, 2004, p. 135) or provide socially desirable responses (Hartman et al., 2015). The Erasmus Impact Study cautioned against assuming that students' self-reported perceptions of program impacts provide "impartial or objective proof of any effect" (European Commission et al., 2014, p. 28). It noted that while "only 50% of the mobile students really experienced a gain in relation to the [objective] memo© factors, 79% thought they had improved" (p. 89). Similarly, Waibel et al. (2017) noted that few studies that report that students claim that transnational educational mobility affected career plans asked students “about actual changes or corrections” (p. 87). To address such concerns, researchers advocate reliance upon more objective measures. For instance, Gillespie et al. (2009) recommend using direct and indirect measures: "the former focusing on what students learn and can do as a result of their engagement, the latter serving as indicators or proxies of student learning" (p. 456). Eyler (2011) suggested determining whether alumni "demonstrate

enhanced knowledge of international issues, interest in such matters, have continued with international travel, maintained connections with people they met abroad, and held positive attitudes" (p. 236). Tonkin and Quiroga (2004) asked student interviewees to back up general claims with specific examples. For its part, the Erasmus Impact Study used a pre- and post-test approach applying a quantitative measure called memo© factors to identify "real effects" (European Commission et al., 2014, p. 21). Soria and Troisi (2014) pointed out a more intractable problem that could skew results in the opposite direction: mobile students may have minimized self-perceptions of their personal development vis-a-vis nonmobile students because they have "a heightened sense of awareness of the enormity of international and global issues and perceived that they still had much to learn" (p. 274).

Other concerns about measurement include maturation effects, whereby changes observed in mobile students may be no different than they would have been if the students had spent the same time at home (Kishino & Takahashi, 2019; Soria & Troisi, 2014) and selection bias, whereby those who choose to participate in IEEs are already different from those who do not, such that, for instance, "both mobility and career-related outcomes may be jointly determined by these factors that are often unobserved" (Waibel et al., 2017, p. 89). As Eyler observes, if such pre-existing differences, and not the IEE experiences, explain outcomes, this "undercuts the conclusions to be drawn" (2011, p. 230).

Concerns that maturation effects and selection bias affect the ability to attribute causation are often addressed by using *control groups*. As Gueron writes, "any evaluation must differentiate between the test program's *outcomes* (for example, the number of people who get a job or graduate from school) and its *net impact* (the number who get a job or graduate who would not have done so without the program)" (as cited in Bringle et al., 2011, p. 277). Control groups facilitate a measure of net impact by providing a proxy for what might have occurred anyway. While controlling for maturation effects by comparing students who participated in IEEs to those who did not will make net impact look less impressive, as Rubin and Matthews (2013) noted, "the causal arguments these comparisons warrant are more compelling" (pp. 78-79; Bryla, 2015; European Commission et al., 2014). To address concerns about self-selection, Eyler (2011) suggested

that “other study abroad programs within an institution may provide control groups that include students equally eager for international experiences.” (p. 230).

3. Methodology

Applying lessons from the literature, this study uses two control groups to assess whether the internship program has been meeting its objectives. First, comparison of the interns to students who did not engage in any IEE (the No IEE or BA alone group) is used to control for maturation effects; if the interns display greater development than the No IEE group, this suggests a net impact in excess of the effect of the BA alone. Second, comparison of the interns to the All Other IEEs group provides a control for selection biases; if the interns display greater development than the All Other IEE group, this suggests a net impact of ISL that cannot be explained by characteristics that distinguish students who are attracted to IEEs.

To address concerns about self-reported information, like socially desirable responses, the questions and analysis were designed to maximize reliance on indirect and objective measures. For instance, rather than ask respondents if they think they improved their leadership skills, the survey asked them about pre- and post-BA frequency of participation in leadership roles in employment and community engagement activities. Similarly, rather than ask respondents if they consider themselves global citizens, global citizenship was assessed indirectly using items from assessment scales. Of course, it was not always possible to avoid asking direct questions. To try to reduce socially desirable responses, baseline and present-day questions on topics were separated by unrelated questions.

3.1. The Survey

The survey’s 108 questions were designed in light of the literature. Some questions were presented to members of all the groups while others were only presented to a subset of respondents. This article draws upon a subset of the survey’s questions that address: demographics, respondents’ pre-BA attitudes and experiences, pre- and post-BA levels and focus of community engagement, post-BA education and employment, items from global citizenship scales, foreign contacts, networking, impacts of the IEE on

educational and career trajectories, and the extent to which respondents believed their BA or IEE helped improve each of 17 skills. Details about specific questions are provided where relevant as they arise.

An invitation to participate in the "Internationalization and Community Engagement Survey" was distributed by the university's Alumni Office to 12,699 alumni who had graduated between 2012 and 2020 from programs from which the interns had been drawn, specifically humanities, social science, and social work. Targeted special invitations were also sent by the International Office to about 450 students who had participated in study abroad during this period and by the authors to the former interns. To encourage participation, respondents were invited to enter a draw for one of twenty prizes of $100 and the researchers promised to donate $10 per response up to a maximum of $2,000 to a UNICEF program that provided COVID-19 vaccinations to children in developing countries. The survey was approved by the university's Research Ethics Board (file #6974). It was open from October to December, 2021 and then extended two months with REB approval.

At 261 completed surveys, the participation rate (approximately 2%) was disappointing. This was likely due in part to a recent decision by the university to shift student and alumni email accounts from Gmail to Outlook, which, anecdotally, caused some alumni to lose contact with the university. To keep age gaps from distorting the results, eleven responses from the No IEE group were dropped because they were older than 42, the highest age in the IEE groups.

Of the remaining 250 completed surveys, 145 were in the No IEE group, 25 in the ISL group, and 80 in the All Other IEE group. The 105 respondents who participated in IEEs represented 135 experiences as 26 had participated in two types of IEE (2: ISL and study exchange; 8: ISL and Other IEE; 16: study abroad and other IEE) and two had participated in all three types. Anticipating this possibility, the survey directed former interns to focus exclusively on ISL when completing the survey and study abroad students who had not participated in ISL were directed to focus on their study abroad experience.

3.2. Data Analysis

All statistical analysis was conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics version 28. In all cases, the data analysis involved comparison of groups where the independent variables were nominal (ISL/All Other IEE/No IEE). Where dependent variables were nominal or ordinal and expressed as proportions, two-tailed chi-square tests were applied; where results were significant, post hoc analysis involved pairwise *z*-tests of two proportions with a Bonferroni correction. Where chi-square tests indicated cells with expected counts of less than five, Fisher's exact test was applied and post hoc analysis involved pairwise application of Fisher's exact test with a Bonferroni correction.

Where dependent variables were ordinal or continuous and capable of being expressed as numerical averages, Shapiro-Wilk tests revealed that data were not normally distributed. Since distributions of the scores were similar for all groups, as assessed by visual inspections of boxplots, Kruskal-Wallis H tests were applied and, where statistically significant differences were revealed, post hoc pairwise comparisons were performed using Dunn's (1964) procedure with a Bonferroni correction.

3.3. Comparing Respondent Groups

Table (1) compares the three study groups with respect to some key demographic and background factors.

TABLE (1)
BASELINE COMPARISONS OF RESPONDENT GROUPS

	ISL (*N* = 25)	All Other IEE (*N* = 80)	No IEE (*N* = 145)	*p*
Demographics				
Median Age at Time of Survey[Δ]	28	29	29	.612
Median Years Since Graduation[π]	4	6	6	.228
Self-identifying as White[†]	20 (80%)	59 (74%)	116 (80%)	.538
Self-identifying as Female[✪1]	21 (88%)	69 (87%)	111 (79%)	.249
Pre-BA Characteristics				
At Least One Parent/Guardian Graduated from a University[†]	9 (36%)	39 (49%)	65 (45%)	.530
Intended to Pursue Post-BA Education[†]	17 (68%)	56 (70%)	100 (69%)	.978

Had Participated in Community Engagement Supporter Activities Regularly or Quite Often†	8 (32%)	36 (45%)	43 (30%)	.066
Had Participated in Community Engagement Leadership Activities Regularly or Quite Often✪	5 (20%)$_c$	14 (18%)$_c$	11 (8%)$_c$	**.026**[2]
Pre-BA International Orientations				
Considered Self a Global Citizen†	10 (40%)	39 (49%)	48 (33%)	.070
Had Had or Desired a Career Involving Work Outside of Home Country†	20 (80%)$_a$	61 (76%)$_a$	83 (57%)$_b$	**.004**
Had Traveled Outside of Canada or the US, Other Than to Visit Relatives†	19 (76%)$_a$	66 (83%)$_a$	90 (62%)$_b$	**.003**

Δ Kruskal-Wallis H test. Median scores were not statistically significantly different between the groups, $\chi^2(2) = .983$.

π Kruskal-Wallis H test. Median scores were not statistically significantly different between the groups, $\chi2(2) = 2.961$.

† Chi-Square test of homogeneity (2xC Table); Post hoc analysis involved pairwise comparisons using the z-test of two proportions with a Bonferroni correction.

✪ Fisher's Exact Test; Post hoc analysis involved multiple Fisher's exact tests (2x2) with a Bonferroni correction (i.e., statistical significance was accepted at $p < .016667$).

[1] Only male and female responses have been included as 6 non-binary/third gender responses were excluded.

[2] No pairwise comparisons were statistically significantly different as assessed by Fisher's exact test, $p < .016667$.

$_{a, b}$ Each subscript letter denotes a category whose column proportions do not differ significantly from each other at the .05 level.

$_{c,}$ Each subscript letter denotes a category whose column proportions do not differ significantly from each other at the .016667 level.

The first thing that can be noted is there are no statistically significant differences between any of the groups with respect to basic demographics (median age, median years since graduation, and proportions reporting being white or female) or pre-BA characteristics (having a parent who participated in higher education, intending to pursue post-BA education, and participation in community engagement supporter or leadership activities). This suggests it is appropriate to use the No IEE Group as a control for maturation effects associated with the BA.

Consistent with some commentators' suggestions, comparison of pre-BA international orientations suggests that members of the ISL and All Other IEE groups differ from members of the No IEE group in ways that might have contributed to their decisions to pursue an IEE *and* some of their subsequent decisions, like choosing to work abroad (Eyler, 2011; Rubin & Matthews,

2013, Waibel et al., 2017). As indicated in Table (1), the ISL and All Other IEE groups differ statistically significantly from the No IEE group with respect to pre-BA desires for careers working outside their home country as well as pre-BA travel outside of the US and Canada. Their rates of pre-BA self-identification as global citizens are also higher, but not statistically significantly so. The decision to use the All Other IEE group as a control for selection bias associated with characteristics that distinguish students who participate in IEEs finds support in the absence of statistically significant differences between the ISL and All Other IEE groups and the presence of some such differences between both IEE groups and the No IEE group.

4. Findings

This section is divided into five subsections, each focusing on results related to one of the five ISL objectives under consideration.

4.1. Increase Local and Global Community Engagement

Rather than directly asking respondents to indicate if their experiences influenced their level of community engagement, the survey asked respondents to self-report their pre-BA and post-BA levels of participation in certain community engagement activities. To reduce the possibility of socially desirable responses, the pre-BA and post-BA questions were separated by unrelated questions.

The survey divided community engagement into two categories using items influenced by Morais and Ogden's (2011) global civic engagement measures. C*ommunity engagement supporter activities* include these items: participated in a fundraiser, volunteered with a non-profit organization, paid membership dues to a non-profit, or donated to a charity. *Community engagement leadership activities* include: served as a volunteer leader with a non-profit organization (e.g., Board member); contacted a newspaper, radio station, or someone in government to express a view about an issue or concern; or expressed a view on a website, blog, chatroom, or other social media. Respondents were asked to indicate if they did any of the items in each category Regularly, Quite often, Sometimes, Rarely, or Never. Respondents who indicated they engaged regularly or quite often in *either* supporter or leadership activities were categorized as being *engaged*.

Community engagement activation (Table 2) provides a sense of the impact of ISL on community engagement in general. It was operationalized by treating those who went from being not engaged pre-BA to engaged post-BA as *activated*. The percentage activated for each group was calculated by dividing the number of respondents activated by the number not engaged pre-BA.

TABLE (2)
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT ACTIVATION

	ISL (*N*=16)	All Other IEE (*N*=43)	No IEE (*N*=100)	*p*
Activated pre- to post-BA (as % of those not engaged pre-BA)✪	10 (62.5%)$_a$	9 (20.9%)$_b$	27 (27%)$_b$	**.009**

✪ Fisher's exact test; Post hoc analysis involved Fisher's exact test (2x2) with a Bonferroni correction (i.e., statistical significance was accepted at $p < .016667$).
$_{a, b}$ Each subscript letter denotes a category whose column proportions do not differ significantly from each other at the .016667 level.

Table (2) suggests that ISL has a positive net impact on community engagement activation. The statistically significant difference between the ISL and No IEE groups suggests this net impact was not due to maturation and the statistically significant difference between the ISL and All Other IEE groups suggests that ISL's net impact was due to the effects of ISL and not to characteristics common to students who pursue IEEs. Thus, ISL appears to have a special impact on activating community engagement.

Activation of global community engagement (Table 3) is of interest because community engagement activities focused on global causes are an anticipated impact of ISL. Unlike community engagement activation, this assessment focused on respondents who indicated any positive level of either form of community engagement (i.e., Regularly, Quite often, Sometimes, or Rarely). Respondents who indicated that either of their supporter or leadership activities included a focus on Global/International Causes were categorized as having an *international focus* to their community engagement; those who went from not having an international focus pre-BA to having one post-BA were categorized as *activated*. The percentage activated for each group was calculated by dividing the number of respondents activated by the number who did not report pre-BA community engagement with an international focus.

TABLE (3)
ACTIVATION OF GLOBAL COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

	ISL (*N*=11)	All Other IEE (*N*=42)	No IEE (*N*=76)	*p*
Activated International Focus of Community Engagement Pre- to Post-BA (As % of All Without Pre-BA International Focus)✪	8 (73%)$_a$	22 (54%)$_{a, b}$	22 (29%)$_b$	**.003**

✪ Fisher's exact test; Post hoc analysis involved Fisher's exact test (2x2) with a Bonferroni correction (i.e., statistical significance was accepted at $p < .016667$).
$_{a, b}$ Each subscript letter denotes a category whose column proportions do not differ significantly from each other at the .016667 level.

Table (3) indicates a statistically significant difference between the ISL and No IEE groups with respect to activation of an international focus of community engagement, but not between the ISL and All Other IEE groups. Thus, it seems that ISL has a net impact on activation of global community engagement that distinguishes it from maturation effects associated with the BA, but not from effects common to all IEEs or characteristics common to students who pursue IEEs.

In sum, while the analysis strongly suggests that ISL has net impacts on activating community engagement and community engagement with an international focus that distinguish it from maturation effects common to all BAs, only its impact on community engagement activation appears distinct from impacts common to all IEEs and/or selection biases associated with students who choose to participate in IEEs.

4.2. Activate Leaders

Rather than ask respondents to self-assess the impact of their experiences on leadership skills, the survey relied upon self-reported, yet indirect, indicators to assess impacts on workplace and community engagement leadership.

Impact on workplace leadership was assessed through *workplace leadership activation*. This was operationalized by comparing answers to a baseline question at the beginning of the survey--Had you ever held a paid supervisor/management position before beginning your BA?—with answers to a question that appeared later in the survey that asked if respondents

have held such a position since completing their BA. Respondents who did not hold workplace leadership positions pre-BA but had held them post-BA were considered *activated.* Rates of activation were calculated as a percentage of those in each group who had not held pre-BA workplace leadership positions. While the ISL group demonstrated a 29% rate of activation (Table 4, row 1), no net impact can be attributed to ISL as this rate did not differ statistically significant from the rates for the All Other IEE and No IEE groups.

TABLE (4)
WORKPLACE AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT LEADERSHIP ACTIVATION

	ISL	All Other IEE	No IEE	*p*
1. Workplace Leadership Activation†	*N* = 21	*N* = 64	*N* = 111	
	6 (29%)	15 (23%)	28 (25%)	.892
2. Community Engagement Leadership Activation✪	*N* = 9	*N* = 28	*N* = 47	
	5 (56%)	8 (29%)	24 (51%)	.143

† Chi-Square test of homogeneity (2xC Table); Post hoc analysis involved pairwise comparisons using the z-test of two proportions with a Bonferroni correction.
✪ Fisher's exact test.

Impact on community engagement leadership was assessed through c*ommunity engagement leadership activation*. Applying the operationalization of *engagement* in 4.1, respondents who went from being not engaged pre-BA to engaged post-BA (i.e., they responded Regularly or Quite often) were considered *activated.* Percentages activated were calculated by dividing the number activated by the number who where not engaged pre-BA. Here again, the absence of statistically significant differences between the three groups (Table 4, row 2) suggests ISL had no net impact.

In sum, while ISL is associated with increases in workplace and community engagement leadership activation, no net impact has been observed that would distinguish it from maturation effects of the BA or selection bias or common effects associated with other IEEs.

4.3. Develop Global Citizens

Global citizenship was primarily assessed indirectly using items from, or modified from, established global citizenship scales, although a

direct question was asked regarding pre-BA global citizenship identity. These measures were applied first, by comparing the groups according to the three key elements of global citizenship and second, by comparing rates of a rough-and-ready measure of global citizenship activation.

Neither Morais and Ogden's (2011) 43-item scale nor Lough et al.'s (2009) 39-item global citizenship scale was included in its entirety, as this may have jeopardized completion rates of an already long survey. Rather, the survey operationalized social responsibility, global competence, and global civic engagement by incorporating selected elements of each scale in ways that worked efficiently with the study's other purposes. Social responsibility was assessed using Lough et al.'s global identity subscale. Global competence was assessed using a combination of Lough et al.'s intercultural relations subscale and Morais and Ogden's global knowledge subscale along with key items from Morais and Ogden's intercultural communication subscale (see Appendix A for the actual items used). While Lough et al. had used a seven-point Likert scale, a five-point Likert scale was used for all items (Strongly disagree, Somewhat disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, Somewhat agree, Strongly agree) to reduce confusion for respondents and to facilitate analysis. Finally, assessment of global civic engagement drew upon responses to questions about community engagement supporter or leadership activities (which, as noted in the previous section, were based on Morais and Ogden's (2011) global civic engagement measures): respondents who indicated that their post-BA supporter or leadership activities had an international focus were treated as exhibiting global civic engagement.

The implications of Table (5) are mixed. The fact that all median scores for the ISL group are at or above 4 (the Somewhat Agree response) and 76% of the ISL group demonstrated global civic engagement suggests that ISL is positively associated with global citizenship. The statistically significant differences between the ISL and No IEE groups with respect to global identity, intercultural relations, and global knowledge suggests that ISL may have net impacts vis-à-vis maturation effects common to the BA. The statistically significant difference between the ISL and All Other IEE groups with respect to global knowledge suggests ISL may have a net impact vis-à-vis other IEEs with respect to this aspect of global citizenship.

TABLE (5)

COMPARISON OF MEDIAN SCORES ON FOUR GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP SCALES AND PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS DEMONSTRATING GLOBAL CIVIC ENGAGEMENT

	ISL	All Other IEE	No IEE	*p*
Social Responsibility				
Global Identity [Δ1]	4.0 (25)$_a$	4.0 (80)$_a$	3.667 (144)$_b$	**.002**
Global Competence				
Intercultural Relations [Δ2]	4.75 (25)$_a$	4.5 (80)$_a$	4.0 (145)$_b$	**<.001**
Intercultural Communications [Δ3]	4.0 (25)$_a$	4.0 (79)$_a$	4.0 (144)$_a$	**.046**
Global Knowledge [Δ4]	4.33 (25)$_a$	3.667 (79)$_b$	3.667 (144)$_b$	**.002**
Global Civic Engagement				
Respondent Has Post-BA International Focus to Either Supporter or Leadership Community Engagement Activities[†]	19 (76%)$_a$	80 (63%)$_a$	73 (50%)$_a$	**.026**

[Δ] Kruskal-Wallis *H* test.

$_{a, b}$ Each subscript letter denotes a category whose column proportions do not differ significantly from each other at the .05 level. Pairwise comparisons were performed using Dunn's (1964) procedure with a Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons. Adjusted p-values for statistically significant differences are included in the notes below.

[1] Median scores differed statistically significantly between the groups, $\chi^2(2) = 12.522$. Post hoc analysis revealed statistically differences in median scores between ISL and No IEE (.049) and between All Other IEE and No IEE (.006).

[2] Median scores differed statistically significantly between the groups, $\chi^2(2) = 22.155$. Post hoc analysis revealed statistically differences in median scores between ISL and No IEE (.001) and between All Other IEE and No IEE (.000).

[3] Median scores differed statistically significantly between the groups, $\chi^2(2) = 6.178$. Post hoc analysis revealed no statistically significant differences.

[4] Median scores differed statistically significantly between the groups, $\chi^2(2) = 12.854$. Post hoc analysis revealed statistically differences in median scores between ISL and No IEE (.001) and between ISL and All Other IEE (.011).

[†] Chi-Square test of homogeneity (2xC Table); Post hoc analysis involved pairwise comparisons using the z-test of two proportions with a Bonferroni correction. Post hoc analysis revealed no statistically significant differences.

$_c$ Each subscript letter denotes a category whose column proportions do not differ significantly from each other at the .05 level.

Global citizenship activation (Table 6) provides a more dynamic assessment of contributions to global citizenship development. This comparison must be considered rough-and-ready and only indicative of a possible relationship. The reason is that pre- and post-BA assessments of

global citizenship relied on different proxy variables for the three elements of global citizenship. To establish a baseline, having indicated that they considered themselves global citizens before starting their BA was treated as a proxy for social responsibility and having had an international focus to both their community engagement supporter and leadership activities was considered a proxy for global competence *and* global civic engagement. Those who satisfied both proxies were defined as pre-BA global citizens. Post-BA global citizens were defined as those who had a mean of 4+ on the global identity subscale (social responsibility), a cumulative mean of 4+ across all items of the intercultural relations, intercultural communications, and global knowledge subscales (global competence), and an international focus to their post-BA community engagement supporter and leadership activities (global civic engagement). Those who were not considered global citizens pre-BA, but who were considered global citizens post-BA, were considered *activated*. Rates of activation for each group were calculated by dividing numbers activated by numbers not considered global citizens pre-BA. This set the bar for global citizenship quite high, but this was considered reasonable given the rough-and-ready nature of this analysis.

TABLE (6)
GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP ACTIVATION

	ISL (*N*=22)	All Other IEE (*N*=64)	No IEE (*N*=128)	*p*
Global Citizenship Activation✪	6 (27%)	6 (9%)	12 (9%)	.059

✪ Fisher's exact test.

The much higher percentage of respondents in the ISL group who were activated as global citizens (27% versus 9% each for the All Other IEE and No IEE groups) suggests that ISL may have a net impact on global citizenship activation, but, as the differences were not statistically significant, this cannot be considered demonstrated.

In sum, ISL has been shown to have a net impact vis-à-vis the BA alone with respect to some of the key elements of global citizenship: social responsibility and two of three global competence subscales (intercultural relations and global knowledge), but not intercultural communications or global civic engagement. ISL was also shown to have a positive net impact vis-à-vis All Other IEEs with respect to global knowledge. Net impacts were

suggested, but not statistically confirmed with respect to global citizenship activation.

4.4. Facilitate Personal and Professional Growth

Similar to approaches noted in the literature review, this section operationalizes effects on personal and professional growth as effects on educational trajectories, career choice, location of work, and skills development. These effects were assessed based upon a mix of self-reported subjective and objective measures.

Impact on educational trajectories (Table 7) was assessed in two ways. The first concerned participation in post-BA education programs. As reflected in row 1 of Table (7), there were no statistically significant differences in this regard.

TABLE (7)
IMPACT ON EDUCATIONAL TRAJECTORIES

	ISL	All Other IEE	No IEE	*p*
1. Percentage Indicating Participation in Post-BA Education Programs†	*N* = 25 14 (56%)	*N* = 80 56 (70%)	*N* = 145 95 (66%)	.428
2. Activation of Interest in Post-BA Education as a Percentage of Those Indicating No Pre-BA Interest in Post-BA Education✪	*N* = 8 5 (63%)	*N* = 24 14 (58%)	*N* = 45 17 (38%)	.169

† Chi-Square test of homogeneity (2xC Table).
✪ Fisher's exact test.

The second way impact on educational trajectories was assessed concerned rates of activation of interest in post-BA education. This was calculated by dividing the number who indicated they had no pre-BA intention to pursue further education, but reported that they had ended up doing so, by the total number who indicated no pre-BA intention. Again, as reflected in row 2 of Table (7), no statistically significant differences were found. Thus, consistent with Franklin's (2010) finding, neither ISL nor IEEs in general have been shown to have any special impact on educational trajectories.

Impact on career goals was assessed based on a question that was only asked of those who participated in an IEE. Cases where respondents self-reported that they had affirmed or changed their career goals as a

"direct result of their international educational experience" were treated as representing an impact. As there was no statistically significant difference between the 52% (13) of the ISL group and 50% (40) of the All Other IEE group who indicated there had been an impact (X^2 test, p = .861), ISL was not shown to have a net impact vis-à-vis other IEEs.

Impact on careers with international aspects (Table 8) was assessed by drawing upon questions concerning pre-BA desire to work internationally and post-BA experience of work that required living abroad or had international aspects (i.e., work that requires living abroad or travelling internationally (Felker & Gianecchini, 2015). As reflected in Table (8), the results were broadly similar for both IEE groups, but starkly different between the IEE and No IEE groups.

TABLE (8)
IMPACTS ON CAREERS WITH INTERNATIONAL ASPECTS

	ISL	All Other IEE	No IEE	*p*
1. Held a Position with International Aspects Post-BA✪	*N* = 25 8 (32%)$_a$	*N* = 80 26 (33%)$_a$	*N* = 145 15 (10%)$_b$	**<.001**
2. Has Lived Abroad for Work Post-BA✪	*N* = 25 7 (31%)$_a$	*N* = 80 17 (25%)$_a$	*N* = 145 3 (2%)$_b$	**<.001**
3. Had Not Desired a Career with International Aspects, But Has Had One Post-BA (as a Percentage of All Who Had Not Desired to Work Internationally Pre-BA) ✪	*N* = 5 2 (40%)$_a$	*N* = 19 4 (21%)$_a$	*N* = 62 3 (5%)$_a$	**.014**[1]

✪ Fisher's Exact Test; Post hoc analysis involved multiple Fisher's exact tests (2x2) with a Bonferroni correction (i.e., statistical significance was accepted at p < .016667).
$_{a, b}$ Each subscript letter denotes a category whose column proportions do not differ significantly from each other at the .016667 level.
[1] No pairwise comparisons were statistically significantly different as assessed by Fisher's exact test, p < .016667.

Row 1 of Table (8) compares post-BA rates of work with international aspects. The first thing to note is that, consistent with the literature, most students who participate in IEEs do not end up working internationally. Second, the statistically significant difference between the rates of work with international aspects for the ISL and No IEE groups suggests that ISL has a net impact versus the BA alone, but not versus other forms of IEE. Row

2 reveals the same pattern with respect to work that requires living abroad. Finally, row 3 compares respondents who reported no pre-BA interest in a career with international aspects but who have subsequently had such a career (international career activation). While the post hoc test revealed no statistically significant differences, the magnitude of the percentage differences suggest that such a finding might be revealed by a study with more respondents.

Impact on development of skills and abilities (Table 9) was assessed by asking ISL and All Other IEE respondents to rate the extent to which their IEE was useful (i.e., Extremely, Very, Fairly, and Not useful) for improving each of 17 skills. Those in the No IEE group were asked to do the same with respect to their BA. Since "Not useful" was almost never selected, respondents who selected Extremely or Very useful were categorized as having found a given experience useful. Table (9) presents comparisons for all 17 skills and abilities, ordered according to the percentage of ISL respondents who indicated that their ISL was useful for improving them.

TABLE (9)

RESPONDENTS REPORTING IEE OR BA WAS EXTREMELY OR VERY HELPFUL FOR IMPROVING SKILL

	ISL	All Other IEE	No IEE	*p*
Ability to Adapt and Act in New Situations†	24 (96%)$_a$	65 (81%)$_a$	95 (66%)$_b$	**.001**
Awareness of Own Strengths and Weaknesses†	23 (92%)	64 (80%)	110 (76%)	.180
Knowledge about a Specific Country†	23 (92%)$_a$	63 (79%)$_a$	56 (39%)$_b$	**<.001**
Openness to and Curiosity About New Challenges†	22 (88%)	65 (81%)	113 (78%)	.480
Ability to Interact with People from Other Backgrounds and Cultures†	20 (80%)$_a$	58 (73%)$_a$	67 (46%)$_b$	**<.001**
Analytical/Problem Solving Skills†	20 (80%)$_a$	41 (51%)$_b$	122 (84%)$_a$	**<.001**
Teamwork†	20 (80%)	56 (70%)	101 (70%)	.565
Critical Thinking†	19 (76%)$_a$	47 (59%)$_a$	129 (89%)$_b$	**<.001**
Decision-making Skills†	17 (68%)	46 (58%)	99 (68%)	.253
Oral Communication†	16 (64%)	46 (58%)	98 (68%)	.320
Skills Related to Academic Discipline†	16 (64%)	47 (59%)	103 (71%)	.169
Planning & Organizational Skills†	14 (56%)$_a$	50 (63%)$_a$	116 (80%)$_b$	**.003**

Reading/Writing Skills†	10 (40%)$_a$	33 (41%)$_a$	131 (90%)$_b$	**<.001**
Computer Skills†	5 (20%)$_{a, b}$	14 (18%)$_a$	51 (35%)$_b$	**.012**
Innovative Potential and Entrepreneurial Skills†	5 (20%)	16 (20%)	30 (21%)	.991
Foreign language Skills✪	4 (16%)$_{c, d}$	30 (38%)$_c$	6 (4%)$_d$	**<.001**
Being Good with Numbers✪	0 (0%)	13 (16%)	21 (15%)	.076

† Chi-Square test of homogeneity (2xC Table); Post hoc analysis involved pairwise comparisons using the z-test of two proportions with a Bonferroni correction.
$_{a, b}$ Each subscript letter denotes a category whose column proportions do not differ significantly from each other at the .05 level.
✪ Fisher's Exact Test; Post hoc analysis involved multiple Fisher's exact tests (2x2) with a Bonferroni correction (i.e., statistical significance was accepted at $p < .016667$).
$_{c, d}$ Each subscript letter denotes a category whose column proportions do not differ significantly from each other at the .016667 level.

As indicated in Table (9), the ISL group only reported statistically significantly *higher* rates of perceived usefulness of their experience versus the No IEE Group with respect to three skills: ability to adapt and act in new situations; knowledge about a specific country; and ability to interact with people from other cultural backgrounds and cultures. (There are also statistically significant differences with respect to critical thinking, planning and organizational skills, and reading/writing skills, but these are higher for the No IEE group.) Thus, while it seems that ISL has a positive net impact vis-à-vis the BA alone with respect to these three skills, the fact that ISL was not statistically significantly distinguished from the All Other IEE group with respect to these skills suggests that these effects are common to all IEEs. The only skill that showed a statistically significantly higher rate for ISL vis-à-vis the All Other IEE group (but, curiously not the No IEE group) was analytical/problem solving skills.

In sum, the fact that ISL was shown to have net impacts vis-à-vis the No IEE group with respect to work with international aspects, working abroad, and three specific skills suggests that these effects are not due to maturation effects. Similarly, the net impact vis-à-vis All Other IEEs with respect to improving analytical/problem solving skills suggests this is an impact of ISL and not due to characteristics common to students who pursue IEEs.

4.5. Enhance Canadian and International Networking

Assessment of enhanced Canadian and international networking was operationalized by asking all respondents about changes in numbers of international contacts and amount of interaction with them, asking respondents who participated in an IEE whether they have interacted with contacts made during their IEE, and addressing two unique questions about post-internship networking to the ISL group.

Increase in international contacts was assessed by asking respondents if they have about the same, a few more, or many more non-familial international contacts than they had pre-BA. Row 1 of Table (10) indicates that students in all three groups had similar rates of pre-BA international contacts, but row 2 shows that statistically significantly higher percentages of the IEE groups reported having *many more* international contacts post-BA than did the No IEE group. This suggests that ISL has a positive net impact on developing international contacts that cannot be attributed to BA maturation effects, but the lack of a statistically significant difference vis-à-vis the All Other IEE group suggests that this effect is common to IEEs.

TABLE (10)
PROPORTIONS OF RESPONDENTS REPORTING VARIOUS ASPECTS OF NETWORKING

	ISL	All Other IEE	No IEE	*p*
1. Respondents Reporting Having Pre-BA International Contacts†	13 (52%)	44 (55%)	75 (52%)	.892
2. Respondents Reporting Having Many More International Contacts Post-BA†	15 (60%)$_a$	48 (60%)$_a$	32 (22%)$_b$	**<.001**
3. Respondents Reporting Using International Contacts Frequently or Rarely (versus Never)†	20 (80%)$_a$	62 (78%)$_a$	74 (51%)$_b$	**<.001**
4. Respondents Reporting Post-BA Interaction with IEE Contacts†	22 (88%)	62 (78%)		.252

† Chi-Square test of homogeneity (2xC Table); Post hoc analysis involved pairwise comparisons using the z-test of two proportions with a Bonferroni correction.
$_{a, b}$ Each subscript letter denotes a category whose column proportions do not differ significantly from each other at the .05 level.

Amount of interaction with international contacts was assessed by asking respondents if they use their international contacts to link people or organizations to useful resources frequently, rarely, or never. Row 3 of Table (10) reports the percentages who indicated they make use of international contacts (i.e., frequently or rarely). Here again, the finding of a statistically significant difference vis-à-vis the No IEE group but not vis-à-vis the All Other IEE group suggests that ISL has a net impact that cannot be attributed to BA maturation effects, but that does not distinguish it from effects common to IEEs.

Subsequent interaction was assessed by asking respondents who had participated in an IEE if they had been in touch with any foreign contacts they had made during their IEE. As row 4 of Table (10) indicates no statistically significant difference, it seems that ISL does not have a net impact vis-à-vis other IEEs on generating international interactions.

Ongoing QES-related networks were assessed through questions that were only addressed to the ISL group, so these cannot be assessed comparatively. Twenty-one (84%) of the former interns indicated they had crossed paths with or stayed in touch with at least one other intern and seven (28%) reported that they had maintained contact with their host organization.

Subsequent semi-structured follow-up interviews over Microsoft Teams (REB #6947) with nine former interns who had indicated on the survey that they were willing to be interviewed revealed that the interns made connections with fellow interns, host-country locals, and host-organization staff, but that the majority of such connections were personal and not professional in nature.

Most relationships between interns tended to be active for the first year or two before dwindling down to sending birthday or holiday greetings on social media or dissipating entirely. Relationships that endured tended to share some commonality that gave the relationship a forward-looking aspect beyond shared nostalgia: for instance, a common professional focus on international relations; a shared interest in working with children; careers in student affairs.

Interns did not tend to maintain relationships with host-organization staff and when they did, it tended to be personal in nature and primarily conducted through social media, although two former interns did report using contacts when they returned to the host country. Reasons given for this lack of interaction included age differences between interns and host organization staff and staff only showing interest in the relationship so long as the former intern would raise money for the organization. Other interns attributed the problem to their not believing that host organization staff would want to stay in touch with them, admitted that they could not see the "value" or "purpose" of maintaining the relationship, or said that they "did not know how to" maintain relationships.

In sum, and unsurprisingly, the results suggest that ISL has a net impact at increasing students' number of international contacts and their frequency of contact with international contacts, but also that this does not distinguish ISL from IEEs in general.

5. Discussion

Reflecting on Tiessen's (2018) observation that many ISL participants recognized "that much of what they learned abroad could be learned in Canada" (p. 86), this article asked two questions: Does ISL deliver on its objectives? And, does it do so more effectively than other less onerous and sometimes cheaper alternatives? The results clearly indicate that ISL is associated with gains with respect to all five objectives, but only sometimes in ways that could be distinguished from gains participants might have experienced had they not participated in ISL (i.e., BA-related maturation effects) or had they participated in a different type of IEE.

Before proceeding further, it is worth noting that this section does not draw many comparisons to previous findings from the literature as variability in methodologies, sample sizes, focus of studies (study abroad, ISL, etc.), operationalization of key variables, and educational background/disciplinary orientations of participants in previous studies would make comparison to this study's results difficult to interpret (we are thankful to one of the anonymous reviewers for pointing this out). For instance, Table (10) reports that this study found that 88% of ISL students and 78% of All Other IEE students reported post-BA interactions with IEE

contacts. While this appears favorable compared to the 19%-28% found by Norris and Gillespie (2009) and the 51%-56% noted by the Erasmus Impact study (European Commission et al., 2014), comparison is complicated by the fact that Norris and Gillespie's respondents participated in their IEE up to 49 years prior versus up to 10 years for this study and the Erasmus study asked if respondents had "new friends abroad", a narrower category than this study's "interactions with IEE contacts". Thus, readers are encouraged to gauge the applicability of this study's findings to their own circumstances by paying keen attention to this study's population and how key variables were operationalized.

5.1. ISL Versus the BA Alone

Statistically significant net impacts vis-à-vis the No IEE/BA-alone group suggested that students were experiencing learning in ISL that would not have occurred at home. This was observed with respect to all but one of the objectives: leadership activation. The possibility of no net impact for leadership had been anticipated by DeGraaf et al. (2013). This result likely reflects that leadership activation is just as likely to occur at home since many aspects of the BA experience, like volunteering (Wurr & Hamilton, 2012), are likely to activate students' leadership potential and leadership activation does not appear to be especially dependent upon going abroad.

Regarding the statistically significant gains with respect to the other four objectives, a case can be made for the special contribution of ISL. Gains in measures of community engagement (community engagement activation, activation of global community engagement) could be attributed to the service-learning aspect of ISL. Gains in global citizenship development (global identity, intercultural relations, global knowledge) could be attributed to the deeply immersive experience of working closely with members of host organizations and their local clientele in non-academic settings.

Differences in personal and professional growth with respect to pursuing careers with international aspects could be due to ISL students having the opportunity to develop valuable international work experience not available to the No IEE students. Of course, the possibility that differences with respect to global citizenship and international work might

also reflect pre-existing differences in the characteristics of students who choose to participate in IEEs cannot be ruled out.

Similarly, the aspects of skill development that distinguish the ISL students from the No IEE students (ability to adapt and act in new situations; knowledge about a specific country; ability to interact with people from other cultural backgrounds and cultures) seem especially likely to be developed while working in a foreign setting.

Finally, working and living abroad is clearly relevant to international networking (having many more international contacts post-BA; using international contacts). While these contacts did not seem to be professional in nature, internationalized networks of personal relationships do seem likely to further reinforce global citizenship by contributing to the development of global social responsibility, global knowledge, and skills related to intercultural relations and communications.

These results suggest that some of what the ISL students learned abroad was not due to BA-related maturation effects and thus, could not have been learned at home in Canada.

5.2. ISL Versus All Other IEEs

When compared to the often less onerous and expensive types of IEE represented by the All Other IEE group, ISL was shown to have fewer positive net impacts.

The fact that ISL was shown to contribute to community engagement activation at statistically significantly higher rates than the All Other IEE group is perhaps not surprising. Unlike the content of some other IEEs like study abroad and professor-led field courses, ISL requires students to gain experience volunteering in typically non-profit organizations.

ISL was also associated with statistically significantly higher rates of self-reported measures of global knowledge than the All Other IEE group. If we consider the actual items that constitute the Global Knowledge subscale (whether respondents are informed on current international issues, whether they feel comfortable expressing their views about global problems, and whether they are able to write an opinion letter concerning global issues), it seems that this scale not only measures one's confidence

about one's knowledge, but also one's feelings of efficacy with respect to mobilizing that knowledge. This might reflect the fact that, unlike, say, study abroad, ISL placements are much more likely to require students to become actively engaged in working on local problems.

Finally, the ISL group demonstrated a statistically significant positive net impact vis-à-vis the All Other IEE groups with respect to perceptions of the usefulness of their IEE for improving their analytical/problem solving skills. Again, this may reflect differences between ISL placements, which often require students to take the initiative in navigating their way to and within their workplaces, and study abroad which tends to take place in well-organized and directive campuses and classrooms.

Taken together, we might characterize the greater effectiveness of ISL vis-à-vis All Other IEEs with respect to community engagement activation, global knowledge, and problem solving as reflecting greater effectiveness at motivating students to understand and care about global issues, think about ways to address them, and seek out opportunities to express their concerns and advance their solutions.

6. Conclusion, Limitations, Future Directions

In response to the questions set out in the introduction, this study has demonstrated that ISL can deliver on all of its objectives, that, with the exception of leadership activation, it does so in ways that do not occur at home, and that ISL has net impacts with respect to community engagement activation, global knowledge, and problem solving that distinguish it from other IEEs. Whether these impacts are sufficient to justify the additional cost and administration that are often associated with ISL is a matter for universities and program funders to decide based upon their own reasons for supporting ISL.

This study has a number of limitations. Findings based on one particular experience of ISL may not be generalizable to other forms of ISL. Respondents' retrospective answers concerning baseline pre-BA experiences and orientations may not accurately reflect what they thought in the past. Results may have been skewed by a nonresponse bias: i.e., those who participated in the survey may have had more positive experiences

than those who chose not to participate (Vanden Berg & Schwander, 2019). While efforts were made to avoid desirable answer bias by basing findings on indirect measures, this was not always possible, especially since the survey relied upon respondent self-reporting. Finally, as the survey was conducted by faculty members who have been deeply involved with the internship program, there is a risk that the researchers may not have been fully objective or that some ISL alumni may have taken this into consideration in formulating their responses (Tonkin & Quiroga, 2004).

Many of these limitations could be addressed by conducting a similar study with students from a wider range of universities who participated in the QES or similar ISL programs. This would address concerns about the researchers being known to the respondents and widen the generalizability of the results. The larger number of respondents would also provide the opportunity to confirm or reject some of the highly indicative, but not statistically significant, results in this study, including those with respect to activation of an international focus to community engagement (Table 3), community engagement leadership activation (Table 4), global citizenship activation (Table 6), and international career activation (Table 8, row 3).

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments and Tony Christensen for advice regarding the statistical analysis. Responsibility for any errors or omissions is, of course, the authors' alone.

References

Ahmed, E. I., & Mohammed, A. (2022). Evaluating the impact of global citizenship education programmes: A synthesis of research. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice,* 17(2), 122-140. https://doi.org/10.1177/17461979211000039

Amin, J. (2015). *African immersion: American college students in Cameroon*. Lexington Books.

Bringle, R. G., Hatcher, J. A., & Williams, M. J. (2011). Quantitative approaches to research on international service learning: Design, measurement, and theory. In R. G. Bringle, J. A. Hatcher, & S. G. Jones (Eds.), *International Service Learning: Conceptual Frameworks and Research* (pp. 275-290). Stylus.

Brown, N. C. (2011). A 360-Degree View of International Service Learning. In R. G. Bringle, J. A. Hatcher, & S. G. Jones (Eds.), *International service learning: Conceptual frameworks and research* (pp. 57-68). Stylus.

Bryla, P. (2015). The impact of international student mobility on subsequent employment and professional career: A large-scale survey among polish former Erasmus students. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *176*, 633-641. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.01.521

Canadian Bureau for International Education. (2022). *Canada's education abroad lexicon*. https://cbie.ca/who-we-are/institutional-resources/canadas-education-abroad-lexicon/

Chan, S., Yau, J. H-Y, Tong, S. K. P., Lam, C., & Kwan, K. P. (2018). Impact of international service-learning on students' learning and development. Office of Service Learning, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University. http://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.30986.41924

Cress, C. M., Yamashita, M., Duarte, R., & Burns, H. (2010). A transnational comparison of service-learning as a tool for leadership development. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, *18*(2), 228-244. https://doi-org.libproxy.wlu.ca/10.1108/19348831011046281

DeGraaf, D., Slagter, C., Larsen, K., & Ditta, E. (2013). The long-term personal and professional impacts of participating in a study abroad program. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, *XXIII*, 42-59. https://doi.org/10.36366/frontiers.v23i1.328

European Commission Directorate-General for Education, Youth, Sport and Culture (European Commission), Brandenburg, U., Berghoff, S., & Taboadela, O. (2014). The Erasmus impact study: Effects of mobility on the skills and employability of students and the internationalisation of higher education institutions. Publications Office. https://doi.org/10.2766/75468

Eyler, J. (2011). What international service learning research can learn from research on service learning. In R. G. Bringle, J. A. Hatcher, & S. G. Jones (Eds.), *International service learning: Conceptual frameworks and research* (pp. 225-242). Stylus.

Felker, J., & Gianecchini, M. (2015). Influence of pre-graduation international experiences on early career internationalization: The mediation effect of career capital. *European Management Journal, 33*(1), 60-70. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2014.07.001

Franklin, K. (2010). Long-term Career Impact and Professional Applicability of the Study Abroad Experience. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 19*(1), 169–191. https://doi.org/10.36366/frontiers.v19i1.279

Geyer, A., Putz, J., & Misra, K. (2017). The effect of short-term study abroad experiences on American students' leadership skills and career aspirations. *International Journal of Educational Management, 31*(7), 1042-1053. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-10-2016-0203

Gillespie, J. L., Braskamp, L., & Dwyer, M. (2009). Holistic student learning and development abroad. In R. Lewin (Ed.), *The handbook of practice and research in study abroad* (pp. 445-465). Routledge.

Grantham, K. (2018). Assessing international student mobility in Canadian university strategic plans: Instrumentalist versus transformational approaches to higher education. *Journal of Global Citizenship and Equity Education, 6*(1), 1-21, https://journals.sfu.ca/jgcee/index.php/jgcee/article/view/176

Hartman, E., Lough, B. J., Toms, C., & Reynolds, N. (2015). Assessing intercultural capacities, civic engagement, and critical thinking: The global engagement survey. In J. Friedman, V. Haverkate, B. Oomen, E. Park, & M. Sklad (Eds), *Going glocal in*

higher education: Theory, teaching and measurement of global citizenship (pp. 127-145). de Drvkkery.

Howard, W., Perrotte, G., Lee, M., & Frisone, J. (2017). A formative case evaluation of the design of an online delivery model providing access to study abroad activities. *Online Learning, 21*(3), 115-134. https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v21i3.1234

Huish, R. (2021). Global citizenship amid COVID-19: Why climate change and a pandemic spell the end of international experiential learning. *Canadian Journal of Development Studies, 42*(4): 441-458. http://doi.org/10.1080/02255189.2020.1862071

Kishino, H., & Takahashi, T. (2019). Global citizenship development: Effects of study abroad and other factors. *Journal of International Students, 9*(2), 535-559. https://doi.org/10.32674/jis.v9i2.390

Langdon, J., & C. Agyeyomah. (2014). Critical hyper-reflexivity and challenging power: Pushing past the dichotomy of employability and good global citizenship in development studies experiential learning contexts. In R. Tiessen & R. Huish (Eds.), *Globetrotting or global citizenshiship? Perils and potential of international experiential learning* (pp. 43–70). University of Toronto Press.

Larsen, M. A. (2016). *International service learning: Engaging host communities*. Routledge.

Lough, B. J., McBride, A. M., & Sherraden, M. S. (2009). Measuring volunteer outcomes: Development of the international volunteer impacts survey. Centre for Social Development Working Papers No. 09-31. https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/csd_research/510/

Lough, B.J., & Tiessen, R. (2018). How do international volunteering characteristics influence outcomes? Perspectives from partner organizations. *Voluntas*, *29*, 104-118. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-017-9902-9.

Massaro, V. R. (2022). Global citizenship development in higher education institutions: A systematic review of the literature. *Journal of Global Education and Research, 6*(1), 98-114. https://doi.org/10.5038/2577-509X.6.1.1124

McBride, A. M., Lough, B. J., & Sherraden, M. S. (2012). International service and the perceived impacts on volunteers. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly 41*(6), 969-990. https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764011421530

Milius, J. L. (2019) *A phenomenological study of leadership outcomes in short-term study abroad* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska]. DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska – Lincoln. https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/aglecdiss/111

Morais, D. B., & Ogden, A. C. (2011). Initial development and validation of the global citizenship scale. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 15*(5), 445-466. https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315310375308

Norris, E. M. & Gillespie, J. (2009). How study abroad shapes global careers: Evidence from the United States. *Journal of Studies in International Education 13*(3), 382-97. https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315308319740

Paige, M. R., Fry, G. W., Stallman, E. M., Josic, J. & Jon, J-E. (2009). Study abroad for global engagement: The long-term impact of mobility experiences. *Intercultural Education, 20*(sup1), S29-S44. https://doi.org/10.1080/14675980903370847

Rubin, D. L., & Matthews, P. H. (2013). Learning outcomes assessment: Extrapolating from study abroad to international service learning. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 17*(2), 67-86.

Santulli, D. P. (2018). The role of international service-learning in cultivating global citizenship and leadership. *New Directions in Student Leadership*, *160*, 97-108. https://doi.org/10.1002/yd.20314.

Sherraden, M., Lough, B. J., & Bopp, A. (2013). Students serving abroad: A framework for inquiry. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 17*(2), 7-41.

Soria, K. M., & Troisi, J. (2014). Internationalization at home alternatives to study abroad: Students' development of global, international, and intercultural competencies. *Journal of Studies in International Education 18*(3), 261-280. https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315313496572

Tiessen, R. (2013). Career aspirations and experiential learning abroad: Perspectives from Canadian youth on short-term placements. In R. Tiessen and R. Huish (Eds.*), Globetrotting or global citizenship?: Perils and potentials of international experiential learning*, (pp. 43-89). University of Toronto Press.

Tiessen, R. (2018). *Learning and volunteering abroad for development: Unpacking Host organization and volunteer rationales*. Routledge.

Tiessen, R., Grantham, K., & Cameron, J. (2018), The relationships between experiential learning and career outcomes for alumni of international development studies programs in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 48*(2), 23-42. https://doi.org/10.47678/cjhe.v48i3.188187

Tonkin, H. (2011). A research agenda for international service learning. In R. G. Bringle, J. A. Hatcher, & S. G. Jones (Eds.), *International service learning: Conceptual frameworks and research* (pp. 191-224). Stylus.

Tonkin, H., & Quiroga, D. (2004). A qualitative approach to the assessment of international service-learning. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad 4*, 131-149.

Universities Canada. (2018). *Handbook for Canadian universities: Queen Elizabeth II Diamond Jubilee Scholarships, QES-2017*. On file with the author.

Vanden Berg, T. M., & Schwander, L. (2019). The long-term impact of a short-term study abroad program: Perspectives on global citizenship. *Journal of Education and Learning*, *8*(4), 18-31. https://doi.org/10.5539/jel.v8n4p18

Waibel, S., Ruger, H., Sette, A., & Sauer, L. (2017). Career consequences of transnational educational mobility: A systematic literature review. *Educational Research Review* 20: 81-98. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2016.12.001

Wurr, A. J., & Hamilton, C. H. (2012). Leadership development in service-learning: An exploratory investigation. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, *16*(2), 213-237.

Appendix A: Items Used to Assess Social Identity and Global Competence

Social Identity

Lough et al.'s (2009) Global Identity subscale

- It would be better to be a citizen of the world than of any particular nation;
- Our responsibility to people of other nations should be as great as our responsibility to people of our own nation;
- Our schools should teach the history of the world rather than the history of our own nation.

Global Competence

From Lough et al.'s (2009) Intercultural Relations subscale:

- I frequently interact with people from different cultural or ethnic backgrounds from me (racial, cultural, ethnic or language);
- I am highly interested in working or forming friendships with people of different cultural backgrounds;
- I am very comfortable talking about diversity with people of different cultures.

From Morais and Ogden's (2011) Intercultural Communication subscale:

- I unconsciously adapt my behaviour and mannerisms when I am interacting with people of other cultures;
- I often adapt my communication style to other people's cultural background;
- I am able to communicate in different ways with people of different cultures.

From Morais and Ogden's (2011) Global Knowledge subscale:

- I am informed about current issues that impact international relationships;
- I feel comfortable expressing my views regarding a pressing global problem in front of a group of people;
- I am able to write an opinion letter to a local media source expressing concerns over global issues.

Author Biography

Andrew M. Robinson is an Associate Professor of Human Rights at Wilfrid Laurier University. His research interests include pedagogy and program development as well as issues arising from the relationship between universal human rights and cultural and religious diversity.

Robert Kwame Ame is Associate Professor of Human Rights and Criminology at Wilfrid Laurier University. He brings extensive experience researching youth justice, children's rights, and national reconciliation. His publications have appeared in academic journals and as book chapters. He is co-editor of two books: lead co-editor of *Children's Rights in Ghana: Rhetoric or Reality*, published by Lexington Books, and co-editor of *Childhoods at the Intersection of the Local and the Global*, published by Palgrave McMillan.