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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this collective case study was to determine how, if at all, Cultural Intelligence (CQ) develops in undergraduate students through a three-stage mission trip process for students at a large Christian university in the southeast participating in three separate short-term mission trips (Africa, Asia, and Europe). This study found that across the entire short-term mission (STM) trip process, religious faith was a consistent theme impacting CQ development. Three spring break short-term mission trip teams were used as three separate cases, from which several participants, or embedded units, provided their individual experiences within the case. Data collection methods occurred in three stages: Pre-Field Training, On-Field Experience, and Post-Field Debriefing, to match the three-stage process of the short-term mission trip. The Pre-Field Training data collection consisted of the Cultural Intelligence Scale and individual interviews; the On-Field Experience data collection consisted of on-field journaling exercises; and the Post-Field Debriefing included post-trip Cultural Intelligence Scale individual interviews. Within-case and across-case analyses were completed using Stake’s (2006) cross-case analysis procedures and Yin’s (2012) pattern matching technique. Findings demonstrated that in the Pre-Field Training stage, the themes of experiential learning, team member and/or team leader influence, religious faith, and personality were the biggest influencers of CQ. In the On-Field Experience stage, field worker influence and engagement with the locals impacted CQ development most. In the Post-Field Debriefing stage, participants expressed that application to participants’ lives and religious faith most profoundly impacted their CQ development.

CQ. Keywords: Cultural Intelligence, short-term mission trip
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Overview

A focus on cultural intelligence (CQ) has taken a front seat in cultural competence research over the past decade, as professional training programs, expatriate assignments, study abroad objectives, and short-term mission (STM) trip procedures have all looked to CQ to improve their processes (Ang et al., 2007; Crowne, 2007, 2008, 2013; Daher, 2015; Earley & Ang, 2003; Harrison & Brower, 2011; Ward & Kennedy, 2007). Cultural Intelligence “refers to what a person can do to be effective in culturally diverse settings” (Ang et al., 2007, p. 339). While quantitative studies reveal positive outcomes associated with CQ, such as cultural judgment and decision-making (Ang et al., 2007), leadership success abroad (Alon & Higgins, 2005; Box, Converso, & Osayamwen, 2015), and cross-cultural success in international business settings (Earley & Ang, 2003; Livermore & Van Dyne, 2015), an understanding of how CQ improves and affects cross-cultural effectiveness remains (Ang et al., 2007; Crawford-Mathis, 2010; Crowne, 2013). In addition, the explosion of STM over the past decade in the U.S. alone, with as many as four million Americans traveling abroad annually (Livermore, 2013), calls for a solid framework in which sojourners can learn and practice culturally intelligent behavior.

The focus of this collective case study was to examine how the STM trip process impacts CQ development in undergraduate students at a large Christian university in the southeast. Three separate STM trip teams with several participants or embedded units, were used as cases, with each team presenting differing perspectives in order to place emphasis “on the experience of people in the program or with the phenomenon” (Stake, 2006, p. 27). Chapter One presents a framework for the current study, builds a foundation for the research, and presents the basis for the problem of the current study. This chapter covers the following areas: background, situation
to self, the problem statement, the purpose statement, the significance of the study, the research questions, the research plan, and delimitations.

**Background**

The modern-day missions movement dates back to the late 1700s, when William Carey set forth a charge to fellow Christians to carry out the Great Commission in his book, *An Enquiry Into the Obligations of Christians to Use Means for the Conversion of the Heathens* (Winter, 1999). This book reverberated throughout the English-speaking world, sparking the establishment of missions societies that would send missionaries to the coastlines of Africa and Asia. Those willing to endeavor to these areas, especially Africa, went knowing that all efforts before them had failed; no missionaries remained on the continent at the beginning of the 1800s. Winter (1999) stated:

> The gruesome statistics of almost inevitable sickness and death that haunted, yet did not daunt, the decades of truly valiant missionaries who went out after 1790 in virtually a suicidal stream cannot be matched by any other era or by any other cause. (p. 255)

By 1865, missions strategy and structure were seen as vital to effective missions efforts, as four “stages” illustrated missions activity: (1) Pioneer: first contact with a people group; (2) Paternal: missionaries train national leadership; (3) Partnership: national leaders work as partners with missionaries; and (4) Participation: missionaries are no longer partners, but only participate in the local church through invitation (Winter, 1999. Though one missionary may not see this entire sequence of stages in his career, the stages represent the missions movement globally and the goal of missions agencies around the world in establishing local churches.

Moving inland, Hudson Taylor challenged missionaries and missions agencies to reach those in inland China. Creating the China Inland Mission, Taylor saw almost 6,000 missionaries
go out, the majority going to inland China. Following suit, missions agencies started to send workers to the unreached interiors, and new faith missions agencies that focused on frontier missions in Africa and Asia took shape. A massive student movement also emerged in the 1880s and 1890s that saw as many as 100,000 college students give their lives to missions. With 20,000 of these students actually moving overseas, a great need was met. By 1925, thousands of new churches had been planted, mainly inland, and the “strength of these churches led both national leaders and missionaries to assume that all additional frontiers could simply be mopped up by the ordinary evangelism of the churches scattered throughout the world” (Winter, 1999, p. 258). With the belief that the needed local churches had been established around the world, missionaries from the United States began to decline in the mid-1900s.

Around this same time, two young men from the Student Volunteer Movement realized the need for both people to be reached in their own languages and the deeper penetrating of already reached groups to get to the smaller unreached people groups who have never been exposed to the gospel, the Bible, or the Christian faith. These two realizations have marked the current missions movement, as both linguistic efforts and an unreached people group focus may require a return to original pioneering techniques of the 1700s and 1800s, as 6,686 of the world’s 16,508 people groups remain unreached (Joshua Project, 2016). This number totals over three million people.

The current need for both Bible translations for an estimated 5,000 tribal groups, and for missionaries willing to start from the ground up among unreached people groups, necessitates both long-term workers and short-term mission trip efforts that can come alongside the long-term efforts and multiply their reach. In his book, *Serving with Eyes Wide Open*, Livermore (2013) described the short-term mission trip trend as such:
In the late twentieth century, churches across America (and other wealthier nations) jumped at this unprecedented opportunity created by the advent of long-haul travel to go, minister, and learn in a fascinating world of cultures and adventures. Short-term missions morphed from a primary avenue for missionary recruitment to a foundational way to provoke spiritual growth in the lives of the participants. (p. 7)

Short-term ministry and service trips occur at a rate of 60 times that of study abroad, comprise more than 45% of all U.S. international volunteer efforts, and recruit volunteers ages 15 to 24 the most (Council for Social Development, 2013). Developing an underpinning for these efforts that help to shape the focus and work of STM teams is necessary, as more than 690 missions agencies, not including churches and higher education, send STM individuals and teams out on a consistent basis (Priest et al., 2006).

Current literature detailing STM refers to the differing goals and practices of missions trips, including evangelism, service projects, cultural immersion, educational programs, and how while the main goal may be evangelism, this can be carried out in a variety of ways through the service and aid of a STM trip individual or team (Probasco, 2014). Like secular international volunteering, most STM trip participants serve for one to two weeks and are engaged in service projects, educational programs, and health initiatives (Council for Social Development, 2013). Most participants are between the ages of 15 and 24, with a large number representing both college-age students and recent graduates. With so many young people participating in STM, “CQ has direct relevance to students because over 77 percent of incoming freshmen in the U.S.A. have prior international experience and students increasingly cross cultures for study, internships and personal travel” (Ang et al., 2007, p. 346).
As STM trips continue to increase, missiologists, STM trip coordinators, and STM trip leaders must be able to shape a knowledge base from which STM trips can be molded, so that CQ is not only learned, but continually developed throughout the process (Priest et al., 2006). Existing research provides clear evidence that STMs influence the beliefs and practices of adolescents and emerging adults (Probasco, 2013), necessitating empirically-driven CQ training programs, on-field practices, and debriefing processes that seek to instill and grow high CQ in STM trip participants.

Prior quantitative research has shown CQ development impacted by experiential learning and social contact principles (MacNab, 2011), the amount of time spent interacting with the host culture (MacNab, 2011; Crawford-Mathis, 2010), and motivation related to the trip experience (Ward, 2011). However, these studies and others previously mentioned have not examined how these factors develop CQ, either before, during, or after a STM trip. If STM trips continue to increase, as well as study abroad and other short-term volunteer programs, cultural intelligence training must be incorporated.

An examination of how to effectively develop CQ during Pre-Field Training, the On-Field Experience, and through the Post-Field Debriefing period is needed in order to effectively develop training models and practices. Each period presents a time in the process in which students are preparing for, engaging in, or debriefing their cross-cultural experiences. As a process, STM trips provide a vehicle through which CQ can be developed through Pre-Field Training, practiced on the field with locals, and reflected upon individually and in a group, so that cross-cultural interactions at home and abroad can improve.
Situation to Self

As a former expatriate and STM trip coordinator currently working to help faculty members develop international academic trips, the role the STM trip process plays in CQ development is both interesting and beneficial to my professional work. Having experienced STM trips from both the participant and leader perspective, I am suspect of the various aspects in the before, during, and after stages of the trip that can impact CQ development. However, as a qualitative researcher, I am obligated to acknowledge my biases and experiences so I can consciously lay them aside to examine the personal experiences of students in these three stages. As I reflect on the outcomes of this research and how it can inform the design of the STM trip stages for both my department and other short-term trip organizers, a pragmatist framework guided this study. A pragmatist framework calls for multiple sources and methods of data collection so that the research questions can be best answered in light of the intended consequences (Creswell, 2013). Collecting data from students who all traveled to different locations during Pre-Field Training, the On-Field Experience, and the Post-Field Debriefing periods allowed for a holistic view of the STM trip process and how each stage impacted CQ development, while comparing data across trip locations for similarities and differences.

I acted as the human instrument in this study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), conducting interviews and analyzing journal entries. Qualitative research allows for findings to be reported in rich detail, as the researcher seeks to communicate participants’ experiences in similar fashion to how life is experienced itself. This personal participation in the study, however, did not come without certain assumptions that must be discussed. In qualitative research, the researcher acknowledges the idea of multiple realities, as experienced by the participants (Creswell, 2013). This ontological issue of multiple realities stems from the fact that students enter the short-term
mission trip process with different experiences and perspectives of short-term mission trips and their process. Collecting data at various times in the process across different trip locations provided a look at these realities at different points in time and in different contexts. In regards to epistemology, the information or knowledge that was collected on the topic was best completed through close contact with the participants (Creswell, 2013). This was achieved through face-to-face contact with the participants as I conducted interviews. Axiological issues that affect this study come in the way of the values and biases that the participants and I brought to the study. As previously stated, I already acknowledged my own experiences in STM and how they impact CQ development. As this is my own experience, the participants too brought their own life experiences into the research. While I recorded and reported the participants’ own words, I personally interpreted and reported themes and findings from the research. My methodology continued to emerge and change as my data collection and analyses brought new issues to light. Although I prepared interview questions ahead of time, I did need to alter those questions once I engaged in the actual interviews with the participants.

**Problem Statement**

Universities strive to produce globally-minded graduates who can both work and live in an ever-increasing globalized world. Cultural courses, international internships, and study abroad are all opportunities that universities offer to better prepare graduates for a global workforce. Another opportunity offered by some schools to prepare students in this way is the short-term mission trip. While there is a growing number of popular press literature concerning STM, little is written by missiologists based on research; most scholarly work has been devoted to study abroad (Priest et al., 2006). Priest et al. (2006) stated, “It is important that missiologists foster a knowledge base than can underpin and shape the zeal that is clearly present in STM” (p.
435), as these types of short-term experiences can either bring about lasting effects in one’s cultural outlook, or reinforce stereotypes. As international or cross-cultural experiences have been shown to positively affect CQ development (Crawford-Mathis, 2010; Crowne, 2007; MacNab, 2011; Krishnan, Richards, & Simpson, 2016), which translates into greater cross-cultural understanding and action, a call for research that examines how CQ is developed through Pre-Field Training, On-Field Experiences, and Post-Field Debriefing has been noted (Ang et al., 2007; Crawford-Mathis, 2010; Crowne, 2008, 2013; Earley & Peterson, 2007; Harrison & Brower, 2011; Livermore, 2013; MacNab, 2011; Ng et al., 2012). Developing training practices and On-Field Experiences that truly do increase CQ further facilitates the desire of universities to send culturally competent graduates into an international workforce.

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this collective case study was to determine how, if at all, CQ developed through a three-stage STM trip process in undergraduate students at a large Christian university in the southeast. The STM trip process includes three stages: (1) Pre-Field Training; (2) On-Field Experience; and (3) Post-Field Debriefing. For this study, the Pre-Field Training period lasted approximately five months, the On-Field Experience lasted approximately 10 days, and the Post-Field Debriefing period lasted approximately six to eight weeks. Typically, a STM trip lasts one to two weeks (Council for Social Development, 2013). The development of CQ was defined as the increase in understanding and application of either all or some of the four dimensions of CQ. To effectively understand how the STM trip process impacted CQ development, a case study, which examines the experiences of the participants within different contexts and situations (Stake, 2006), was ideal. For this study, three STM trips traveling during the academic spring semester break were used as individual cases. Each case represented a different context, as each
traveled to a different continent and engaged with different people groups. Each case contained no more than 15 undergraduate student team members and two adult leaders who worked for the university. Gathering data from the students during the Pre-Field Training, On-Field Experience, and Post-Field Debriefing in the STM trip process provided a rich data pool from which to draw conclusions about the process’ possible impact on CQ development. Examining this possible impact allows CQ researchers, missiologists, and STM trip coordinators to more effectively develop programs and training that prepare STM trip participants to engage cross-culturally.

**Significance of the Study**

STM trips provide the cross-cultural experiences in which to practice and improve one’s CQ, yet training programs, on-field guidelines, and post-field debriefing practices rooted in CQ research have yet to be developed (Ang et al., 2007; Bennett & Eberts, 2015; Crawford-Mathis, 2010; Crowne, 2008, 2013; Earley & Peterson, 2007; Harrison & Brower, 2011; Livermore, 2013; Ng et al., 2012; MacNab, 2011). Since international experiences have been found to positively affect one’s CQ development (Cho & Morris, 2015; Crawford-Mathis, 2010; MacNab, 2011) and CQ has been highlighted as a fundamental capability in numerous intercultural effectiveness outcomes (Earley & Peterson, 2007; Livermore & Van Dyne, 2015), the ability to pinpoint exactly what aspects of these international experiences impact CQ development is significant. This study aimed to examine those aspects in a STM trip experience, adding to the literature on international experiences and their relation to CQ development.

CQ development is crucial, not only for those participating in STM trips, but also for American college students nationwide, as more than 900,000 international students enrolled in American higher education institutions in the 2014-2015 school year (Institute of International Education, 2016a). Traveling abroad is no longer necessary to engage with those of different
international cultures, and because of this students must be able to engage effectively. CQ training programs for college-age students can be implemented despite traveling internationally or not.

The findings of this study will not only aid STM trip organizers and recruiters in developing Pre-Field Training, On-Field Experiences, and Post-Field Debriefing activities that purposefully seek to develop CQ, but also add to the empirical and theoretical literature on CQ and international experience aspects that contribute to its development. The qualitative literature will benefit from this study, as the experiences of the participants will aid in building a base from which to further understand and continue to build CQ development literature.

Research Questions

Three main questions guided this study in understanding how the STM trip process impacts CQ development:

1. How does the Pre-Field Training impact CQ development in undergraduate students participating in a STM trip?

To effectively prepare for an international experience, pre-departure training that seeks to educate about and develop CQ has been recommended by various CQ researchers (Harrison & Brower, 2011; Livermore, 2013; MacNab, 2011; Kamdar & Lewis, 2015; Bennett, & Eberts, 2015). Priest (2006) found a decrease in ethnocentrism when short-term Pre-Field Training incorporated cultural learning exercises and posited that language training, coaching, peer and social support, and collective reflection may influence cross-cultural effectiveness once on the field. Instructor or team leader nuances also play a role in the development process of CQ in the Pre-Field Training stage, as well as the organizers and mission-trip recruiters who may shape expectations about the STM trip (Livermore, 2013; MacNab, 2011). Examining the Pre-Field
Training activities and content will help to better shed light on what types of training impacts CQ development.

2. How does the On-Field Experience impact CQ development in undergraduate students participating in a STM trip?

While exposure to different cultures has been shown to affect CQ development (Crowne, 2013; Tarique & Takeuchi, 2008; Wilson & Stewart, 2009), the depth of exposure and type of exposure has not been studied fully (Ang et al., 2007; Crawford-Mathis, 2010; Crowne, 2008, 2013). This could include participation in local activities (Crowne, 2013), type of lodging (Crowne, 2007), the ability to employ feeling and understanding while immersed in a cultural experience (Alon & Higgins, 2005; Chen & Isa, 2003; Yamazaki & Kayes, 2004), and the opportunity for reflection (MacNab, 2011; Shim & Paprock, 2002). The quality of international experiences has yet to be examined considering its impact on CQ development.

3. How does the Post-Field Debriefing impact CQ development in undergraduate students participating in a STM trip?

The Post-Field Debriefing is extremely important, as the impact of the experience can fade in the months following travel (Probasco, 2013). Within six to eight weeks after the trip, most participants resort back to previous assumptions and behaviors (Livermore, 2013). Priest (2006) stated, “For positive changes to last, they must be reinforced by a set of practices, relationships, and virtues taught in the home setting” (p. 444). For CQ development to be reinforced and continue and the international experience to provide “individuals with the social contexts and authentic activities to learn how to manage cross-cultural differences” (Ng et al., 2012, p. 37), an opportunity for reflection and discussion is necessary to question the experience, reconcile possible tensions, and make decisions based on the insights gained from the experience.
Exchanging how the Post-Field Debriefing allows for reflection and discussion, along with its impact on CQ development, is necessary.

**Research Plan**

A qualitative collective explanatory case study was employed to compare and contrast themes within and across the systems of STM trip teams (Creswell, 2013). Each STM trip team presented a unique, closed-bounded system in which students’ CQ was impacted in different ways through the Pre-Field Training, On-Field Experiences with varying cultures and experiences, and the Post-Field Debriefing. The embedded units within these systems, or the student team members, provided varied experiences related to their team, which impacted their CQ in different ways. Multiple sources of data were collected within each case and at different points in the STM trip process, so that factors impacting the CQ of the students could be examined and compared. The similarities and differences uncovered during this study allowed for a greater variety of knowledge on this topic (Creswell, 2013; Yin, 2009).

In order to collect a variety of data, individual interviews with each student, the Cultural Intelligence Scale, and on-field journaling exercises were utilized. Data was collected in three stages: (a) Pre-Field Training, (b) On-Field Experience, and (c) Post-Field Debriefing. The Pre-Field Training lasted approximately five months, and data was collected prior to the first team meeting and at the end of the Pre-Field Training. The On-Field Experience lasted approximately 10 days, and individuals completed their on-field journaling exercises at that time. The Post-Field Debriefing data was collected six to eight weeks after the teams’ returns, since by that time people have returned to their Pre-Field assumptions and thinking regarding their experiences (Livermore, 2013). This allowed me to see if they had truly experienced a growth in their CQ.
Collecting this data in various formats and at different points in the process allowed for an in-depth examination of how the STM trip process impacted CQ.

**Delimitations**

Delimitations, or decisions to narrow the focus and scope of the study, included the design chosen, the time of year in which the STM trips took place, and the setting for and type of short-term trips chosen. A collective case study was chosen because it provided a comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon of the impact of the STM trip process on CQ across three different cases. This served in comparing and contrasting data within and across those cases, as well as allowing for replication and greater confidence in the propositions made.

The teams that made up the cases for investigation in this study all came from the same university and short-term mission trips program. The fact that this study also only used short-term mission trips, as opposed to humanitarian aid or study abroad, was purposeful in that it presented findings applicable to short-term mission trip programs. The time of year in which the STM trips occurred was a delimitation because the timeframe in which Post-Field Debriefing data collection can occur must be at least six to eight weeks after the students’ return. Using trips that occurred during the spring break ensured that students would still be present on campus when debriefing data collection needed to occur. These cases only included those of an international nature. As STM trips can be both domestic and international, the three STM trips used in this study traveled outside of the United States. Participants for this study had to be traveling on one of the selected spring break Africa, Asia, or Europe teams that had been pre-selected in conjunction with the director of the short-term mission trip program.
Definitions

The following definitions will guide the reader in his understanding of Cultural Intelligence and short-term mission trips, as these terms are used throughout this study.

1. Cultural Intelligence (CQ) – Cultural Intelligence refers to what a person can do to be effective in culturally diverse settings (Ang et al., 2007).

2. Metacognitive CQ – Metacognitive CQ refers to mental processes that individuals use to acquire and understand cultural knowledge (Flavell, 1979).

3. Cognitive CQ – Cognitive CQ refers to an individual’s knowledge of the norms, practices, and conventions in different cultures acquired from education and personal experiences (Ang et al., 2007).

4. Motivational CQ – Motivational CQ refers to the capability to direct attention and energy toward learning about and functioning in situations characterized by cultural differences (Ang et al., 2007).

5. Behavioral CQ – Behavioral CQ refers to the capability to exhibit appropriate verbal and non-verbal actions when interacting with people from different cultures (Ang et al., 2007).

6. Short-Term Mission (STM) Trip – A Short-Term Mission Trip refers to a one to two week domestic or international time of exposure to a different cultural context in which the main goal of evangelism is carried out in a variety of ways through the service and aid of a STM trip individual or team (Council for Social Development, 2013; Probasco, 2014).
Summary

The rising number of individuals participating in STM trips necessitates the development of practices that seek to responsibly develop individuals’ CQ. With both the age of participants hovering within the university sphere, and the goal of higher education now aimed in developing graduates to interact within a globalized world, the vehicle of the STM trip offers an opportunity to see students’ CQ intentionally molded. The three stages of the STM trip process, the Pre-Field Training, the On-Field Experience, and the Post-Field Debriefing offer separate yet interconnected timeframes in which individuals learn, practice, and reflect on their experiences. Learning how these timeframes can be utilized by universities, mission agencies, and other organizations to foster individual growth in CQ will assist in building future practices, programs, and research that produces individuals ready to interact and thrive in a variety of cultural contexts.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Overview

The current level of cross-cultural work, education opportunities, and service-oriented work necessitates the ability to not only engage in specific cultural settings, but also adjust one’s behavior across a variety of culturally-diverse settings. This capability to know, understand, and adjust one’s thinking and behavior accordingly is necessary for a variety of culturally diverse settings, but even more so for university students, as Cultural Intelligence (CQ) “has a direct relevance to students because over 77 percent of incoming freshmen in the U.S.A. have prior international experience (e.g. traveling or hosting international students) and students increasingly cross cultures for study, internships and personal travel” (Ang et al., 2007, p. 346). Beyond the collegiate realm, CQ has been linked with specific cultural outcomes such as cultural judgment, decision-making, cultural adaptation, and task performance in culturally diverse settings (Ang et al., 2007; Jyoti & Kour, 2015; Konanhalli et al., 2014; Cho & Morris, 2015). As the world continues to globalize, the possibility of engaging with a person of another culture is inevitable and the skills necessary to effectively engage are vital.

Study abroad opportunities, short-term mission trips, cross-cultural internships, and other international and cross-cultural experiences have become more accessible and realistic for university-age students, as worldwide travel has grown increasingly more convenient, less expensive, and even a requirement for some degree programs (Liberty University, 2014; Eastern Mennonite University, 2014; Lee University, 2012). In the 2013-2014 academic year, more than 300,000 U.S. college students studied abroad for academic credit, with the majority majoring in business, STEM fields, social sciences, foreign language and international studies, and fine or applied arts (IIE, 2016b). Sixty-two percent of those students spent less than eight weeks in their
study abroad location. In addition to traditional study abroad, over 22,000 U.S. students participated in non-credit education abroad, such as volunteering (IIE, 2016c).

In regards to humanitarian aid and religious-based efforts, as many as four million Americans take short-term trips annually, ranging from two weeks to one year (Livermore, 2006). In 2014, one of the top volunteering abroad companies, Go Overseas, performed a Google search report to gather data on volunteering abroad trends for 2013 (Go Overseas, 2014). Natural disasters proved to be the biggest motivation in desire to volunteer abroad, with Japan, Haiti, and the Philippines remaining in the top 15 countries for volunteer search opportunities. The most popular searches for volunteer program type were medical volunteering, volunteer teaching, and wildlife volunteering, as illustrated by a clear trend in volunteer program categories like volunteering with children and conservation volunteering. However, the stigma surrounding “volountourism,” as it’s currently called, can paint a dark picture of students serving abroad for selfish reasons (Wesby, 2015). The need for culturally intelligent individuals in these situations is even more apparent.

The growing number of cross-cultural interactions, ever-changing cultures, and the continued globalization of the world demands that individuals be culturally intelligent. Because the CQ construct has been found to contain fundamental capabilities that can predict and affect intercultural effectiveness outcomes, such as cultural judgment, decision-making, cultural adaptation, and task performance in culturally diverse settings (Ang et al., 2007), the call for its use in both training and assessment situations has been the focus of recent research (Harrison & Brower, 2011; Alon & Higgins, 2005; Gilleard & Gilleard, 2002; Olson & Kroeger, 2011).

The following literature review provides an overview of the construct of Cultural Intelligence, including its background in terms of development, and provides a discussion of
each of its four dimensions (Metacognitive, Cognitive, Motivational, and Behavioral) and their respective sub-dimensions. Recent studies focused on CQ and findings pertinent to each dimension are presented, as well as the call for future research. Short-term volunteering in a general sense is overviewed, which includes the broader areas of humanitarian aid and development and study abroad, with a more specific focus on short-term mission trips ending the section. CQ findings and present gaps in CQ literature are discussed, setting the stage for a specific call for research in relation to CQ development and the short-term mission trip process. Situating the study in the literature, a foundation for further research is provided.

Theoretical Framework

This study examined the role that the STM trip process played in CQ development. In order to build a foundation on which to base this study, both STM research and CQ research were paired to establish a conceptual framework. STM trip research specifically deals with the growth of STM trips, as well as the unique process that accompanies STM trips: (a) Pre-Field Training; (b) On-Field Experience; and (c) Post-Fiend Debriefing. These three stages present specific periods in which CQ can be developed, as established in the following review of research.

Cultural Intelligence

This section on Cultural Intelligence details the development of the concept, including its four dimensions, other intelligence constructs, and existing intercultural competence models. These sub-sections provide further background for why and how Cultural Intelligence is utilized.

Overview and background. A review of Cultural Intelligence would not be complete without first discussing the concept of culture itself. Hofstede (1980) addressed the concept of culture, stating it is “the collective programming of the human mind that distinguishes the
members of one human group from those of another;” it is “a system of collectively held values” (p. 24). These values, or common characteristics, affect the way in which a group responds to its environment, in the same way an individual’s personal characteristics affect the response to an environment. These characteristics or values determine the identity of that human group, whether societies, ethnic groups, organizations, generations, or families. Even as nations or societies contain smaller subcultures, overarching characteristics such as norms, values, and behaviors identify members of those subcultures as belonging to them (Hofstede, 1980).

At the center of a culture are societal norms, or the value systems shared by the majority. While the origins of a culture can stem from ecological factors such as geography, economic factors, demographics, history, technology, and so on, societal norms affect the way in which institutions in that culture are established and maintained. Cultural institutions such as family patterns, role differentiation, social stratification, education, religion, and political structure, among others, further reinforce societal norms once established and maintained. Hofstede (1980) believed that societal norms rarely change through outside influence, but can gradually shift, except in the case of military conquests or other violent outside influences.

In discussing national cultures or subcultures present within them, individualism versus collectivism is seen by researchers as the most deep-seated and affective difference between cultures (Greenfield, 2000; Triandis, 1996, 2002). Collectivist cultures, which include primarily those in Asia, Africa, and South America, operate within a “we” mentality, as individuals are “interdependent within their in-groups (e.g. family, tribe, nation, etc.), give priority to the goals of their in-groups, shape their behavior primarily on the basis of in-group norms, and behave in a communal way” (Triandis, 2002, p. 909). The focus of collectivist cultures is first and foremost on relationships and maintaining those relationships. For example, in Indonesia one might
respond to an invitation with, “I will try my best,” even if the possibility is extremely low. This response signals to the inviter a desire to attend, thus maintaining the relationship. Whereas in individualistic cultures, one might decline the invitation, even going so far as to list the various personal reasons why one declined.

Individualistic cultures “are autonomous and independent from their in-groups; they give priority to their personal goals over the goals of their in-groups, they behave primarily on the basis of their attitudes rather than the norms of their in-groups…” (Triandis, 2002, p. 909).

Individualistic cultures, like those found in Northern and Western Europe and North America, operate within a “me” mentality, generally placing the needs of the self above others. This can be found in something as universal as child rearing, as individualistic cultures seek to raise children according to the predispositions and choices of the parents, while also allowing children to make choices for themselves, a hallmark of self-reliance and independence. Collectivist cultures approach child rearing with conformity to the societal norms in mind, obedience to authority, and the idea that one day the child will take care of the parents.

Numerous cultures and subcultures has led to the development of a myriad of intercultural and cross-cultural competency models to aid in integrating and operating in different cultural contexts. While these models somewhat prepare individuals for cross-cultural interactions, Ang and Earley (2003) identified the lack of a comprehensive research-based model that addressed individual intercultural capabilities. While consulting with multiple companies preparing for Y2K in 1997, Ang discovered that although the brightest information technology minds from around the globe were technically competent, they could not effectively work together. Even after being trained in emotional, social, and practical intelligence, these teams of
professionals could still not effectively bridge cultural divides. The need for a workplace capability to help bridge these divides was obvious. The initial idea for CQ was born.

Pulling from intelligence models, namely IQ (Intelligence Quotient), EQ (Emotional Intelligence), Social Intelligence, and Practical Intelligence, Ang and Earley (2003) observed how these intelligences affected overall job performance, especially when working within like-minded cultures. The need to thrive in the increasing cultural complexities facing individuals and organizations called for an additional and more holistic intelligence model. In an attempt to address this need, Ang and Earley introduced the concept of Cultural Intelligence, drawing from Sternberg and Detterman’s (1986) survey of intelligence research in an attempt to view cross-cultural capabilities as a type of intelligence. The concept of CQ “refers to what a person can do to be effective in culturally diverse settings” (Ang et al., 2007, p. 339). It consists of “the ability to appropriately switch behaviors and perspectives as well as an understanding and appreciation of (i.e., attitudes and knowledge regarding) cultural similarities and differences” (Nguyen, 2010, p. 10).

The distinction of basing CQ in intelligence research means that CQ focuses on learned capabilities, integrates both psychology and sociology research findings, emphasizes the capability to rework one’s concept of self and others, and allows for a direct correlation with other findings from intelligence research (Livermore, 2011). In addition to its foundation in intelligence research, CQ differs from other intercultural models because it is culture-free and “refers to a general set of capabilities with relevance to situations characterized by cultural diversity” (Ang et al., 2007, p. 339), which can include ethnic, generational, and even organizational cultural differences.
In 2008, CQ was further conceptualized as a four-factor construct by Ang and Van Dyne (2008), also based in intelligence research. Across all intelligence models (emotional, social, practical, or cultural), four complementary factors are present: (a) motivation, (b) cognition, (c) meta-cognition, and (d) behavior, which are all interrelated (Livermore, 2011). Ang and Van Dyne proposed the idea of a multidimensional construct that focused on both mental and overt capabilities, which drew from Sternberg and Detterman’s (1986) integrative theoretical framework on multiple loci of intelligences. Ang and Earley (2007) believed this theory of multiple intelligences could be applied to intercultural capabilities as well, given that effectiveness in culturally diverse settings demands metacognitive, cognitive, motivational, and behavioral capabilities working in tandem.

**Existing intelligence constructs.** Because CQ is a “malleable capability that can be enhanced” (Van Dyne et al., 2012, p. 297), each of the four dimensions (metacognitive, cognitive, motivational, and behavioral) can be enhanced independently. This ability to increase one’s capability in each of the four dimensions differs from personality or fixed-intelligence theories and models. While personality is innate and contains stable traits that are typically consistent across time and situations (Costa & McCrae, 1992), CQ can be developed through study, practice, and intercultural experiences at any given time and on a continual basis. CQ, like other intelligence frameworks (EQ, Social Intelligence, and Practical Intelligence), deals with learned capabilities that can be developed through training, learning, and experience.

Although personality typically is unchanged across time, it is related to CQ, as Ang et al. (2006) illustrated through comparison studies of CQ to the Big Five (John & Srivastava, 1999). The Big Five trait of openness to experience related to all four dimensions of CQ. That is, the tendency to be creative, imaginative, and adventurous, positively affected the development of
CQ and one’s ability to be effective in culturally diverse settings. The study and research devoted
to personality traits correlated to the concept of CQ, as empirical research suggested specific
personality traits can lead to and enhance an individual’s CQ capabilities (Ang et al., 2006).

General intelligence (IQ) differs from CQ in that it refers to a “learner’s capability to
acquire, retain, and interpret various types of information and experiences” (Earley & Peterson,
2004, p. 104). Whereas both IQ and CQ are capabilities possessed by an individual, IQ solely
functions as a mental capability and CQ includes both mental and behavioral capabilities. While
the concept of CQ is culture-free, it is specific to culturally diverse settings, whereas IQ is not
specific to a particular context. CQ broadens and builds on this idea of intelligence as a mental
capability of processing and interpreting information by including motivational and behavioral
facets of intelligence, which allow for an all-encompassing, varied function of an individual’s
capabilities.

Theorists posit Emotional Intelligence (EQ) as an individual’s ability to deal with
personal emotions and understand and convey human emotions, while also displaying the ability
to read and respond to the affective states of culturally similar others (Earley & Peterson, 2004;
Law et al., 2004; Mayer et al., 2000). EQ generally assumes the individual has a familiarity with
the culture’s context, and therefore the individual is aware of the nuances that accompany
emotional states and displays in that culture; EQ is culture-specific as people use schema and
cues subjective to their own cultures. However, whereas the individual may have a familiarity
with his or her cultural context and the ability to read and respond to emotions there, this same
ability may not be contained within a different cultural context. Reading, interpreting, and then
acting on affective cues from culturally dissimilar others is not always a transferable ability
found in EQ (Earley & Ang, 2004). This weakness was answered in the construct of CQ, as the capabilities contained therein are transferable across cultural contexts (Ang & Earley, 2003).

**Existing intercultural scales, models, and constructs.** In developing the construct of CQ, Earley and Ang (2003) sought to both synthesize the large body of literature on intercultural competency models, while also providing theoretical coherence and clarity. This lack of theoretical coherence in the existing intercultural competency models (Yamazaki & Kayes, 2004) drove CQ researchers to situate the construct in contemporary theories of intelligence, providing a sound, theoretical and empirical foundation from which to develop and assess the four facets of intelligence. As modern competency models only addressed one or two of the CQ dimensions (metacognition, cognition, motivation, and behavior) at best, a comprehensive construct was needed to fully address the variety of capabilities needed and used in culturally diverse settings.

The CQ construct solely focuses on the capability of an individual in relation to the mental and behavioral facets of intelligence, while considering how personality can affect the four dimensions. Conversely, existing cultural competency models and scales combine ability and personality, such as the Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory (CCAI) (Kelley & Meyers, 1995), Cross-Cultural World Mindedness (CCWM) (Der-Karabetian & Metzer, 1993), the Cultural Shock Inventory (CSI) (Reddin & Filmore, 1975), the Intercultural Adjustment Potential Scale (ICAPS) (Matsumoto, 2001), and the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) (Hammer, Bennett, & Wiseman, 2003). Ang et al. (2007) stated, “Although personality characteristics are important to cross-cultural adjustment, including stable dispositional traits in competency models muddies the validity and precision of these models” (p. 340). Additionally,
some intercultural competency models such as the Culture-Specific Assimilator (Albert, 1983) only focus on country-specific knowledge, whereas CQ is culture-free and transferable.

Differing from theories of personality, other types of intelligences, and existing intercultural competency models and scales, CQ is “a set of relatively malleable capabilities that can be enhanced over time” (Ang et al., 2007) and that can be transferred between cultures. Also, CQ’s position within contemporary theories of intelligence lends validity to the construct and allows for the growth of an individual’s capabilities to be assessed over time.

The four dimensions of CQ. As a multidimensional construct, Cultural Intelligence is based in Sternberg’s (1986) multiple loci of intelligence framework. Sternberg specifically sought to synthesize the “disparate and previously disconnected views on intelligence by proposing four interrelated ways to understand individual-level intelligence” (Van Dyne et al., 2012, p. 297). Metacognition, cognition, and motivation reside in an individual as mental capabilities, while overt actions serve as behavioral capabilities. Metacognition and cognition allude to cognitive processing abilities of an individual, whereas motivation represents the cognitive processes of drive and choice. Behavioral capabilities or overt actions reside within an individual’s ability to practice motor skills and enact a range of verbal and nonverbal actions.

Applying this multiple loci of intelligence theory, Ang and Van Dyne (2008) developed the four-factor construct of CQ, as they saw the specific relevance and necessity of all four facets working together for an individual’s ability to function in culturally diverse settings. The original loci of intelligence from Sternberg’s (1986) framework were reworked as the following: Metacognitive CQ, Cognitive CQ, Motivational CQ, and Behavioral CQ. While each capability is qualitatively different from the others, together they compose the overall capability of CQ. As individual facets, each can be enhanced independently through “active engagement in education,
travel, international assignments, and other intercultural experiences” (Van Dyne et al., 2012, p. 297), which are discussed further below in relation to studies completed on CQ dimensions and specific aspects of cross-cultural experiences.

Further conceptualizing CQ, Van Dyne et al. (2012) developed 11 sub-dimensions, which are nested within each main factor and help to further expand the Cultural Intelligence Scale. Metacognitive CQ contains three sub-dimensions: (a) Planning, (b) Awareness, and (c) Checking; Cognitive CQ contains two sub-dimensions: (a) Culture-General Knowledge and (b) Context-Specific Knowledge; Motivational CQ contains three sub-dimensions: (a) Intrinsic Interest, (b) Extrinsic Interest, and (c) Self-Efficacy to Adjust; and Behavioral CQ contains three sub-dimensions: (a) Verbal Behavior, (b) Non-Verbal Behavior, and (c) Speech Acts. The four dimensions and their respective sub-dimensions are discussed in further detail below, along with prior research regarding each of the four factors.

**Metacognitive CQ.** The dimension of Metacognitive CQ refers to mental processes that individuals use to acquire and understand cultural knowledge (Flavell, 1979). An individual with high Metacognitive CQ knows when and how to apply cultural knowledge, has multiple knowledge structures from which to choose, and knows when to suspend judgment and look for additional cues (Triandis, 2006). According to Early and Peterson (2004), “Metacognition is a critical aspect of CQ because much of what is required in a new culture is putting together patterns into a coherent picture, even if one does not know what this coherent picture might look like” (p. 107).

The metacognitive-cognitive dimension was conceptualized by Earley while using self-concept theory, which posits the self as a mental representation of an individual’s knowledge and experience, social identity, and social roles (Earley & Peterson, 2004). High Metacognitive CQ
involves the ability to receive new information and experiences, and use them to alter one’s concept of the self.

Metacognition involves two complementary concepts: metacognitive knowledge and metacognitive experience (Flavell, 1987). Metacognitive knowledge involves the acquired world knowledge related to cognitive matters and can be broken down into three types: (a) knowledge about people as thinking beings; (b) the nature of the knowledge acquired; and (c) the procedures or strategies used to achieve a desired goal (Earley & Peterson, 2004). Metacognitive experience involves taking in new experiences and using them to guide future interactions.

Beginning in the early 1970s, research on metacognitive development initially focused on children, as their meta-memory was under study (Flavell, 2004), specifically memory performance and memory strategies. The term branched out to apply to the study of children’s cognitive abilities concerning comprehension, language, communication, perception, and problem solving. Currently, that focus has waned, with adult metacognition now under review and researchers conducting one or another type of Theory of Mind research (Flavell, 2004).

While Theory of Mind (TOM) and Metacognitive research overlap, TOM usually investigates children’s mental development or the most basic mental states—desires, beliefs, knowledge, thoughts, and intentions. Metacognition research focuses more widely on adult task-related mental activities (i.e., problem-centered and goal-oriented activities) (Jost, Kruglanski, & Nelson, 1998; Metcalfe & Shimamura, 1994). Metacognitive CQ is based on individual high-level cognitive strategies and deep information processing before, during, and after cross-cultural interactions, which are still being developed in children or pre-adolescents. Further capabilities include the planning, monitoring, and revising of mental models of cultural norms for countries or groups of people, as well as an individual being “consciously aware of others’ cultural
preferences before and during interactions” and the ability to “also question cultural assumptions and adjust mental models during and after interactions” (Ang et al., 2007, p. 338).

Drawing from O’Neil and Abedi’s (1996) State Metacognitive Inventory (SMI), Van Dyne et al. (2012) identified three sub-dimensions of Metacognitive CQ: planning, awareness, and checking. O’Neil and Abedi extended the work of Pintrich and DeGroot (1990), who identified the strategies of metacognition as planning, monitoring, and modifying cognitions with the addition of awareness. O’Neil and DeGroot also combined the strategies of monitoring and modifying into the single construct of “checking.”

Individuals with high Metacognitive CQ have an awareness of both the diverse cultural contexts they enter, and how their own culture affects their assessment of and behaviors in them (Triandis, 2006). In addition, these individuals recognize the importance of preparing (i.e., planning) for cross-cultural interactions by participating in and exposing themselves to different cultural norms through training programs, cultural events, and other opportunities. This sub-dimension of planning relates to how an individual considers and evaluates a cultural context before entering it, and how one’s actions may be perceived by the culturally different other. Planning considers the self (How do I go about obtaining something?), others (What might they do to obtain something?), and the resulting interdependence (How might our actions affect this situation?) (Van Dyne et al., 2012). Necessary steps are taken to ensure successful participation in the cultural context by considering the perspective of the culturally different other and how the other might perceive and react to one’s behavior.

Awareness is “the capability of making sense of self, others, and the situation in specific cultural contexts” (Van Dyne et al., 2012, p. 299). While planning focuses on an upcoming interaction and how one might prepare for it, awareness happens in real time. This real-time
awareness includes how culture influences an individual’s mental processes and behaviors, the mental processes and behaviors of others in cross-cultural interactions, and the cross-cultural interaction itself. An individual with awareness knows how culture affects habits, behaviors, and judgments when interacting within a different culture, and is willing to suspend judgment about interactions until further cues are gathered (Van Dyne et al., 2012).

The checking sub-dimension of Metacognitive CQ sees an individual question deep-seated assumptions during and after an intercultural interaction, and then adjust mental models based on unmet expectations or new information (Van Dyne et al., 2012; MacNab, 2012). Held cultural assumptions, or stereotypes, are questioned in light of these interactions, as one seeks to reconcile previous beliefs against the actual interaction. Checking involves a responsible approach to adjusting one’s cultural schema based on intercultural interactions.

**Cognitive CQ.** Along with Metacognitive CQ, Cognitive CQ is an individual’s “knowledge of the norms, practices, and conventions in different cultures acquired from education and personal experiences” (Ang et al., 2007, p. 338). Cognitive CQ is the culture-specific knowledge that is acquired through cultural experiences and/or pre-trip or pre-assignment training. This culture-specific knowledge includes the culture’s economic, legal, and social systems, and an understanding of the basic framework of cultural values (Hofstede, 2001). Individuals with high Cognitive CQ understand these elements of a culture can change from one to another (Brislin, Worthley, & MacNab, 2006). Awareness of the changes in norms, practices, and beliefs allows an individual to appreciate and understand why and how behaviors occur, which aids in appropriate cultural behavior on the part of the individual.

In developing the two sub-dimensions of Cognitive CQ, culture-general knowledge and context-specific knowledge, Van Dyne et al. (2012) looked to cultural anthropology research by
Brown (1991) and Murdock (1987) and the cross-cultural training literature of Bhawuk and Brislin (2000), which helped to identify factors that led to effectiveness in cross-cultural situations. While early training programs focused on context-specific knowledge to aid those relocating overseas, increasing globalization ensured interaction with culturally diverse others, which demands culture-general knowledge (Van Dyne et al., 2012).

*Culture-general knowledge* refers to “knowledge of universal elements that constitute a cultural environment” (Van Dyne et al., 2012, p. 301), including both objective and subjective components. Objective cultural components refer to artifacts and practices that are visible, including economic systems, legal systems, traditional culture types, communication norms, non-verbal expressions, and religious beliefs. Subjective components are unseen, as they are psychological in nature, and include norms, beliefs, and assumptions shared within a culture, such as values of collectivism-individualism, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity-femininity (Hofstede, 2001).

*Context-specific knowledge* refers to the specific way in which a cultural universal is manifested in a specific domain and how to proceed within that domain (Van Dyne et al., 2012). A domain could refer to both a particular location in the world, like a country or region, or a specific subculture such as educators, athletes, public servants, etc. It could also include a demographic domain based on age, gender, or socio-economic status. Context-specific knowledge aids the individual in understanding the norms, practices, and beliefs of a culture, allowing the individual to interact effectively.

Obtained and practiced together, culture-general knowledge and context-specific knowledge allows an individual to have a larger picture of the overall universal elements found within and across cultures, as well as a more specific knowledge that allows for effective
interaction within a particular domain. CQ requires both types of knowledge when preparing for and entering into a cultural context different from the home culture.

Motivational CQ. Regarding to intercultural interactions and international travel, Motivational CQ has lead all other CQ factors in terms of psychological, sociocultural, and academic adaptation (Leung, 2001; Mak & Nesdale, 2001; Tsang, 2001). Motivational CQ refers to the “capability to direct attention and energy toward learning about and functioning in situations characterized by cultural differences” (Ang et al., 2007, p. 338). These motivational capacities “provide agentic control of affect, cognition and behavior that facilitate goal accomplishment” (Kanfer & Heggestad, 1997, p. 39). In culturally diverse settings where meanings, language, and environmental factors are unfamiliar and can create anxiety, agentic control provides the motivation to thrive in spite of cultural uncertainty.

An individual with high Motivational CQ can direct attention and energy towards cross-cultural situations, pulling energy from both self-efficacy and intrinsic and extrinsic motivational factors. Because CQ is a malleable individual difference, Motivational CQ is based in “state-like individual difference constructs, rather than enduring individual differences or contextual variables that are not within the control of the individual” (Van Dyne, 2012, p. 303). Contemporary motivation theories based in state-like constructs include Ryan and Deci’s (2000) Self-Determination Theory (STD) and Bandura’s (1997) Self-Efficacy Theory. STD emphasizes the role of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation regarding individual interests, and provides reasoning to interact in culturally diverse settings, while Self-Efficacy Theory provides the confidence to interact in such settings. Drawing from these theories, Van Dyne et al. (2012) created the three sub-dimensions of Motivational CQ: intrinsic interest, extrinsic interest, and self-efficacy to adjust.
Intrinsic interest refers to the valuing of a “culturally diverse experience in and of itself because it is inherently satisfying” (Van Dyne et al., 2012, p. 303). This can include working with individuals from diverse cultural backgrounds, interacting in diverse cultural settings, and regularly engaging in new cultural experiences. The deep satisfaction and enjoyment that accompanies these interactions are found within the individual and provide motivation not found in others. The ability to adapt and thrive in culturally diverse settings is aided by a deep desire to do so.

Extrinsic interest refers to the tangible, personal benefits gained from interacting in culturally diverse settings (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Extrinsic motivational factors can include promotions, the ability to enhance one’s resume, increased employability, academic credit fulfillment, or even the ability to obtain souvenirs and photos. Extrinsic interest presents outside benefits that motivate one to interact in culturally diverse settings despite challenges.

Self-efficacy to adjust involves “having task-specific confidence in culturally diverse settings” and the capability “of dealing with the stress of adjusting to new cultures” (Van Dyne et al., 2012, p. 304). Self-efficacy to adjust and intrinsic interest go hand-in-hand because when one has both the internal motivation to succeed and the confidence to do so, the ability to thrive in culturally diverse settings becomes easier.

Combined, the three sub-dimensions of Motivational CQ provide one with the tangible benefits to succeed, the intangible motivation to thrive, and the confidence to persevere when faced with challenges. Individuals with high Motivational CQ enjoy and are drawn to culturally diverse settings because they value experiences and have the confidence to succeed (Van Dyne et al., 2012).
**Behavioral CQ.** While Metacognitive, Cognitive, and Motivational CQ are all mental capabilities, Behavioral CQ refers to one’s overt actions and like the other three dimensions, has specific relevance to functioning in culturally diverse settings. Behavioral CQ is defined as “the capability to exhibit appropriate verbal and non-verbal actions when interacting with people from different cultures” (Ang et al., 2007, p. 338). Metacognitive and Cognitive CQ are related to Behavioral CQ, as the “knowledge gained during cultural encounters provides a foundation for behaviors to be engaged in,” and “metacognitive strategies might be used to inform and shape a person’s behavioral repertoire” (Earley & Peterson, 2004, p. 109). While one must understand cultural elements and strategize accordingly, in addition to having the internal motivation and confidence to succeed, these mental capabilities must be complemented with the ability to exhibit appropriate actions based on the cultural values of the setting. Individuals with high Behavioral CQ use situationally-appropriate behaviors such as words, tone, gestures, and facial expressions (Gudykunst, Ting-Toomey, & Chua, 1988).

Based on intercultural communication research, scholars have classified communication behaviors into three categories: verbal behaviors, non-verbal expressions, and speech acts (Van Dyne et al., 2012). Because culturally appropriate behaviors vary from one culture to another, individuals must be aware of these differences and have the ability and flexibility to adjust when necessary. “This behavior flexibility is critically important in intercultural contexts because people do not have direct access to thoughts, feelings, and motivations of others” (Van Dyne et al., 2012, p. 305). The three sub-dimensions CQ scholars identified as most important to the Behavioral dimension are *verbal behavior, non-verbal behavior, and speech acts*, which are all based on the intercultural communication research of Gudykunst et al. (1988) and Hall (1976).
Verbal behavior involves flexibility in vocalization, such as accent, tone, speed, pitch, and inflection (Van Dyne, 2012). This flexibility includes the ability to sense and adjust to formality in communication, as well as recognizing when to take turns speaking and when to use or avoid silence.

Non-verbal behavior encompasses many different areas of communication that are expressed not with words, but through body language, facial expressions, and gestures (Knapp & Hall, 2010). Cognitive CQ plays a role, as the knowledge of a culture’s non-verbal behavior is extremely important and can sometimes communicate more than verbal behavior. Non-verbal behavior includes knowing how close to sit to another person, physical contact, eye contact, and greetings (e.g. shaking hands, bowing, nodding, kissing). In some cultures, non-verbal behavior may even extend to dress attire, such as in Middle Eastern cultures where women are expected to dress more modestly than in some western cultures.

Speech acts refer to one’s “flexibility in manner of communicating specific types of messages such that requests, invitations, apologies, gratitude, disagreement and saying ‘no’ are expressed appropriately based on local standards” (Van Dyne et al., 2007, p. 305). Cultures vary in the way that words are conveyed, such as the actual words that are used and the force with which they are used. In western cultures, when turning down an invitation, one can simply say “no.” However in Asian cultures where saving face is practiced, an individual would promise an attempt to attend.

Combined, the three sub-dimensions provide an individual with the behavioral flexibility to act culturally appropriate. Given that Behavioral CQ is the most visible factor to culturally different others, knowing behavioral cultural norms and having the capability to enact them is
vital in showing respect in culturally diverse settings. Persistence in learning these behaviors and having the aptitude to know when and how to enact them is also vital (Earley & Peterson, 2004).

**Short-Term International Volunteering**

Short-term international volunteering has taken all shapes and sizes, as STM trips, humanitarian aid, and academic time abroad has lead people of all ages, races, and backgrounds to travel internationally for a short time. Thanks in large part to air travel innovations over the last 50 years, international travel has become much easier and the number of volunteers traveling internationally every year has increased. The section below highlights these three types of short-term volunteering, ending with a section on STM trips, and specifically, the STM trip process.

**Overview and types.** Short-term international volunteering emerged as early as the 1920s, as short-term work camps in Europe were established to aid in rebuilding projects after World War One. In the 1930s and 1940s, short-term teams were sent to India and other developing countries to provide emergency aid and relief (Devereux, 2008). As early as 1790, young men were moving overseas to spread the gospel of the Bible. Over the next 200 years, hundreds of faith-based missions agencies were established and thousands of missionaries of all ages were sent to every continent (Winter, 1999). In the 1950s, saw George Vewer mobilized college students on summer breaks as short-term missionaries (Operation Mobilisation, 2013). The sending of young, willing, and able students on short-term cross-cultural experiences was the beginning of what is known today as Operation Mobilisation. A decade later, President John F. Kennedy formed the Peace Corps program and charged college students to help those in need and take care of the broken, poor, and forgotten all over the world (Peace Corps, 2013). While the secular and religious foundations of these organizations may differ, international short-term volunteering is a modern-day phenomenon.
Devereux (2008) suggested that “international volunteering allows a ‘humanizing response’ to the pace and impersonal push of globalization,” and “has the potential to challenge the economic and technical focus of globalization in favor of people connecting and relating with each other on a global scale” (p. 358). In the fifty-plus years since international volunteering took off, international short-term volunteering has expanded into an estimated four-million-plus person per year phenomenon, as North America alone sends between four and five million people from both secular and religious organizations overseas in short-term volunteer and service capacities (Livermore, 2013). Current exact statistics on volunteering abroad are unattainable, as the number of NGOs, non-profits, faith-based organizations, and for-profit companies and their respective volunteer programs are so vast and varied, in addition to different definitions surrounding related terms such as “voluntourism” and “volunteerism.” Without a cohesive approach, tracking the practices, goals, and actual outcomes of this sector is difficult.

The following section overviews the three main types of short-term international volunteer experiences: (a) humanitarian aid and development, (b) academic programs, and (c) religious short-term mission trips.

**Humanitarian aid and development.** Humanitarian relief and organizations such as the American Red Cross, Samaritan’s Purse, UNICEF, Doctors Without Borders, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), along with other non-profit and for-profit organizations, send individuals and teams in both disaster-related humanitarian work and developmental capacities to aid in clear water initiatives, Human Immunodeficiency Virus/Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome (HIV/AIDS) education, building projects, farming projects, medical care, and other areas (Council on Foreign Relations, 2014; Samaritan’s Purse, 2014). International Volunteering and Service (IVS), a current trend worldwide, has experienced
unprecedented growth in the 21st century, as the number of individuals and organizations interested in this trend has grown (Sherraden et al., 2008). By 2015, an estimated 10 million volunteers were traveling annually and spending up to $2 billion to do so (Popham, 2015). The variety of opportunities, locations, program lengths, and costs has opened the door for ordinary people wishing to make a difference; however, no centralized regulatory body for the volunteer tourism industry exists, making it difficult to know or control the quality of these programs. Georgeo (2016) commented that the commercial drive of the industry lends itself to profit rather than the local community needs and detailed tactics used by volunteer organizations to recruit university students. Physicians can now spend two weeks a year in developing countries, administering vaccinations, pulling teeth, or performing minor surgeries. Teachers can spend their summers tutoring youth in an African village, and college students spend their Christmas, spring, and summer breaks rebuilding homes affected by natural disasters. Research on volunteers from North America from 2004-2012 found most to be college graduates, or college-age Caucasians, who were financially-sound and engaged in either educational or labor-intensive projects, youth mentoring capacities, counseling, or medical work (Lough, 2013).

**Academic programs.** In an academic capacity, study abroad programs and degree-related cross-cultural experiences have also grown, as the Institute of International Education (2016b) reported that more university students than ever have completed some type of overseas cross-cultural experience during their tenure. With the modern accessibility and availability of international travel and the increased urge from higher education institutions for students to become culturally competent, cross-cultural academic programs are currently on the rise. In the 2013-2014 academic year, more than 300,000 U.S. college students studied abroad for academic credit, with the majority of students (32%) studying in the United Kingdom, Italy, and Spain; this
number has more than tripled over the past two decades (IIE, 2016b). Domestically, more than 900,000 international students enrolled in U.S. institutions in the 2013-2014 academic year, facilitating a necessity for cultural competence on the part of U.S. college students never having traveled abroad (IIE, 2016a).

International education organizations such as the Association of International Educators (NAFSA), the Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA), the Association for the Advancement of International Education (AAIE), and the Institute of International Education (IIE) all promote the internationalization of higher education through international exchange programs, study abroad programs, and global-worldview-based curriculum, providing training, conferences, and resources to aid in the study abroad movement. These national organizations are in addition to European and Asian organizations such as the European Association for International Education, who hosts more than 4,000 attendees at its annual conference (de Wit, 2012).

**Short-term mission trips.** In the realm of religious volunteer research, relatively little has addressed STM trips, as the focus has generally been on preparing for long-term service; those that do address STM trips are generally found in popular press (Priest et al., 2006). Probasco (2014) described short-term mission trips within a religious context. The main purpose is that of evangelism, though the way in which this is achieved varies from individual to individual and team to team (Probasco, 2014). Service projects, educational training, health care, sports outreach and other types of humanitarian-focused work predominantly underpin STM trips. Livermore (2013), a CQ expert and short-term missions proponent, spoke to the current model of STM trips having morphed out of the initial intent to recruit long-term missionaries to the currently-seen goal of individual transformation. Of the number of individuals traveling each
year for short-term volunteering efforts, 45% are of a religious nature and sent out of mission organizations (Council for Social Development, 2013). This number does not include trips sent out from churches or higher education institutions.

**Short-Term Mission Trip Process**

The Pre-Field Training, On-Field Experience, and Post-Field Debriefing portions of these experiences are critical in setting the tone, providing sound cultural training, and guiding the experience of individuals, as existing research has provided clear evidence that STM trips influence beliefs and practices of young participants (Probasco, 2013). Joplin’s (1995) experiential education research has been used as a reference for STM trips and cross-cultural study tours (Linhart, 2010; Wood & St. Peters, 2014), as this theory fits the short-term missions experience best. Joplin’s model best reflects how STM proponents see the transformative power of these experiences. However, modifications were made to this model as reflection and debrief did not hold as much importance as is ideal in a STM model. Also, the issue of learning transfer is not present in Joplin’s model. Regarding STM, the effectiveness of a short-term experience lies heavily in the long-term changes in one’s thinking and action.

The following sections highlight research and recommendations on how Pre-Field Training, On-Field Experience, and Post-Field Debriefing should be structured in light of developing and improving an individual’s cultural intelligence, as well as contemporary theories of experiential education. The STM trip process presents three specific stages in which CQ can be taught, practiced, and improved. Understanding each stage and how it plays a role in the STM trip process is necessary in knowing how CQ-specific training can be implemented.

**Pre-Field Training.** Harrison and Brower (2011) called for more research that delves into pre-departure courses to develop CQ. MacNab (2011) created an experiential education
approach to CQ, with a multi-step process that included both preparation and reflection stages for cultural engagement. MacNab’s process produced promising results but called for further research in this type of training. MacNab also proposed that the length of training be examined, as CQ development is a process.

In line with MacNab’s study, Linhart (2010) proposed a modified version of Joplin’s (1995) experiential education model, which outlined a process in which STM trip participants can operate. Linhart’s (2010) model emphasized a dependency on experience for learning in both training and preparation and debrief. During the training and preparation, individuals or teams focus on the action that is to come, or the On-Field Experience itself. This could include cultural-specific knowledge, culture-general learning, role-play, or other experiential learning activities. Reflection may take place within the modified model, as learning about the experience to come occurs. This reflection occurs with the support and feedback of team leaders and teammates.

**On-Field Experience.** Experiential Learning Theory plays a critical part in developing and improving CQ, as concrete experiences within a culture—being fully immersed—provide opportunities to learn cultural cues, behaviors, and other skills necessary for cultural adjustment and adaptation (Chen & Isa, 2003; Crowne, 2013; Yamazaki & Kayes, 2004). Interaction with the local culture such as homestays and working alongside locals on multinational teams has been shown to increase knowledge of cultural norms, language, and community needs (Priest et al., 2006). These types of experiential learning activities, both planned and organic, provide individuals and teams with the opportunities to experience the culture first-hand, which has been shown to impact CQ (MacNab, 2011). Priest et al. (2006) also found that when field-based cultural learning exercises and on-field orientations were provided, individuals decreased in ethnocentrism.
Similarly, Cultural Learning Theory (CLT) states that exposure to and engagement in culture is key in acquiring cultural knowledge (Ward, 2011). In a study by Ward cultural distance emerged as the single significant predictor of adaptation problems. The inability or motivation to engage with the host culture had been found to impede the adaptation process. Certain factors such as specific skills and competencies facilitate the acquisition of culture, whereas certain factors can also inhibit this acquisition.

In line with CQ research and Cultural Learning Theory, the process of reflection is necessary when engaging in new cultural experiences (MacNab, 2011). The ability to reflect and discuss these new experiences provides for a base from which to make future decisions regarding one’s behaviors in a cultural setting. Expats learn best from reflective action—the process of making decisions based on insights gained from contemplation (Shim & Paprock, 2002). While this research supports purposeful reflection during the On-Field Experience, the modified Joplin experiential education model suggests that reflection and debrief be placed at the end of the experience, as learning occurs once the experience has concluded and not during the process (Linhart, 2010). However, learning is on-going, which is especially true in a foreign culture with which participants have no previous experience. This difference in the time and place of reflection and debrief, as well as the amount, should be noted in the On-Field Experience, as it could affect the development and improvement of one’s cultural intelligence.

**Post-Field Debriefing.** Contemporary experiential education research, like that of Kolb (1983), is rooted in the idea that learning is cyclical in nature and represented by four stages in which people interact with their experiences, beginning with a concrete experience. This concrete experience occurs in the here and now, followed by a time of reflection where the individual constructs an abstract conceptualization and then applies that new understanding
through action in a new situation. While this process is ongoing, as stated in the previous section, there is debate concerning when and where debriefing should occur within the short-term missions trip experience (Linhart, 2010).

In Joplin’s (1995) experiential education model, the act of reflection is the key component. And while the act of reflection is present in the action cycle of Joplin’s (1995) model, the modified version has placed debrief in the transition from the action (On-Field Experience) cycle to the post-trip period (Linhart, 2010). Differentiating reflection from debrief, Joplin (1995) defined debrief as:

Here, learning is recognized, articulated, and evaluated. The teacher is responsible for seeing that the actions previously taken do not drift along unquestioned, unrealized, unintegrated, or unorganized. Debrief helps the student learn from experience. Debrief is the sorting and ordering of information, often involving perceptions and beliefs. (p. 19)

Placing debrief at the conclusion of the On-Field Experience also ensures that the team is still meeting together, as typically the support and feedback of the team leaders has been removed once the trip concludes. Support by the teammates is also removed, which can feel stark as this small community had been meeting together for sometimes several months before the trip. Debriefing together as a team or individually with team leaders allows for discussion of experiences from the trip, application to the individual’s personal practices and beliefs, and the ability to ask questions to clarify and makes sense of what was experienced.

The issue of learning transfer has also been a concern for and critique of short-term mission trips, as an increase in areas like giving, serving overseas long-term, and local service is not evident, despite participants’ claims of the significant personal effect of these experiences (Linhart, 2010). One inhibitor of this learning transfer is that it usually occurs during the trip.
However, as participants are usually in unfamiliar locations for a short amount of time, the ability to truly see and understand the culture is severely limited, which can impede CQ development. Participants may develop a romanticized view of the culture, as the experiences there can be surreal. Attempting to facilitate learning transfer while in the experience limits the ability to truly transfer this learning into one’s everyday life. Although STM trip leaders and facilitators desire participants to develop a deeper spiritual life, desire to serve others, and motivation to serve overseas one day, emphasizing learning transfer in the wrong stage of the trip may inhibit ongoing transformation in participants’ attitudes, beliefs, and practices in relation to cultural thinking. Noting the time and place of debrief in the STM trip process could shed more light on its impact on CQ development.

Related Literature

The following section details related literature that provides further background, research, and findings in the fields of Cultural Intelligence and short-term international volunteering. Each section also includes calls for future research that helps to substantiate this study.

Cultural Intelligence

During the conceptualization period of CQ, the first symposium on CQ was held in 2004 at the Academy of Management’s Annual Meeting; the need and relevance of CQ in the workplace was communicated. This also presented Ang and Earley the opportunity to receive feedback on the construct, speak with fellow international professionals about the challenges of continually working cross-culturally, and further refine and develop the CQ construct. In 2006, a special issue of the journal *Group and Organization Management* was published, devoted solely to the conceptualization and empirical investigation of CQ. In 2007, Ang published the first
article on the measurement and predictive validity of CQ and encouraged further empirical studies across a variety of disciplines.

Other studies sought to further validate CQ as a predictor of specific outcomes, such as cultural judgment, decision-making, cultural adaptation, and task performance in culturally diverse settings (Ang et al., 2007; Jyoti & Kour, 2015), leadership success abroad (Alon & Higgins, 2005; Box et al., 2015), cross-cultural success in international business settings (Alon & Higgins, 2005; Ang et al., 2007; Earley & Ang, 2003; Konanhalli et al., 2014; Livermore & Van Dyne, 2015; Daher, 2015), and how multicultural individuals are more effective abroad due to higher CQ (Nguyen, 2010). These quantitative studies further added to the validation and credibility of CQ as a measurement tool and predictor of effective intercultural outcomes. However, a call for further research in how CQ develops among individuals in relation to international experiences and cross-cultural training has been identified in recent studies (Ang et al., 2007; Ng, Van Dyne, & Ang, 2012; MacNab, 2012; Wood & St. Peters, 2014). Despite the number of studies discussed that lend credibility and validity to the CQ construct, further qualitative research opportunities abound, including both developing and examining pre-departure courses that seek to develop CQ (Harrison & Brower, 2011; Wood & St. Peters, 2014), identifying how and why cultural exposure develops CQ (Crowne, 2013), studying how a variety of cross-cultural interactions affects CQ (Ang et al., 2007), and understanding the nature of changes in CQ development (Ng et al., 2012).

Metacognitive CQ. Previous research that explored Metacognitive CQ includes Ang et al.’s (2007) findings that Metacognitive CQ was positively related to cultural judgment and decision-making, and that it also predicted task performance in intercultural settings. The study recommended that training include modules on Metacognitive CQ, as it has been shown to be a
fundamental capability in relation to intercultural effectiveness. Studies whose findings concern Metacognitive CQ include Tarique and Takeuchi’s (2008) study of 212 undergraduate students enrolled in management courses in a mid-size New York City university. Participants completed a survey four weeks prior to the end of the semester, which measured demographics, control variables, and prior international experiences. Three weeks later, participants completed a questionnaire that assessed the four facets of cultural intelligence. After completing four separate moderated regression analyses for each of the facets, Tarique and Takeuchi found that the length of stay in a country was positively correlated with Metacognitive CQ. MacNab’s (2012) study, which included 743 graduate students enrolled in international and cross-cultural management courses both in an American and Australian university, employed a seven-step experiential educational approach to CQ education that was found to significantly influence Metacognitive CQ. Ward, Wilson, and Fischer (2011) found that Metacognitive CQ was associated with better sociocultural adjustment and fewer adaptation problems in a sample of 104 international students at a New Zealand university. Students completed a CQ assessment during pre-term orientation, and then assessments of adaptation problems three months later.

Areas of further study in Metacognitive CQ include how environmental factors and individual characteristics can influence CQ training outcomes (MacNab & Worthley, 2011), as well as the ideal amount of time for CQ training to effectively influence the metacognitive dimension (MacNab, 2012). Tarique and Takeuchi (2008) recommend further investigating other moderators that play a role in developing CQ other than the length of stay or number of countries visited.

**Cognitive CQ.** Ang et al.’s (2007) study in which cognitive CQ predicted cultural judgment and decision-making in a sample of 235 undergraduate students in an American
university and 358 undergraduate students in a Singaporean university added to the empirical literature on Cognitive CQ. Participants completed various online questionnaires on CQ in addition to cultural judgment and decision-making scenarios, which were then tested for correlations. Tarique and Takeuchi’s (2008) work, highlighted in the Metacognitive CQ section above, showed a positive correlation between length of stay in a country and Cognitive CQ. In a 2008 study of 140 undergraduate students from an American northeastern university, Crowne (2008) found a positive relationship between Cognitive CQ and students who had been abroad for educational purposes, as well as higher Cognitive CQ for those who had visited more foreign countries for educational or employment purposes.

More research is needed in this area, including research on how the study abroad or internship experience develops Cognitive CQ, as well as how training in CQ in the actual country or culture of the cross-cultural interaction compares with receiving the same training in the home culture (Crowne, 2008). Related to Cognitive CQ development, Tarique and Takeuchi (2008) recommended more longitudinal studies that examine the effects of international non-work experience on CQ development.

**Motivational CQ.** In a study by Ward et al. (2011), Motivational CQ was related to fewer sociocultural difficulties in 104 international exchange students at a New Zealand university, when CQ was tested at the beginning of the term and sociocultural adaptation and psychological symptoms were tested three months later. Those with higher Motivational CQ showed less adaptation problems three months later, compared to those who did not enter the exchange experience with high Motivational CQ. This study was supported by Chirkov, Safdar, de Guzman, and Playford’s (2008) findings that motivation predicts psychological and sociocultural adaptation over time. In addition, Chirkov, Vansteenkiste, Tao, and Lynch (2007)
also found that among international students, self-determined motivation leads to better academic performance and higher subjective well-being. Motivation has also been linked to better psychological, sociocultural, and academic adaptation in sojourners and immigrants in general (Leung, 2001; Man & Nesdale, 2001; Tsang, 2001). While motivation has been found to positively correlate with cross-cultural adaptation, there is still “the need for the continued exploration of these constructs within the acculturation field” (Ward, 2011, p. 141).

**Behavioral CQ.** In the early stages of CQ development, Earley and Peterson (2004) conducted a study aimed at finding the relationship between CQ and intercultural effectiveness outcomes among international managers. The researchers found that Metacognitive CQ and Behavioral CQ were fundamental capabilities in relation to these intercultural effectiveness outcomes. In a related study, Ang et al. (2007) found that foreign workers with higher Behavioral CQ and Metacognitive CQ were better able to adapt their behaviors accordingly, which is necessary in a changing global workplace that has become increasingly more complex and dynamic and demands the ability to culturally adapt behaviors. While much of the Behavioral CQ research has been focused on the international workplace, the capability and flexibility to adapt behaviors accordingly is necessary in all culturally diverse settings. However, Crowne (2008) found that limited cultural exposure negatively affected Behavioral CQ, as the opportunity for social learning inhibits the ability to develop culturally appropriate behaviors.

**Criticisms of CQ.** In light of the short history of CQ over the past decade or so, and the lengths to which researchers have gone to validate CQ as both a construct and a measurement tool (Ang et al., 2006; Ang et al., 2007), criticisms of the construct are difficult to find. However, regarding the CQ assessment, a recent article discussed the validity and reliability of tests used to assess cross-cultural competence (Matsumoto & Hwang, 2013), including tests such as the CQ
assessment. Matsumoto and Hwang (2013) advised that the CQ assessment include further research demonstrating its incremental validity. Although the CQ assessment has been subjected to multiple Confirmatory Factor Analyses and has reported data concerning validity across personality and other individual difference variables, further testing across different samples of demographics (e.g., sex, age, language, etc.) is necessary to demonstrate incremental validity. The lack of evidence for the CQ assessment’s reliability in different languages was also noted.

There is also a lack of qualitative research in the process of the development and validation of the CQ assessment. While qualitative methods have been used in the creation process of the CQ assessment, the validation process is lacking in this area, as well as in the validation process of the CQ construct as a whole (Matsumoto & Hwang, 2013).

**Call for future research in Cultural Intelligence.** Past studies found specific outcomes and correlations associated with CQ, such as cultural judgment and decision-making, task performance, and cultural adaptation (Ang et al., 2007; Cho & Morris, 2015; Jyoti & Kour, 2015; Konanhalli et al., 2014; ), leadership success abroad (Alon & Higgins, 2005; Box et al., 2015), cross-cultural success in international business settings (Alon & Higgins, 2005; Ang et al., 2007; Daher, 2015; Earley & Ang, 2003; Livermore & Van Dyne, 2015), and higher CQ levels among multi-cultural individuals than monocultural individuals (Nguyen, 2010). However, these studies focused on outcomes and predictions associated with CQ levels, but not on the process of CQ development or the nature of changes associated with CQ development. Some studies sought to explore how experiential education programs develop CQ (MacNab, 2012; Wood & St. Peters, 2014) and how Cultural Intelligence training better prepares global managers (Earley & Peterson, 2004), but even these studies and others call for further research to be completed on how CQ develops, and the factors associated with these changes (Ang et al., 2007; Crowne,
2013; Harrison & Brower, 2011; MacNab, 2012; Ng et al., 2012; Ward, 2011). A further exploration into how CQ develops before, during, and after a cultural experience would provide increased understanding of the construct and how it can be purposefully enhanced during training, the cultural experience itself, and debriefing periods.

**Short-Term International Volunteering**

With the explosive surge over the past two decades in international short-term volunteering, a lack of empirical research assessing specific outcomes of these experiences remains (Lough & McBride, 2012; Machin, 2008; Sherraden et al., 2008). The majority of scholarly work that has been produced has focused on study abroad research or secular-based volunteering, with little in the way of short-term travel in religious contexts (Priest et al., 2006).

**Humanitarian aid and development.** While the aim of humanitarian efforts is to assist individuals in developing countries with health, infrastructure, education, struggles caused by natural and other disasters, an additional focus on enhancing one’s cultural knowledge or practices, while not necessarily present, can be a by-product (Crown, 2013; Chen & Isa, 2003; Crawford-Mathis, 2010). While the aid provided by these organizations can certainly improve the physical well-being of the recipients and communities, there has been no proven lasting positive impact on those who receive such aid, nor on the cultural outlook of those who carry out the work (Livermore, 2013). In a study for the *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, Smith and Font (2015) said that volunteer organizations should be more mindful of their operations, focusing on assessment of their programs, intentionality of those they recruit that match the needs and skill level of locations, and the goal of leaving a lasting impact through respect with local communities. As illustrated, a call for further research in the outcomes of such volunteering is needed (Sherraden et al., 2008; Machin, 2008).
**Academic programs.** The lasting impact of study abroad experiences is still unknown, though scholarly work has been devoted to study abroad outcomes (Priest et al., 2006) such as cultural intelligence (Nguyen, 2010; Harrison & Brower, 2011; Crowne, 2008), adjustment (Hechanova-Alampay, Beehr, Christiansen, & van Horn, 2002), how certain personality traits affect intercultural adjustment (Savicki et al., 2004), and the effect of homesickness on psychological adjustment (Ward & Kennedy, 1993). While the Open Doors 2013 report stated that these international interactions and experiences last a lifetime (Institute of International Education, 2013), other research has found that within six to eight weeks, participants resort back to Pre-Field thinking and assumptions (Livermore, 2013). A call for an increase in study abroad opportunities, resources, and quality programs that meet students’ academic needs has been loud and clear, as it is “increasingly important for U.S. students to attain international knowledge, cross-cultural communication skills, and intercultural competence” (Institute of International Education, 2014). The international business world has clearly seen the need for CQ training to support and promote healthy expatriate assignments and adjustment, but the educational world is only now taking notice of this must for cross-cultural interactions (Johnson et al., 2006; MacNab et al., 2012; Tung, 1982; Wood & St. Peters, 2014). Overall, research concerning CQ training in pre-study abroad training is scant (Harrison & Brower, 2011; Kamdar & Lewis, 2015; MacNab et al., 2012), though cultural intelligence in the adjustment phase has been found to increase in post-study abroad tests (Nguyen, 2010; Harrison & Brower, 2011; Crowne, 2008).

**Short-term mission trips.** The recent criticism of STM trips has been that individuals and teams make no lasting impact on those with whom they interact, and that the impact they do make is one of culturally unintelligent Westerners with little regard for culturally differing
beliefs and practices (Livermore, 2013). Livermore (2013), along with others, calls for the integration of sound cultural intelligence training, purposeful interaction with locals on the field, and meaningful debriefing opportunities (Chen & Isa, 2003; Crawford-Mathis, 2010; Crowne, 2013; Gilleard & Gilleard, 2002; Harrison & Brower, 2011; Nguyen, 2010; Olson & Kroeger, 2011).

As training focuses for short-term trips can range from culture-general knowledge to culture-specific knowledge, include experiential learning exercises, and last from a few hours to several months, research that supports how to go about Pre-Field Training and what to include to help develop CQ is lacking. Bennet and Eberts (2015), Kamdar and Lewis (2015), and Woods and St. Peters (2015) called for more well-rounded Pre-Field Training that will ultimately produce desired outcomes, but in short-term volunteer and academic trips.

CQ literature often denotes the positive effect engaging with the host culture has on CQ (Crawford-Mathis, 2010; Crowne, 2007; MacNab, 2011; Woods & St. Peters, 2014). However, research is limited as to how exposure and the type of cultural exposure affects CQ development (Ang et al., 2007; Crowne, 2013; Woods & St. Peters, 2014).

Summary

Cultural Intelligence researchers have stated that, “CQ has direct relevance to students because over 77 percent of incoming freshmen in the USA have prior international experience and students increasingly cross cultures for study, internships and personal travel” (Ang et al., 2007, p. 346). While existing research provides evidence that STM trips influence the beliefs and practices of those involved (Probasco, 2013), the nature of effects and the particular contexts in which they occur have yet to be studied (Sherraden et al., 2008). The number of young adults who embark on not only STM trips, but also study abroad programs and other international
volunteering, as well as the number of international students with which they come into contact every day on American college campuses, necessitates that these students practice high CQ. Developing training and teaching that can improve CQ calls for research that explores how CQ is developed. One way to carry out this is through the STM trip process, which includes Pre-Field Training, On-Field Experience, and Post-Field Debriefing (Ang et al., 2007; Crowne, 2013; Ng et al., 2012; MacNab, 2012). This exploration allows for research that serves as a foundation for training programs and practices across short-term volunteering organizations. The increasing globalization of the world demands the capability to interact with cultural intelligence, as borders disappear and cultural engagement becomes inevitable.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODS

Overview

The purpose of this collective case study was to determine how, if at all, Cultural Intelligence developed through a three-stage mission trip process for students at a large Christian university in the southeast participating in three separate short-term mission trips. In order to understand how the stages of the short-term mission (STM) trip process impacted the development of CQ, a collective case study was chosen in order to gather data from three different short-term teams. This replication across cases generated a greater pool from which to draw data, which allowed for greater analysis of similar themes. This chapter describes the design of the study, including the setting, participants, and data collection and analysis procedures.

Design

Qualitative research allows the researcher to deeply examine and understand the participants’ or co-researchers’ thoughts, feelings, attitudes, and beliefs in relation to their own realities (Creswell, 2013). Qualitative research can take on various forms, including case studies, phenomenology, ethnography, narratives, and grounded theory. A case study was chosen for this study because it allowed for the researcher to carefully observe and understand “a specific, complex, functioning thing” (Stake, 1995, p. 2). The development of CQ within the bounds of the STM trip process has yet to be examined, although it provides an ideal setting in which CQ development may occur. A collective case study was utilized so that the results of each case could be compared, and replication across cases took place to ensure dependability (Yin, 2009). Each case was from within the same university program, as opposed to different programs at other institutions, which is why a collective case study was chosen. Examining three separate
STM trip teams allowed for a greater pool of data from which to draw conclusions pertaining to factors that may or may not impact CQ development, and provided greater evidence for conclusions made and transferability of findings.

This collective case study was explanatory in nature; it sought to understand how CQ was developed through the STM trip process in relation to the environment and context of each team. The individual student team members served as embedded units in each case, providing their own experiences within the cases. Multiple sources of data were collected within each case so that a comprehensive picture of the students’ development of CQ within the STM trip process could be examined. Each STM trip team presented a unique, closed-bounded system in which to research CQ development. Although many of the required activities of each team were the same (i.e. workshops, CQ Self-Assessment, team meetings), the way in which they were presented, the individual characteristics of the team leaders, the On-Field Experiences of each team, and other factors varied.

**Research Questions**

Theoretical propositions in case studies provide a theoretical basis from which to implement the case study. These statements allow the researcher to commence the study with explanations based in research that explains why relationships occur (Yin, 2012). For this study, the theoretical propositions discussed in Chapter Two regarding how concentrated engagement with locals while on the field, effective Pre-Field Training that implements both cultural theory and practice, and a purposeful Post-Field Debriefing held six to eight weeks after return all impacted CQ development and aided in developing the research questions. After CQ development research is assessed, theoretical propositions can be deduced and translated into how data will be collected and what content will be included.
The following research questions guided this study:

1. How does the Pre-Field Training impact CQ development in undergraduate students participating in a STM trip?

2. How does the On-Field Experience impact CQ development in undergraduate students participating in a STM trip?

3. How does the Post-Field Debriefing impact CQ development in undergraduate students participating in a STM trip?

Setting

The setting for this study was Lynwell University (pseudonym), a private liberal arts university in the southeastern United States. Lynwell University enrolled over 14,000 students in its residential undergraduate and graduate programs with an additional 90,000 students enrolled in online programs during the 2014-2015 academic year. At the time of this study’s data collection stages, Lynwell University’s Department for Global Exchange (DGE) coordinated more than 25 STM trips per year, primarily comprised of residential undergraduate students. These short-term trip teams each contained eight to 20 students and two leaders, and traveled during all three school breaks (Christmas, spring, and summer) and to every continent except for Australia and Antarctica. The ministry focus of each team was different, but may have included areas such as teaching English, construction projects, anti-sex trafficking work, children’s ministry, humanitarian aid, refugee camps, and sports camps. Students were recruited in August and September of each school year through Convocation announcements, in-class announcements, on-campus events, and at the DGE’s annual Global Expo, which promoted the department as a whole and unveiled all of the STM trips offered that year. After completing an online application that included biographical, medical, insurance, and spiritual information,
along with an explanation for their choice of teams, students were interviewed by a STM trip coordinator and accepted to a team. Teams then began Pre-Field Training and team meetings as early as the first week of October. All team members were required to attend four training workshops that provided an overview of the topics of support development, security training, CQ, and the Gospel and personal testimony. Separate team meetings with his or her team and team leaders, possible team retreats, and celebration gatherings, which were held after the Christmas and spring break teams returned, as well as a Post-Field Debriefing meeting. While the workshops were taught using standardized curriculum, the form that individual team meetings and retreats may have taken was unique to each team.

The DGE began implementing CQ training during the 2013-2014 school year, and required each team member to complete the CQ Self-Assessment (Livermore, 2013) before and after the overseas experience. All team members were required to attend two workshops that reviewed CQ during the 2013-2014 school year, but the workshops were condensed into one workshop for the 2014-2015 school year. While team leaders also completed the CQ workshops and CQ Self-Assessment during the 2013-2014 school year, they were not instructed, nor were they required, to integrate any purposeful teaching or training regarding CQ into their team meetings or events. For the 2014-2015 school year, the DGE planned to offer further cultural training to team leaders in conjunction with CQ principles, along with supplemental activities that could be used during individual team meetings, however they were not able to do so.

Team leaders were either staff or faculty of Lynwell University, or staff with the mission agencies the university partnered with on a trip. Team leaders were chosen based on recommendations from well-known and respected colleagues of the DGE. Team leaders met with their team’s STM trip coordinator monthly for one-on-one coaching, training, and follow-up
after team meetings. Team leaders also debriefed with the STM trip coordinator after their teams returned.

**Participants**

Undergraduate student team members from DGE’s Spring Break STM trips were selected as participants of this study and served as embedded units of analysis within the three cases. In a collective case study, several cases are reviewed to compare and contrast themes within and across cases (Creswell, 2013). As one targeted issue is the focus of the study, multiple cases allow for more in-depth information regarding the issue (Stake, 1995, 2006; Yin, 1994, 2009). An analysis of multiple perspectives comprised a holistic picture of CQ development within the STM trip process. Below are the participants for each case, including their ages and year in school at the beginning of data collection.
Table 1

Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Year in School</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Residency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Mitch</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Haley</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Lori</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Exercise Science</td>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Felicia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Worship Music</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Megan</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Penny</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Caleb</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Theology</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Britt</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Nora</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Tori</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Health Promotions</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sampling Procedures

In order to collect multiple perspectives, three cases, or STM trip teams from Lynwell University’s DGE were used. Within each case, embedded units of analysis were used for data collection. These embedded units were the undergraduate student team members on the three teams that served as cases for this study. Approval to conduct the study was secured from the Director of the DGE and the Director of Global Short-Term Teams (Appendix A), as well as permission to review student applications in a digital database for participant selection and administer and view the CQ Self-Assessment results. Approval was then sought from Lynwell University’s Institutional Review Board (IRB) (Appendix B). Once approval was received from the IRB and DGE staff, I electronically communicated with the Director of Global Short-Term
Teams to identify three potential teams to serve as cases. The three cases were chosen based on the pre-determined criteria of: (a) each team will travel during the university’s spring break period, (b) each team will travel to a different continent, (c) each team will contain between 10-20 students for sampling purposes, and (d) none will be coordinated by the researcher, to decrease bias. Because I worked in this department as a STM trip coordinator, ethical considerations were taken into account. Using STM trip teams that were not coordinated by the researcher ensured that credibility remained intact and that there was no undue influence on the students and their CQ development. Next, I contacted each of the three team leaders to review the study and their team members’ participation in it, and obtained the team leaders’ consent (Appendix C). I also requested the date and time of the first team meeting and workshop offering.

Purposeful sampling occurred with participant selection, which was “based on the assumption that the investigator wants to discover, understand, and gain insight and therefore, must select a sample from which the most can be learned” (Merriam, 2009, p. 77). According to Wilson and Stewart (2009), individuals experiencing their first time traveling overseas saw the greatest development in CQ, compared to those who had traveled two or more times. This potential for CQ development provides more data from which to draw themes regarding how the STM trip process impacted CQ development. Based on this premise, participants who have no international travel experience outside of North America were considered, as “participants should be selected explicitly to encompass instances in which the phenomena under study are likely to be found” (Zach, 2009, p. 6). However, after looking through team member applications, not enough participants matched this criterion to meet saturation. In order for saturation to occur, one-third to half of the student team members needed to be sampled. Because
of this, an open invitation was issued to all team members. Those agreeing to participate completed and signed an electronic Consent Form (Appendix D), a demographic survey (Appendix E), and completed the Pre-Field Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS) (Appendix F).

**Procedures**

Data collection for this study commenced once approval was received from the Institutional Review Board (IRB). Expert review of interview questions and on-field journaling prompts was conducted prior to the proposal defense, and pilot studies were held prior to formal data collection with the participants. Four undergraduate student workers with whom I worked agreed to participate in a pilot study to provide clarification of interview questions and review the on-field journaling prompts. Two team members from a 2014-2015 Christmas break team also sat through a pilot of the Post-Field Debriefing interview questions. A demographic survey, individual interviews, on-field journaling exercises, and the CQS were used as data collection methods during three separate stages in the study: (a) Pre-Field Training, (b) On-Field Experience, and (c) Post-Field Debriefing.

**Pre-Field Training**

In the Pre-Field Training stage of the data collection, participants were asked to sign the informed consent form, complete a demographic survey, and complete an electronic version of the CQS at the start of their Pre-Field Training stage, ideally before any team meetings or workshops commenced. The pre-field CQS helped to gauge CQ prior to any cultural training and gather information pertaining to why the individual desired to join the respective team. A Pre-Field interview was scheduled during the time between the end of Pre-Field Training and before the team’s departure, to assess the Pre-Field Training stage. Interviews (Appendix G) took place on Lynwell University’s campus for the convenience of both the students and the researcher.
Interviews lasted approximately 30 minutes to one hour and were audio recorded to ensure accuracy and intent of the participants. To decrease my own bias as a STM trip coordinator, I incorporated self-reflective note-taking into the interviews, making comments about what was being said, and intentionally asking for clarification during the interviews. I then wrote my own summary of the interviews, noting major points, right after the interview ended. The recordings were downloaded onto my personal computer and saved to a folder on my personal email. Transcriptions of the interviews were completed over a month’s time by a paid assistant. After reading through the transcriptions, I went back through any unclear areas with the transcriber. After this, I began analyzing the interviews using pattern matching (Yin, 2012) as discussed in the data analysis section below, by first looking at each individual participant, or embedded unit, then each case comprised of each set of participants, and finally all cases together.

**On-Field Experience**

The On-Field Experience stage of the data collection consisted of the on-field journaling exercise. Participants were given their journals, which included prompts to be answered (Appendix H), at the conclusion of the pre-field interviews. Directions were given, along with an opportunity for the participants to ask any questions. Participants returned their journals within two weeks after their return to then be coded for data analysis.

**Post-Field Debriefing**

The Post-Field Debriefing stage included an individual interview (Appendix I) to gauge the six to eight weeks since the team’s return, and a second completion of the CQS to gauge any changes in CQ. Both data collection methods were completed during the individual interview time within six to eight weeks after the participants’ return.
The Researcher's Role

I served as the human instrument for this study. In doing so, the issue of bias arose, which must be noted and clarified. During the data collection for this study, I served as a coordinator of short-term mission trips in the Department for Global Exchange at Lynwell University and had both seen and experienced CQ development on a first-hand basis. I have also lived overseas in both South Korea and Indonesia, where I taught at an international school and an English academy. These experiences have served to both develop my own CQ and to make clear factors that impact CQ development. While I came into this study with my own experiences and assumptions, I put certain safeguards in place to keep this bias or influence from affecting the study. I did not use short-term mission trip teams or participants who I had direct contact with or influence over. They were not part of teams that I, myself, coordinated. In this way, I did not have any contact with the participants except for in the data collection stages.

As the human instrument in this study, I hoped to create a comfortable and supportive environment in which the participants could feel at ease in expressing their thoughts and feelings in the interviews and on-field journaling. I worked to ensure participants understood the confidentiality of their responses and my role as a professional researcher, in order to secure more honest answers.

Data Collection

Data were collected in three stages: (a) Pre-Field Training, (b) On-Field Experience, and (c) Post-Field Debriefing. During the Pre-Field Training, a demographic survey, the CQS, and an individual interview were completed; during the On-Field Experience, journaling prompts were completed; and during the Post-Field Debriefing, individual interviews and a second completion of the CQS were undertaken.
Pre-Field Training

The Pre-Field Training stage included a demographic survey, a pre-trip Cultural Intelligence Scale Assessment, and an individual interview.

Demographic survey. Each participant completed a demographic survey (Appendix E) that included questions pertaining to the year in school, major and minor, desire for joining the respective team, international travel experience, and expectations for the on-field time. These surveys were used to help inform and guide the individual interviews.

Cultural Intelligence Scale. The CQS (see Appendix F) is a 20-item scale that includes cultural belief statements relating to metacognitive CQ (Strategy), cognitive CQ (Knowledge), motivational CQ (Drive), and behavioral CQ (Action), and has participants select how strongly they agree or disagree with the statements via a 7-point Likert-type scale. Based on responses, participants are rated as low (lowest 30%), average (middle 40%), or high (highest 30%), when compared with similar people. According to Ang et al. (2007), the CQS has been used across various samples, times, and countries and has shown validity as a measurement tool with a goodness of fit of 0.92.

Interviews. Collecting data through individual interviews during Pre-Field Training allowed me to hear the personal thoughts and feelings of the participants. Interview questions included restatements of, or references to, the already-completed demographic survey questions to provide clarification and guide the interview. Questions assessing current CQ were semi-structured, as they contained pre-determined interview questions that standardized the interviews and guided the discussion, but were open-ended in nature. The questions were based in CQ research, which truly focused the discussion on CQ development. Questions pertaining to the participant’s scores on their pre-trip CQ Self-assessment were also asked.


**Interview questions.** These questions (Appendix G) were based in CQ literature related to developing one’s own CQ. Referring to the demographic survey and asking the participants to talk more about their own backgrounds, including their own views of culture, built more complete portraits of the participants. Understanding why the participants chose their specific teams and what expectations they had for them provided information that may relate to developing cross-cultural knowledge or abilities. It also helped in seeing if the STM trip made any impact on the students’ long-term goals. MacNab and Worthley (2011) proposed individual characteristics and self-efficacy as predictors of CQ development, so examining participants’ motivation and expectations for their team could play a role in how, or if, they develop CQ through the STM process.

The purpose of the Cultural Intelligence questions was to help the researcher understand how the Pre-Field Training had impacted CQ development. Asking both personal questions and team-oriented questions provided for elements from a variety of contexts that may or may not have impacted CQ. Also, asking questions in past, present, and future tense allowed me to better understand how participants saw their CQ impacted, and how they expected it to continue to play out once on the field.

Because STM trips are predominantly faith-based, and participants had indicated on their demographic surveys that faith played a role in why they were on these teams, it was necessary to include faith-based questions. As a clear factor in these participants’ motivations, I sought to understand how their faith affected their own personal and team preparation.

**On-Field Experience**

For the On-Field Experience stage, the on-field journaling exercise (Appendix H) was presented to participants at the conclusion of the Pre-Field interview. I gave each participant a
journal with the daily prompts secured inside the front cover. The participants were asked to return these journals within a week of returning from the STM trip.

**Journals.** In order to collect data while participants were overseas, each completed on-field journaling exercises. As experiential learning is believed to be the most effective way of learning about a new culture (Alon & Higgins, 2005; Crowne, 2013; MacNab, 2012; Yamazaki & Kayes, 2004), a time of reflection and discussion is vital in helping one to consider and further develop CQ. Journaling allowed the participants to record and evaluate their time on the field and factors that impacted CQ development.

**Journal prompts.** Prompts were given prior to the participants’ departure, along with an explanation of the prompts. Participants were asked to address each prompt at certain times during the on-field time. Prompts were based on both CQ literature and Experiential Learning literature. The purpose of these journaling prompts was to allow students to reflect on their experiences on the field as they were happening. While some questions could be answered at one time only, others necessitated evaluation throughout the On-Field Experience, since CQ development has been shown to be a process (MacNab, 2012). Questions one and two were based on the work of Priest (2006), who found a decrease in ethnocentrism in STM trip participants when on-field cultural orientations and field-based cultural-learning exercises were present. Questions three through five were based on research that suggested CQ development is highly correlated with cultural exposure (Crowne, 2008, 2013; Ward, 2011; Ang et al., 2007). Crowne (2013) commented, “Exposure to other cultures will increase CQ, because exposure to other cultures allows one to recognize cultural differences more readily, particularly, if the individual is interested in learning new behaviors and changing behaviors” (pp. 8-9). However, a gap in the literature remains regarding the depth and type of exposure related to CQ.
development (Crowne, 2013). Also, experiential learning, or learning where people are immersed in a cultural experience, has been shown as necessary for learning behaviors that are essential for CQ (Yamakazi & Kayes, 2004; Alon & Higgins, 2005; Chen & Isa, 2003).

Questions six and nine pertained to the idea that “organizers and mission-trip recruiters play a significant role in shaping our expectations about STM [short-term missions]” (Livermore, 2012, p. 48). Team leaders and on-field personnel play a role in how activities are planned, training is carried out, and cross-cultural interactions are facilitated. This influence and control over the short-term mission trip process should be evaluated in light of CQ development. Question 6 overlapped with both the team leader effect on CQ development, as well as the role that debriefing played. Question seven allowed for the participants to reflect on both team and personal reflection, and the role each may have played in CQ development. As Shim and Paprock (2002) noted, expats learn best through self-reflection, where they are then able to make decisions based on insights gained from contemplation. Question eight asked the participants to evaluate their own personal faith throughout the on-field time and how it may have played a role in both CQ development and CQ practice. Questions 10-13 asked the participants to evaluate the on-field time as a whole and its impact on the four dimensions of CQ (Drive, Knowledge, Strategy, and Action). Questions three through eight were answered twice during the on-field time as the day-to-day interaction with the local culture may have changed, as well as the participants’ comfort level with the local culture. Evaluating these items at various times not only provided a more comprehensive picture of the on-field time, but also allowed the participants to evaluate their change in attitudes and perceptions over the course of the trip.
Post-Field Debriefing

In the Post-Field Debriefing stage of the data collection, individual interviews (Appendix I) were conducted with participants within six to eight weeks after their return. Participants also completed the CQS, which was the same assessment taken during Pre-Field Training. This was so that quantitative data could be used to help further triangulate the data collected on CQ development throughout the STM trip process. This timeframe had been chosen because according to the literature (Livermore, 2013), a shift in worldview due to cross-cultural interaction will have either taken effect by that time, or the person will have returned to his pre-interaction worldview. If further clarification or follow-up was needed, interviews included questions pertaining to the on-field journaling analyses. Interviews lasted approximately 30 minutes to one hour and were audio recorded. The same assistant was used to transcribe this set of interviews.

Cultural Intelligence Scale. Each participant was asked to complete the post-field CQS a week prior to his or her interview. In some cases, the participant was not able to do so and was asked to complete it in person before the interview began. A second measure of students’ CQ post-field provided another form of triangulation, so that changes in CQ could be compared against responses received during the post-field interviews.

Interviews. The Post-Field Debriefing interviews lasted approximately 30 minutes to one hour and were audio-recorded for accuracy and to aid in reliability of data collection. Follow-up questions were asked if further clarification was needed to fully understand participants’ experiences. Immediately following the interviews, I hand-wrote my own thoughts and impressions of the participants, which were not present in the transcriptions. This also aided in seeing my own bias versus the participants’ actual words. Transcriptions of the interviews were
completed by the same assistant in the Pre-Field stage. All recordings and transcriptions were saved in a folder in my personal email.

**Interview questions.** Questions focused on the Post-Field Debriefing timeframe of six to eight weeks after participants’ return, and were based on CQ research. The purpose was to examine the debriefing period as a whole, with the intent of uncovering how the team, team leaders, and others played a role in CQ development during this time. Priest (2006) wrote that, “for positive changes to last, they must be reinforced by a set of practices, relationships, and virtues taught in the home setting” (p. 444). Similar to the cross-cultural setting, a time of reflection should also be present in the post-field period, as expats learn best from reflective action, or a process of making decisions based on insights gained from contemplation (Shim & Paprock, 2002). Because CQ development is a process, the length of the training process must be considered (MacNab, 2012), including the Post-Field Debriefing period and how it has played a role in the continued CQ development of participants. Questions four, five, and seven specifically focused on CQ, while others considered the debriefing period as a whole and sought to allow the participant to speak openly about what had and had not aided in re-entry, processing, and subsequently, the desire and ability to continue with cross-cultural interactions.

**Data Analysis**

Data analysis occurred in three separate stages, mirroring the data collection procedures. Each stage employed pattern matching, as propositional constructs were used to examine and link the data during the different analysis stages. Yin (2012) noted that pattern matching is one of the most effective analysis techniques for explanatory case studies. The constructs were drawn from literature on the STM trip process and CQ development, with different constructs used in each stage of the STM trip process. These constructs are detailed in the proceeding sections.
Pattern matching aided in identifying themes in each stage of the STM trip process, both within each case and across cases. Time-series analysis was also used, so that responses related to changes over time could be recorded and further explored to substantiate the findings (Yin, 2012). Rival explanations (Appendix J) were also noted during the within-case and across-case analyses to help strengthen the validity of the study. Table Two (Appendix K) illustrates how data collection and data analysis were employed throughout the study.

Each stage of data collection and analysis included written (On-Field Experience journals) and transcribed (Pre-Field Training and Post-Field Debriefing interviews) sources. I began with the Africa case in each stage of data analysis. I read each piece of narrative data through twice before I began coding. This allowed me to hear the participant’s experience and gain a sense of his voice. On the third reading, I circled key phrases and underlined sentences that communicated CQ development. I then used the initials assigned to each propositional construct to code these phrases and sentences, in addition to the corresponding CQ dimension, writing them in the margins. If a propositional construct did not apply, I wrote “rival” in the margin. On the fourth read-through, I moved the propositional constructs, key phrases, and sentences to the individual analysis table (i.e. Appendix L), and the rival themes to the individual rival explanations table (i.e. Appendix M). At that time, I created rival explanations themes. Once each participant’s narrative data source was analyzed, I used a within-case analysis table (i.e. Appendix N) to group all the findings, writing each participant’s name where a theme and related CQ dimension was reported. This helped me to see, overall, who from the team reported certain themes and related CQ dimensions. Once each within-case analysis table was completed, I used a cross-case synthesis table (Appendix S) to group all findings from all cases together for that stage of data collection.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Case 1</th>
<th>Case 2</th>
<th>Case 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Field Training</td>
<td>CQS [\text{Scores for each dimension are given to further add to the qualitative findings}]</td>
<td>CQS [\text{Scores for each dimension are given to further add to the qualitative findings}]</td>
<td>CQS [\text{Scores for each dimension are given to further add to the qualitative findings}]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Individual Interviews</strong> [Within-case analysis]</td>
<td><strong>Individual Interviews</strong> [Within-case analysis]</td>
<td><strong>Individual Interviews</strong> [Within-case analysis]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Cross-case synthesis including CQ scores and interviews</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cross-case synthesis including CQ scores and interviews</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cross-case synthesis including CQ scores and interviews</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Field Experience</td>
<td><strong>On-field journaling</strong> [Within-case analysis]</td>
<td><strong>On-field journaling</strong> [Within-case analysis]</td>
<td><strong>On-field journaling</strong> [Within-case analysis]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Cross-case synthesis</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cross-case synthesis</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cross-case synthesis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Field Debriefing</td>
<td><strong>Individual Interviews</strong> [Within-case analysis]</td>
<td><strong>Individual Interviews</strong> [Within-case analysis]</td>
<td><strong>Individual Interviews</strong> [Within-case analysis]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Post-Field CQS</strong> [\text{Scores for each dimension are given to further add to the qualitative findings}]</td>
<td><strong>Post-Field CQS</strong> [\text{Scores for each dimension are given to further add to the qualitative findings}]</td>
<td><strong>Post-Field CQS</strong> [\text{Scores for each dimension are given to further add to the qualitative findings}]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Cross-case synthesis including interviews and CQ scores</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cross-case synthesis including interviews and CQ scores</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cross-case synthesis including interviews and CQ scores</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 1.* Data analysis stages
**Pre-Field Training**

The Pre-Field Training stage of the STM process included the completion of the CQS prior to the beginning of Pre-Field Training, and individual interviews were conducted after the completion of Pre-Field Training, but prior to the team’s departure. Pattern matching was used to analyze the interviews in this stage to establish any common themes related to the propositional constructs. The constructs used during the Pre-Field Training data analysis utilized initials during coding. The constructs were (a) experiential learning (EL), (b) length of training (LT), (c) time of reflection (TR), and (d) team member/team leader influence (TM). During this stage, participant portraits were also created from the demographic survey to provide the reader with a more holistic view of the participants and their experiences.

**Participant portraits.** In order to provide a clear picture of each participant, demographic information such as age, gender, major, and year in school, along with international travel experience and other descriptive questions about the participants’ desires and motives in joining their respective teams, were collected through the demographic survey and during the Pre-Field interviews. This information was used to write short narratives about each participant.

**Cultural Intelligence Scale.** Each participant completed a Pre-Field CQS (Appendix F), which was scored by the researcher. Each participant’s scores are included in Chapter Four Findings. During the individual interviews, I asked for further clarification of the assessment’s results to help create a clearer picture of the participants’ experience in cross-cultural situations. This aided in the participant portraits and further triangulating the data of CQ development with the interviews.

**Interviews.** After transcription of each individual interview, interviews were read twice before coding commenced. On the second read, initial thoughts and comments were written in
the margins. During the third read, the propositional constructs were used and the corresponding initials were written into the margins where that construct could be seen, along with the CQ dimension(s) communicated. After coding was finished, specific quotes and/or phrases were placed into construct tables. Each participant had an Individual Pre-Field Interview Analysis Table (Appendix L) for the Pre-Field Training stage. Each of the propositional constructs was given its own column, with the rows denoting the CQ dimension it impacted. A separate Individual Rival Explanations Analysis Table (Appendix M) was kept for each participant. Because participants sometimes noted more than one CQ dimension as being impacted, or even different propositional constructs in one statement, some statements appear in more than one space on the construct table.

A Pre-Field Within-Case Analysis Table (Appendix N) served for the within-case analysis, in which each propositional construct had its own column, as well as rival column. Each participant was placed in his or her own row, and the corresponding CQ dimensions were written into the appropriate space on the table. For the rival themes, the specific themes were written into the table, along with the related CQ dimension. The bottom row was used to record the overall team findings for each construct and the related CQ dimensions. This aided in the cross-case synthesis.

**On-Field Experience**

The On-Field Experience was the second stage in the STM trip process. Because participants were on the field during this time, journaling exercises were used to collect data. Students were asked to complete specific journaling prompts at specific times during their on-field time. Pattern matching was used to identify common themes and link data during the analysis process, and each construct given initials to be used during coding. The propositional
constructs used during this stage were: (a) orientation to the culture (OC), (b) engagement with locals (EL), (c) field worker influence (FW), (d) team member/team leader influence (TM), and (e) time of reflection (TR). These constructs were drawn from the literature on STM trip process and cross-cultural interactions, as well as quantitative results of the impact of on-field time on CQ development. Each individual journal was read through twice, with initial thoughts and comments recorded in the margins on the second read. On the third read, the entries were coded for the five constructs, along with any rival themes and the corresponding CQ dimensions. A column for time-series analysis was also included to note any changes over the course of the on-field time (Yin, 2012). The Individual Rival Explanations Analysis Table (Appendix M) was also used to note any themes outside of the established constructs.

The within-case analysis mirrored that of the Pre-Field data analysis. After completing each participant’s Individual On-Field Journal Analysis Table (Appendix O), an On-Field Within-Case Analysis Table (Appendix P) synthesized the data, which included a column for changes over time.

**Post-Field Debriefing**

In the Post-Field Debriefing stage, individual interviews were conducted six to eight weeks after the participants’ return, in addition to a post-field CQS. The questions focused on the debriefing period, both as a group and individually, and the participants’ thoughts towards possible changes in CQ scores.

**Cultural Intelligence Scale.** Each participant completed a post-field CQS (Appendix F) within six to eight weeks after returning, which was scored by the researcher. Each participant’s scores are included in Chapter 4 Findings.
Interviews. For this stage, the propositional constructs were drawn from the literature on debriefing and given initials for coding purposes. The constructs were (a) discussion of experiences (DE), (b) time for contemplation (TC), and (c) application to participant’s life (AP). Once the interviews were transcribed, pattern matching took place using the established constructs. Each interview transcript was read through twice, with initial thoughts and comments written into the margins on the second read-through. On the third read, coding was completed using the propositional construct initials. Corresponding statements and/or phrases were placed into each participant’s Individual Post-Field Interview Analysis Table (Appendix Q), along with an additional Individual Rival Explanations Analysis Table (Appendix M). Time-series analysis also took place in this stage of data analysis, as the participants may have experienced a change in CQ development over that initial return period (Yin, 2012). A column was included that recorded any responses in the interview that indicated themes related to changes over time. Within-case analysis mirrored the Pre-Field Training and On-Field Experience analyses, utilizing a Post-Field Within-Case Analysis Table (Appendix R).

Cross-Case Synthesis

The final type of analysis utilized in this study was that of cross-case synthesis. Yin (2012) discussed the importance of cross-case synthesis in a collective case study where replication logic was applied to the study and “addresse[d] whether findings from a set of multiple experiments…support any broader pattern of conclusions” (p. 17). Since theoretical propositions were used to code and categorize the data in all three stages of data collection, synthesizing the findings across cases proved somewhat simple. Each case’s overall team findings from its Within-Case Construct Table were transferred to an Across-Case Analysis Table (Appendix S), including applicable time-series analyses and rival explanations for further
identification of themes across cases; this also established theoretical replication and further substantiated the findings (Yin, 2012). Overall findings from each stage are discussed in Chapter Four.

**Trustworthiness**

Trustworthiness in a research study includes credibility, dependability, transferability, and confirmability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Addressing these areas ensured that the subjective nature of qualitative research was not an issue for the researcher.

In this study, credibility was achieved through the triangulation of data, which is “an effort to assure that the right information and interpretations have been obtained” (Stake, 2006, p. 35). Collecting data through interviews, journaling, and the CQS provided a rich data pool from which to draw findings and different contexts in which the participants’ experiences could be examined. Also, running a pilot test to check data collection methods, implementing an expert review of findings, and using a well-known data analysis process developed by Yin (2012) increased credibility.

Dependability was addressed in this study through my lack of influence with the participants and the data collection procedures. I chose short-term teams and participants with which I had no direct contact. I neither coordinated, nor lead, any of these teams, which helped to ensure that there was no undue influence on the participants. However, my familiarity with short-term mission trip teams and the process they undergo aided in developing data collection procedures that truly examined the process. The data collection procedures and checks in place also aided in dependability. Utilizing both paper and digital copies of all data collection methods in the form of an audit trail ensured dependability.
Finally, confirmability and transferability were addressed through the data collection and analysis procedures outlined, so that the study could be replicated by another researcher. The variety of data collection methods from a number of participants within each case allowed for a comprehensive picture of the setting for each case, as well as the experiences of each participant within that setting at various times in the process. The richness of data that was collected over a considerable span of time further added to, and saturated, the findings of this study.

Selecting three cases that represented a variety of locations and involved a variety of ministry focuses aided in the transferability of findings; sampling one-third to one-half of the teams provided a greater pool of data as well.

**Ethical Considerations**

Several protocols were put in place to ensure the ethics of this study. First and foremost, I secured approval from both the directors of the Center for Global Exchange and the IRB before conducting any data collection. To ensure no undue influence over participants, I chose teams and participants with which I had no direct contact. Participants were provided with an explanation of the study, including any potential risks, and were given the option to remove themselves from the study at any time. They were assured confidentiality in the study, and pseudonyms were used for both participants and setting names. If any participant wished to remove himself or herself from the study at any time, any audio recordings or transcriptions collected during his or her time in the study were destroyed. All audio recordings and transcripts will be kept on a password-protected email account and destroyed after three years.
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

Overview

This study sought to examine how Cultural Intelligence is developed through the short-term mission trip. Three short-term mission trip teams (Africa, Europe, and Asia) traveling at the same time were used as individual cases, with each team’s own participants serving as embedded cases. Data was collected from the participants across three stages of the trip process: (a) Pre-Field Training, (b) On-Field Experience, and (c) Post-Field Debriefing. Analysis was completed at the individual embedded case level, the individual team case level, and then across all three team cases. This cross-case analysis allowed for the comparison of emergent themes.

This chapter includes portraits of the cases and their individual participants, followed by findings from each stage of data collection, including major themes and CQ dimensions. The research questions are answered and a summary of findings presented at the end.

Cases and Participants

Chapter Three included demographic data on all participations for this study. Included in this chapter are case and participant portraits that further delve into each case’s context, and each participant’s previous cross-cultural experiences and motivations for joining the respective team. This detail helps to paint a more complete picture of the context within which each participant found himself or herself, and provides factors that may also have contributed to CQ development during the short-term mission (STM) trip process. I assigned pseudonyms to all participants and assigned continent names to each team, as opposed to the specific country names.

All three teams were sent as part of the Department for Global Exchange’s STM trip program at Lynwell University. This STM trip program had been operating out of the university for over 20 years, although the number of teams sent out greatly increased over the past few
years. During the year of this study, and the few that preceded it, the program sent an average of 25 STM trip teams, traveling during the university’s winter break, spring break, or summer break. Teams consisted of eight to 20 students, with two full-time university employees serving as team leaders. All students were required to complete an online application that contained demographic information, narratives concerning their motivation for joining a team, as well as their personal faith journey, and were required to sign a Doctrinal Statement, Acknowledgement of Risk, Financial Agreement, and program-specific policies and expectations forms. Personal and pastoral references were requested of all applicants, as well as a report of the student’s conduct standing within the university from the Office of Student Conduct. Students were then interviewed in person by DGE staff. Students were required to complete four training sessions (Appendix T) prior to their departure, including (a) Cultural Intelligence, (b) The Gospel and Personal Testimony, (c) Safety and Security, and (d) Support Development. The team leaders were also required to attend these four trainings, in addition to monthly meetings with their trip’s coordinator, and once-a-semester team leader training. Teams typically met once or twice a month in order to build unity, prepare for ministry-specific tasks while on the field, learn culture-specific information, and develop spiritually as a team.

The purpose of this STM trip program was to allow students the opportunity to engage with a variety of cultures, while transforming their perspective of God’s presence and purpose in the world and in their own lives. The trainings provided students with the skills to engage cross-culturally, while also preparing them to share their faith in a cross-cultural setting. Ultimately, the program sought to see a greater love, respect, and desire to engage develop in the students through working with those on the field in their everyday service to a local culture.
Africa

A team has been sent to this same location in West Africa for the past two years. The team participated in medical missions work, such as working at a local pharmacy and serving in a local clinic. The team stayed in locals’ homes, ate local food, attended village church services, shopped at the local market, and immersed themselves daily in the host culture.

The Africa team consisted of two leaders, one male and one female, each of whom were staff members of the university. Each team leader had led at least one short-term mission trip in the past for this specific department within the university. The male team leader is originally from West Africa, and so served as a semi-cultural expert for pre-trip training. The female team leader studied pre-med sciences at the undergraduate level, and so had a deep interest in the medical focus of this trip. The team leaders’ personal interest in both the location and the focus of the trip allowed them to be more invested in the team and the trip from the beginning. Also, the team leaders’ care and concern for the team members is illustrated in the findings, when team member and/or team leader influence was reported.

Student team members were made up of all undergraduate students, five males and seven females. As the focus of this trip was medical missions, nursing majors were considered first for this trip, especially in the case of male participants, so that a gender balance could somewhat be achieved on the team. This team proved to be one of the strongest in unity that I had seen during my time working in this department. The degree to which they bonded beforehand grew while on the field and was maintained once they returned; this loyalty to one another and the cause was evident in their interviews and journals. All student team members were given the opportunity to participate in this study.
**Matt.** Matt is a Caucasian male who was a history major who also served in the university ROTC program. He was a graduating senior during this study, the only graduating senior on the team. Matt never traveled to anywhere but Canada for two one-day trips, but said that God guided him to this team and that he was excited to experience a completely different culture than his own, to understand long-term missions better by experiencing the missions field first-hand and to grow his faith. Matt spoke of God’s hand in his joining this team:

They [office staff] were really excited because apparently on the day before they were praying for more guys specifically and she [student worker] was really excited so it was really cool to hear that from my end because I could see God’s work from their end.

**Mitch.** Mitch is a Caucasian male who was a freshman and a nursing major. Mitch planned to pursue a medical missions career in the Middle East. Having grown up in Brazil for 14 years as a child of missionaries, Mitch interacted with Portuguese-speaking Africans in Brazil but wanted to experience another culture. Mitch said, “My plan was never to just stay in one country it was to travel the world so I think the Lord just wired me like that and that hunger for cultures has just been growing and growing.”

**Peter.** Peter is a Caucasian male who was a junior and a religion major. Peter planned to serve as a long-term missionary or start a non-profit or outreach ministry. Peter had previously traveled to Poland and Ireland for two weeks each, both in a ministry context. Peter said that God had placed this specific country on his mind for the past two years: “I have always, for a long time, had an interest in [African country]. I used to participate in Invisible Children, and one of my friends, her husband is actually from [African country].” Peter hoped to learn about a new culture and be a vessel through which God could work.
**Haley.** Haley is a Caucasian female who was a junior and a nursing major. Haley planned to have a career in pediatric nursing or medical missions. She saw this specific trip as an opportunity to use her future profession as a ministry. Haley said:

I wanted to experience the nursing realm overseas and not just here. With what I am learning in class, I feel like it will be a great way to get experiences and use my nursing experiences to honor God and help people there.

Haley had previously traveled to France for six days on a high school trip, and to India for six days as part of a former university-sponsored mission trip. Haley hoped to gain relationships with those in Africa through the practice of medicine, get to know her teammates more, and see nursing as an avenue through which God can speak to people.

**Lori.** Lori is a Caucasian female who was a freshman and nursing major. Lori planned to have a career in medical missions. Lori said that she had been inspired by past mission trip teams, this specific team in particular, and had seen God specifically lead her to this trip. Lori said, “I looked at the [African country] booth, talked to them and I was like, I really want to do this. . .He just showed his faithfulness through this whole journey.” Lori had previously traveled to Honduras and Guatemala in a missions context for one week each. She hoped to expand herself through this trip, to give herself completely to the trip, and to share the love and joy she had been blessed with through service in Africa.

**Sarah.** Sarah is a Caucasian female who was a freshman and a nursing major. Sarah was considering a career in medical missions. She had previously been on seven mission trips to Mexico, each for three to five days’ time. Sarah said she had had a pressing desire on her for the past year and a half to participate in missions work in Africa. She said:
A year or two ago, I felt God really implanting in my heart to go on a missions trip farther than I have ever gone before. . .I really felt that God wanted me to specifically go to Africa to do something big.

Sarah saw this trip as a life-changing experience, as she would be able to immerse herself in a new culture, honor God through participating in medical missions, and build relationships with her teammates and the people in Africa.

Asia

Lynwell sent a team to this specific Southeast Asian location twice previously. The team worked among local university students, many of whom were international students. Daily activities ranged from English conversation clubs, athletic games, and exploring the local community. The team stayed in local accommodations, ate local cuisine, and traveled on public transport. The guide for the entire time was an American expat who has lived in the country for over a decade and has become well-known in the community for his work with university students.

The team leaders for this trip have changed each year. For this specific trip, both team leaders, a male and a female, were employees of the university and worked with college-aged students daily. The female team leader specifically worked in the university’s student leadership department but had not led a team until this year. The male team leader led a team the previous year.

The Asia team recruited 10 students, four males and six females. Because the ministry focus of this team was varied, no specific academic major or experience was required. All students were invited to participate in this study, but only four agreed to participate in the study, and one dropped out during the Pre-Trip Training stage.
David. David is an African-American male who was a sophomore and an exercise science and coaching major. David planned to use exercise science in a global context and as a ministry tool. He expressed his hopes for this experience, “. . . So instead of judging people, kind of understanding where they come from. Understand things behind the scenes like that.” He also communicated that this trip would be an opportunity to experience other cultures, helping to inform his future career. David said that his faith in believing that the Great Commission should be carried out was the basis for joining this team. David has no prior international travel experience.

Felicia. Felicia is a Caucasian female who was a senior and a worship music major. She had a desire to participate in missions-type work for a while. Felicia said, “Going globally on missions trips is something that the Lord put in my heart in high school, so this is just actually a time in which it’s become a reality for me.” She felt God leading her to be a part of this team. Felicia expected to learn more about student ministry, how to handle cross-cultural situations, and how to better invest in the future of global missions. She credited her faith as the most important factor in joining this team and in sustaining her during her time in Asia, as she anticipated dealing with culture shock and team dynamics. Felicia saw group unity amongst her team as a significant factor in her motivation, as she looked to her teammates for support and encouragement. Her future in worship music was also a guiding factor in her confidence to interact with young people in Asia, especially college students. She expected this trip would provide her with more practical training. Felicia had previously traveled to Canada for two days for leisure, and to Italy and Austria for a combined two weeks to see friends and family.

Megan. Megan is a Caucasian female who was a junior and a psychology major with a studio arts minor. She planned to go on to earn her Masters in Counseling after graduation.
Megan’s future career goal is to work with adolescent psychiatry patients. Megan said, “I just really have a heart for people and like helping and showing people God’s love. Basically, as 2 Corinthians says, comforting others in their troubles as God is comforting us in ours.” Megan expressed that God led her to join a team and she chose the one with the fewest students. She expected to serve others through God’s love while in Asia, and to connect with similar people as they worked with college students. Megan had previously traveled to Mexico for nine days on a service-based mission trip.

**Penny.** Penny is a Caucasian female who was a freshman and a computer science major. She hoped to pursue a career in cyber security. Penny is a child of missionaries; her family served in Peru. She had also been to other South American countries for visits. Penny joined this team because they needed more members and because she felt God was calling her to it. She enjoys learning new languages and interacting with other cultures. Penny left the study prior to the Pre-Field Training interview.

**Europe**

The Europe team is another short-term mission trip that has traveled annually from the university, specifically for the previous four years. The trip traveled to a western European country and worked amongst northern African immigrants in a community center setting. The team members taught English, helped with a kids’ club, participated in a women’s Bible study, and participated in various other activities overseen by the community center. The team stayed in either a local hotel or hostel and ate a variety of both north-African and local cuisine. They shopped at grocery stores for self-prepared meals. Most of this trip was spent interacting with north-African immigrants, as opposed to the majority host culture. However, students were both briefed in the local western European culture as well as the north-African culture.
In years past, this trip has been led by at least one of the same leaders each year. This year, however, that team leader was unable to lead, and so two new team leaders were assigned, one male and one female. Each team leader was a university staff member. The female team leader had led at least one previous trip and also served in the university student leadership office. The male team leader had not led a team before, but worked with students regularly in his university job. While neither team leader had experience with this particular country, the department appointed them because of their report with university students.

The Europe team recruited 11 students total, two males and nine females, all of whom came from a variety of academic backgrounds. Because the ministry focus of the trip was English-as-a-second-language, there was no specific experience or academic major required of the students. All student team members were invited to participate in this study, and four agreed.

**Caleb.** Caleb is a Caucasian male who was a junior and a theology major. Caleb hoped to work in the counseling field or potentially in missions after graduation. He credited his faith with giving him the desire to participate on this team, and viewed serving overseas in a mission-related context as both a privilege and command. Caleb said, “I definitely have a heart to go, definitely want ministry to be a part of my life.” He believed the work the team would be doing to be beneficial to those in need and appropriate for a one-week trip. He expected to build close relationships with his teammates, to be challenged physically, emotionally, and spiritually, to serve as the hands and feet of the church, and to have his view of the world challenged after the team’s return, which would enable him to engage people back in his home culture in new ways. Caleb had previously traveled to Guatemala for one week in a service-based missions context.

**Britt.** Britt is a Hispanic female who was a freshman and interdisciplinary studies major. Britt aspired to use the arts, specifically dance, in a global way. She would like to have a
Christian-based dance ministry that brings together different cultures. Britt said, “I want to be able to affect the world and I know that media would be the most effective way to do that because we are connected globally because of it.” Britt enjoys traveling abroad, having been to Panama for three weeks on a traditional service-based mission trip, to Peru for one month for both missions and leisure, to the Dominican Republic six times for three weeks to one month for leisure, and to Haiti for 10 days in a service-based mission capacity. However, Britt had never traveled to Europe and saw this trip as the perfect opportunity. Being fluent in the local majority language, Britt saw this trip as ideal because she could use her knowledge of the language to better connect with the locals. She expected that through this trip, her team would be strong and united, ready to say “yes” to whatever opportunities came their way for sharing their faith in action and word. Britt credited her faith in God and his love for her with giving her the courage to apply for this trip despite financial limitations. She saw the command to share her faith with others as a driving force behind her participation on this team. Britt shared, “It wasn’t just about what I wanted to do; it was just about God and how he wanted to work in this.”

**Nora.** Nora is a Caucasian female who was a junior and a nursing major. Nora plans to work overseas in her career. At the time of this study, Nora attended a church for those from the same majority language of the western European country. That, in addition to her love of the country’s majority culture, motivated her to join this trip. Nora said:

I have always loved the [European] culture and I have always loved [European country]. I think that Europe is probably one of the least places that they think of when they think of missions. Everyone is drawn to Central America, South America, and those Hispanic countries.
Nora’s faith compels her to spread God’s love to others, which she sees as an important factor in why she wanted to participate. Nora had previously traveled to Mexico for one week in a missions capacity, and to Nicaragua for two months on an academic internship.

**Tori.** Tori is a Caucasian female who was a junior and a health promotions major. Tori planned to work as a dietician either domestically or abroad. She already had a heart for North Africans before going on this trip, which led to her motivation for signing up. Tori said, “I wasn’t allowed to go to the Middle East, my parents were not comfortable with that. So God opened the door with the [European country] trip, which was wonderful. So I wanted to specifically work with that people group; that is why I chose [European country].” As someone who was considering overseas work, Tori looked to have this interest confirmed through interactions with the people and the culture during this trip. She also hoped to form strong bonds with her teammates, be unified in purpose with her team, make an impact on the people through her faith while there, and then apply what she learned to her everyday life back in her home country. Tori had previously traveled abroad to Italy and Greece on an academic trip for a combined 10 days, and to Haiti for 10 days on a traditional service-based mission trip.

**Findings**

In looking at the data collected throughout the STM trip process, major themes emerged within each case that were found across a majority of the participants for that case. Those major themes were then compared with each of the other cases. Major themes found across all cases are discussed below, but also include themes that were found for an entire case but not necessarily across all cases. Within each major theme, sub-themes are presented to explain how that overarching theme impacted CQ development and individual CQ dimensions.
In considering statements made by participants during data analysis, some statements could have related to more than one CQ dimension. Because CQ is an interconnected concept, each of the four dimensions all affect each other, even though they are separate. For example, I may learn that bowing is a customary greeting in Japanese culture, which affects my strategy for how to interact with Japanese individuals, and ultimately my behavior, as I enact bowing when meeting someone for the first time. Knowing and carrying out this strategy and behavior effectively raises my confidence to interact in the future. Participants may have alluded to having developed more than one CQ dimension in their interviews and journaling, thus, it was catalogued as such in the data analyses matrices.

While considering how each theme impacted CQ development, and identifying which CQ dimensions in particular were impacted, I referred back to the definitions of each dimension. This helped in identifying and differentiating between dimensions, especially when participant reports were vague, jumbled, or hard to decipher. Using the CQ dimension definitions as a foundation, I looked for the following key phrases and words when coding:

1. Metacognitive (META) – “planning,” “strategy,” “aware,” “think about,” references to how they planned to interact, how they planned to assess their interactions, and how they would improve their strategy
2. Cognitive (COG) – “I know what they ______ (do, like, eat),” “I know how they ______ (act, speak),” “learn about,” references to learning or knowing about both culture-specific and culture-general knowledge
3. Motivational (MOT) – “excited,” “confident,” “enjoy,” “I know I can _____ (speak, interact, behave, do), references to looking forward to interacting, how interactions affected their confidence and desire
4. Behavioral (BEH) – “act,” “speak,” “interact,” references to behaviors

**Pre-Field Training**

As stated in Chapter Three, the propositional constructs used in the Pre-Field Training data analysis were (a) experiential learning, (b) length of training, (c) time of reflection, and (d) team member/team leader influence. Sub-themes within each major theme provide a richer explanation for how and why those themes in particular influenced CQ development. Other rival explanations were identified and included below if a majority of participants and cases reported them as influencing the development of CQ. Rival explanations reported were (a) Christian faith, (b) personality, and (c) previous cross-cultural experiences. Individual CQ dimensions were included if a majority of participants indicated their development.

Fourteen participants completed the CQ T1 Self-Assessment during the Pre-Field Training stage. These scores (1 – lowest; 7 – highest) provided quantitative measurements of CQ prior to cultural immersion. Comparing the extent of participants’ previous international experience against their T1 scores (Table 3), and taking into account their feedback concerning anxieties, excitement, confidence, and strategy to interact once in country, allows the researcher to better understand why T1 scores may have been reported as they were. For those who had had prior international travel experience, scores hovered in the 4.0-6.0 range. In speaking with the participants, a common consensus was that although previous international exposure was helpful in developing their CQ at the current score, the culture they would experience would require different cultural knowledge than that which they were familiar. The participants indicated that they assessed themselves both confidently because of prior experience, but also reserved, as they expected to learn and grow more in this new cultural context. The table below identifies the
change in scores from the Pre-Field Training T1 to the Post-Field Debriefing T. Scores are given alongside participant comments.

To be reported as a major theme, it had to have been found in two of the three Asia team participants (66%), in at least three of the four Europe team participants (75%), and in at least four of the six Africa team participants (66%) (Table 4). This allowed for the reporting of themes across a majority of participants. In regards to CQ dimensions most impacted, findings were reported in accordance with the same percentages. In some instances, a major theme, or CQ dimension, was found within one or two cases, but not across all three. All participant quotes included in the findings below come from the Pre-Field Training interviews.
### Table 2

**Summary of Participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>International Travel</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Two International Day Trips to Canada</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>All stages</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Mitch</td>
<td>Lived outside of home country for 14 years</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>All stages</td>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Two two-week trips to Europe</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>All stages</td>
<td>Jr</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Haley</td>
<td>Two one-week trips to Europe and south Asia</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>All stages</td>
<td>Jr</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Lori</td>
<td>Two one-week trips to central America</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>All stages</td>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Seven three to five day trips to Mexico</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>All stages</td>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>No international travel exposure</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>All stages</td>
<td>So</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Felicia</td>
<td>Two-day trip to Canada; Two-week trip to western Europe</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>All stages</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Megan</td>
<td>Nine-day trip to central America</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>All stages</td>
<td>Jr</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Penny</td>
<td>Missionary kid from Peru; short vacations to central and South America</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Only demographic survey &amp; CQ T1</td>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Caleb</td>
<td>One week missions trip to Central America</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>Pre-Field &amp; On Field</td>
<td>Jr</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

Summary of Pre-Field Training Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Experiential Learning</th>
<th>Length of Training</th>
<th>Time of Reflection</th>
<th>Team Member/Team Leader Influence</th>
<th>Religious Faith</th>
<th>Personality</th>
<th>Past Experiences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Mitch</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Haley</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Lori</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Felicia</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Megan</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Caleb</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Britt</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Nora</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Tori</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Experiential learning.** All participants from the Asia and Europe teams and five of the six participants from the Africa team reported experiential learning as affecting CQ development. For this theme, I looked for indications of cultural learning activities, informational sessions, and other immersive opportunities that prepared the participants for their field time. Interviews with the participants revealed that both the inclusion and exclusion of experiential learning activities from the Pre-Field Training affected cultural preparation. Thus, the sub-theme of Cultural Learning is included below. As is the case with most STM trips, the opportunity to share one’s faith is prevalent so training and preparation in how to contextualize the gospel to the local culture and people is imperative.

Participants also spoke in the future tense, explaining that the anticipated field time would allow for truly immersive experiential learning. Those first-hand encounters would increase their knowledge and confidence in interacting with the culture, but was also affecting their confidence during the Pre-Field Training. This gave way to the sub-theme of Anticipated On-Field Time.

**Cultural learning.** All participants from the Asia and Europe teams and four of the five participants who reported experiential learning as a theme on the Africa team communicated that hands-on, intentional, and immersive experiences increased their knowledge of the culture, or Cognitive CQ. All teams averaged between a 3.0 and 3.5 for Cognitive CQ, indicating an awareness of limited culture-specific and culture-general knowledge. Learning about the similarities and differences of cultures as well as culture-specific information was considered the most beneficial outcome of experiential learning.

Peter, of the Africa team, increased his Cognitive CQ from a 2.17 to 3.00. He noted the benefit this cultural training provided:
They [team leaders] showed us slides of certain things we may see, and the living conditions that they are a lot different than they are here. Being used to them and talking ahead of time still really won’t prepare us much, but it gives us more of an idea so we are not completely thrown by it.

In addition, Britt, of the Europe team, stated that the culture-specific training in Islam significantly prepared her, as it allowed her to understand how and why the people within that culture function as they do. This, her On-Field Experience, and Post-Field Debriefing, all contributed to her almost three-point jump in Cognitive CQ from 3.83 to 6.17:

Another thing I didn’t realize was just how to behave in the culture. We had an Islam seminar and that helped me so much to understand the culture, understand the people. . . how you interact with one another [within the team itself]. . .certain things like that about the training helped me to prepare for this and inspired me in a way that, if those things weren’t there, I don’t think I would feel as confident or ready.

Tori, Britt’s teammate, praised the Islam culture-specific training, which enabled her to compare and contrast American-based interactions with what they could expect during the On-Field Experience, and provided her with a framework from which she could interact. This further supports her rise in Cognitive CQ by the end of the STM trip process. Tori went from 2.17 to 3.83, commenting on the benefit of the culture-specific training:

The Islam seminar was the best thing we did just because our interaction with Muslims here is very different from the interaction we will have over there. So, it kind of gave us an idea of what we will be working with, how we should view them. . .it’s just getting a bigger understanding.
Megan, of the Asia team, grew in her Cognitive CQ from 3.17 to 4.33. She attributed it partially to the workshops provided during Pre-Field Training:

In the workshops and stuff, we just kind of talked about how the culture is different in understanding them. So I think that is something that kind of made me more mindful, like it was definitely at the forefront of ‘hey, this is important.’

Sarah, of the Africa team, assessed her Cognitive CQ almost three points higher with a score of at 5.00 by the six-to-eight week mark after her trip’s return. She spoke to the role the training in the Pre-Field stage played in her growth, claiming that it not only gave her information, but also encouraged her to implement that new knowledge then, as opposed to waiting until the On-Field Experience, “. . . talking through what we are learning and putting it into practice now, thinking through like cultural things, thinking through like testimonies and the gospel itself and just how to present it in a way that is culturally global.” Talking through cultural differences and how to communicate them in light of one’s spiritual experiences, practicing being culturally minded, and then reflecting on all she had learned helped Sarah to prepare for her field time.

**Anticipated on-field time.** During the Pre-Field training interviews, all of the Asia team expressed that the anticipation of being able to experience the Asian culture first-hand and learn from it within that experiential context would help to improve their confidence to interact, or Motivational CQ.

Megan, whose Motivational CQ increased from 6.00 to 6.40 by the end of the study, commented that she looked to the on-field time itself to provide for further confidence to interact:
I am not confident in my ability to be able to do it right now, but that I will be able to kind of adjust to the culture once I get there. . .I think that after the initial little while I think it will be easier and I will get more comfortable on that.

Felicia, whose Motivational CQ also increased from 6.80 to 6.90, expressed that her motivation to interact was enhanced by being in the culture. She said, “I just love getting immersed in that, getting to know how they function and different things.” David also spoke of how his presence in the culture, experiencing it and learning from it, would produce the motivation to engage. David’s Motivational CQ also increased from 6.00 to 6.40. David said, “I’m excited to learn new things and to not be small minded. Just to see what they do differently than us and see how it can help us improve on the way we think about them. . .”

**Team member and/or team leader influence.** All 13 participants reported that both their team members and their team leaders influenced their development of CQ. Having a group of people who are united in a common goal, who are preparing together, with similar anxieties, excitement, and focus, impacted the desire and confidence to interact cross-culturally. The unifying bond of a team propelled the participants as they looked to their field time. Also, the focus of the team meetings impacted CQ development and Cognitive CQ in particular, as participants felt that they were both beneficial in regards to cultural learning, but were not always focused enough on cultural learning, thus inhibiting their on-field preparation. The sub-themes of Focus of Team Meetings and Team as a Support System are discussed below in relation to their direct influence on CQ development.

**Focus of team meetings.** Two of the three Asia team participants noted that the team meeting times impacted Cognitive CQ and Motivational CQ both positively and negatively. The sharing of cultural experiences enhanced cultural general knowledge, but the lack of the culture-
specific training and teaching adversely affected Cognitive CQ, as participants would then be looking to the on-field time to help inform their culture-specific knowledge.

Megan, whose Cognitive CQ increased by 1.16 and Motivational CQ increased by .40, commented that although the Pre-Field Training time was beneficial, it could have provided more culture-specific training. She had to depend on the On-Field Experience for the needed cultural learning. Megan stated,

I loved getting to know the team, I think that was great and it’s going to really help us have a strong group when we go in, but I think it would have been also beneficial to us to know the Malaysian culture, some of the language, where things are, talk about this in those meetings because we didn’t really focus on that very much.

Felicia, whose Cognitive CQ increased by .67 and Motivational CQ increased by .10 also noted the lack of culture-specific training. While she spoke of the immersion during the On-Field Experience, perhaps more culture-specific training during this stage would have produced an even larger increase in scores:

Just in discussion about things and their experiences on different cultures helped me realize how much I don’t know and how much I am learning from them as they are sharing. . . that’s something we haven’t really talked about [culture-specific knowledge] and so that’s something that makes me a little hesitant about going, and that’s something that brings down my confidence because I don’t know exactly the culture for people our age looks like.

**Team as a support system.** All participants from the Africa and Asia teams and three of the four Europe team participants identified their team members and team leaders as contributors to their Motivational CQ. As all teams already had averages in the high 5.0s to mid-6.0s for
Motivational CQ going into the Pre-Field Training, the addition of supportive team members and team leaders indicated a sustained, if not increased, level of Motivational CQ.

Tori, of the Europe team, remained at a 5.40 during the entire STM trip process, despite her comments on how the team had specifically contributed to her confidence:

I think it’s because the whole team is helping each other, or when she [team leader] goes over, or even [male team leader], about what we are doing and why we are doing it, the fact that we are discussing it, and going over the details, just makes you feel better that you are aware of what you are going into.

Tori’s teammate, Britt, who increased in her Motivational CQ score, spoke to how she had found a place within the team:

Talking a lot, just to each other, laughing, joking around, I don’t know, it just seems like that has been huge. Getting to know each other and doing a lot of talking. I don’t know, I feel really happy because I already feel loved within the team.

Britt discussed this belonging within the context of feeling motivated and confident to carry out the team’s tasks.

The Asia team also experienced the benefit of a strong team. Megan commented, “I loved getting to know the team. I think that was great and it’s going to really help us have a strong group when we go.” Felicia even commented on how the team bond would help to reduce culture shock:

I don’t see it being too much of a problem specifically having a team that is really tight. We know how to be vulnerable with each other and seeing each other through any struggles that we have we will handle it as a team.

David commented,
we actually told our testimonies yesterday for the first time. It was a pretty great moment because we also found out things about others that we never would have known and it also helped us to get closer and understand each other.

He also noted the team leaders’ positive effect. He said, “. . .they [the team leaders] have been a great mix. . .they are also really encouraging, they work well together, they make the trip exciting, they make it fun because they are both people with exciting characteristics.”

Members of the Africa team had the most to share about the impact of their fellow team members and leaders. Each member spoke to how the unity of the team and the almost family-like bond developed through intimate times of sharing and prayer, and encouraged, supported, and motivated their desire to interact in Africa. Although Lori indicated her team as a strong influence on her excitement to interact in Africa, she remained at the same pre and post Motivational CQ score. She spoke about “. . .having amazing people on my team, everyone and just who they are, and we are going to have such an impact. So that has been the biggest thing that has kind of kept me excited for it.” Mitch also indicated that the team bond was one that not only impacted his desire to interact cross-culturally, but inspired him to do so with his teammates as well. This was so impactful that he scored himself at the highest possible marks in the T2. Mitch explained,

. . .that retreat just sparked something in it and I know I have mentioned this a lot, but for friends I’ll do a lot, but I will do everything for my family and on that retreat the Lord just made me extend the circle around my heart and help them do good for them. I want to help them and so things that will hinder me, will also hinder the effectiveness of the team, and to be a good support for the team.
Haley, who remained at 7.00, referred to her team as a confidence booster, although her confidence was already scored as high as possible prior to the beginning of Pre-Field Training. Haley may have attributed the sustaining of this score to her team’s influence. She said, “It’s definitely a confidence booster to know that people are understanding with you and that you have more of a friendship too so that we can build off each other and help each other while we are there.” Developing relationships with team members, spending time together, and sharing both anxieties and excitement proved to be a common theme across the Africa team that greatly improved their CQ motivation.

**Christian faith.** All Africa and Asia participants and three of the four Europe team participants noted that their Christian faith was an influence on their CQ development during the Pre-Field Training. This theme emerged outside of the propositional constructs. In identifying this theme, I noted words and phrases connected to the Christian faith, such as, “God,” “Holy Spirit,” “Jesus,” “faith,” “prayer,” “He” when speaking about God, “the Lord,” “servant’s heart,” and “God’s will.” The two most prominent CQ dimensions where transformation was evidenced were those of Metacognition and Motivation. In asking participants to explain their CQ T1 scores during their Pre-Field Training interviews, participants communicated that their personal and shared faith in and relationship with an all-knowing, all-powerful God impacted their confidence and motivation to interact cross-culturally, but also affected how they would consider and approach a cross-cultural interaction. While Motivational CQ was scored higher than Metacognitive CQ for almost all participants on the T1, the extra boost in confidence and desire to serve from their personal faith was explained somewhat in supplemental terms; lower Metacognitive CQ did not produce anxiety as they leaned on their trust in God to enhance their motivation.
Participants expressed that trusting in discernment from God regarding interactions, desiring to be in constant communication with God to help in processing and checking, and seeking wisdom in how to improve future interactions, were key in developing a strategy to interact while on the field, or in developing Metacognitive CQ.

Peter, of the Africa team, initially assessed his Metacognitive at 5.00, which is seen in his comment below regarding his strong belief that his faith would help provide wisdom in his interactions:

A lot of what we are going to be seeing there is not going to be normal for us…But by letting the Holy Spirit be our comforter and not trying to comfort ourselves, we can be ready for those things, we can be ready to know that God promised grace, but He also promised struggling. . .by being ready and by being constantly connected with the Spirit, we can be ready for whatever comes our way.

Lori, also of the Africa team, described her approach to cross-cultural interactions in regards to her faith, “. . .I just want to see what He is going to do through me. I really would like to be a lot more intentional than I was back then. . .I just want to be really open, that is kind of my whole goal for the trip.” With a growth in her Metacognitive CQ from 3.75 to 4.50, it could be inferred that she did, in fact, allow her faith to guide her interactions, to make her more open.

David, of the Asia team, discussed his own mental and spiritual preparation for cross-cultural interactions, “. . .It [team meeting] impacted my thinking when it comes to communication. . .yesterday we talked about praying every day before we go, to pray and just say ‘I am there to serve,’ when you get that into your mind, your whole mindset changes.”

Nora, of the Europe team, spoke to her intended strategy for interacting cross-culturally, and how her faith affected it:
I think it will mostly affect me countenance, because I want them to see that I am different even if I can’t necessarily talk about why right away. I want them to see a different. So I think it will mostly be how I act and how I see things there.

Nora’s teammate, Britt, also expressed that her faith played a role in shaping her strategy, even more so than the cultural teaching itself, as she took away not only information but the workshop leader’s experiences in that that religious culture, which encouraged her own ability to interact through her faith:

That seminar [Islam seminar] impacted me more than anything that has happened during the workshops because he just said such profound things about how life is easy when you just want God’s will and when you give your life to Him. . .So as long as whatever I do or go about it, obeying the Holy Spirit, I will be fine. . .Because I can go to a thousand workshops and still not be ready because God is the One who knows our hearts and He is the One that knows what to say to impact others.

All participants who expressed religious faith as an influence on CQ indicated that their personal faith was a factor in how confident and motivated they felt to interact cross-culturally leading up to their field time (Motivational CQ). Sarah (4.60/6.40), from the Africa team, commented, “I am like really excited to get out there. God has been preparing me in the past to not be as afraid to interact with people.” The motivation her faith provided can be further seen in the fact that she assessed herself almost two points higher at the end of the study, increasing from 4.60 to 6.40. Matt (4.40/6.20), her teammate, added that he was driven to interact because of his faith. Having this as his primary motivation at the beginning, and then indicating a growth in Motivational CQ from 4.40 to 6.20, provides further support that he carried this central purpose into the On-Field Experience and Post-Field Debriefing:
I think I have never really gone anywhere specifically just for the purposes of, you know, helping other people and showing the love of Christ. That is obviously something I should live my whole life doing, but this is like 10 days specifically where that is my focus, so that is definitely something that I am excited about, motivated about. And realizing it’s not that much of a long time either, so putting as much effort in the opportunity to do that.

Megan, of the Asia team, spoke about how her desire to share her spiritual journey would affect her motivation on the field:

I feel that since we are going to be very spiritually motivated to talk to them about those kinds of things, and think about their faith, their beliefs, and how their life is, you know, that’s going to play in.

Also from the Asia team, Felicia, who had a rather high score in the T1 of 6.80, which indicated her already-held belief that God would sustain her interactions, even grew in Motivational CQ through the STM trip process, increasing her score to 6.90. Felicia commented,

just as I have faith that He will get me there, I have faith that He will get me through there. He is sending us there for a reason, he has a purpose in our team and I am just going to keep seeking Him and have faith that He will make sure we need to do everything we need to do there.

**Personality.** The other theme to emerge outside of the propositional constructs was that of personality. In their Pre-Field Training interviews, all Africa and Asia team participants and three of the four Europe team participants expressed that their natural inclinations, personal characteristics, and interests, would play a role in both their confidence to interact cross-culturally and their approach to those interactions. While several participants mentioned that
their previous experiences interacting cross-culturally impacted how they approached this experience, they all believed their own personal characteristics and interests were the main influence. Therefore, the two sub-themes that emerged were Personal Characteristics and Personal Interests. Within these sub-themes, the most prominent CQ dimensions impacted were Metacognition and Motivation.

**Personal characteristics.** All 12 of the participants who expressed personality as contributing to their CQ development during this stage also discussed how it affected their ability to strategize future cross-cultural interactions during the on-field time. Matt, who more than doubled his Metacognitive CQ score from 3.00 to 6.75, anticipated that his own personality would play a factor in how he interpreted, assessed, and planned for cross-cultural interactions. His noted personal strategy of observation and increased CQ scores, which indicated that his personality positively impacted his CQ development during this STM trip process. Matt explained,

> I am planning to...take the reserved approach at first, just observe what is going on around me...I imagine I will probably be kind of like I am with my other acquaintances and friends from other cultures; just observe, be as general as possible...

Peter (5.00/4.75), his teammate, noted similarly that his established tendencies would play a part in his Metacognitive CQ, although his score actually decreased from 5.00 to 4.75. It is interesting that Matt scored himself higher in the end, noting he would use an observational approach, while Peter scored himself lower after indicating an extroverted approach. Peter shared,

> I tend to be very upfront with a lot of things. I tend to be very out there, very focused, or not focused, if you want to put it that way...So if I can just review that in my own mind
before I do it, have accountability with other team members on what I am doing, and what I am not.

Lori, of the Africa team, planned to actually develop a strategy because her personality is not one that lends itself to careful consideration of a situation:

that’s [strategy] probably something that I needed to focus on but haven’t focused on the most. I am someone that kind of takes everything at face value so it’s important for me to have a strategy and be, ‘ok, so maybe that wasn’t what it seemed, it was what I thought was going on, but was it?’ you know? . . .specifically with my personality, I am not like real analytical in situations and stuff.

Tori, of the Europe team, seemed to be very self-aware of how she needed to carefully assess her natural inclinations before engaging in cross-cultural dialogue, which possibly contributed to her increase from 4.00 to 5.75. Tori stated,

I am going to go in observing more than talking. I am very extroverted and I am going to try not to be, just so that I won’t step on anyone’s toes initially. . .I don’t want to hit the ground running with my personality. . .

Tori’s teammate, Nora, also considered how her own personality could affect her approach and assessment of her cross-cultural interactions. Nora said, “probably just telling myself to calm down. That is what I usually do when I get frustrated or things are different than what I thought they would be. I just like usually ask the Lord to calm me.”

**Personal interests.** All Asia and Europe participants and five of the six Africa participants who reported personality as impacting CQ expressed that their personal interests impacted their motivation and confidence (Motivational CQ) to interact cross-culturally. Haley, of the Africa team, relayed that her personal interest in medical missions was a driving force
behind her motivation to interact with the local Africa culture. Haley said, “I think that it’s going to be a great experience because that is what I want to do personally, to experience that, because in the future I want to be a nurse and go overseas.” Lori stated similarly that her desire to serve people propelled her in this experience. She claimed,

I went to Honduras and I never had more joy than to go, tell people about Christ and just spend time loving on this people and it was such a way of molding me and showing me that this is what I love, this is what I want to do for Christ.

Megan, on the Asia team, expressed that a passion for spending time with people would influence her Motivational CQ. This interest closely mirrored the On-Field Experience theme of engagement with the locals, which Megan also noted as having impacted her Motivational CQ:

Also for me personally, I love to hear people’s personal life stories and figure out what is going on in their lives and how I can kind of listen in a way that they may never have had someone to listen to them before.

Felicia (6.80/6.90), Megan’s teammate, also noted that her personal interest of working with the college-aged population gave her confidence and motivation for the on-field time. This mirrored the On-Field Experience theme of engagement with the locals, which Felicia also reported as influencing Motivational CQ:

well, college students are what I am surrounded by now, and high school students and middle school students are the kind of ministry age I feel called to. When I am around them I feel really comfortable and I am able to just get in with them and just minister to them without any pressure at all.

Previous cross-cultural experiences. Five of the six Africa team participants indicated that their previous cross-cultural experiences contributed to their current CQ and influenced how
they would interact in country. For example, Lori alluded to past STM trips and how they shaped her Cognitive CQ T1 score of 3.33. She said, “Because I have been to Mexico many times, I have been able to experience what it is like to be in so much poverty and looking over at Africa, it seems like it’s a bit similar. . .” Lori came away from the STM trip process with a T2 score of 4.33, which illustrated that this additional cross-cultural experience added to her culture-specific and culture-general knowledge. Similarly, Mitch pulled from his time growing up in Brazil to shape his Metacognitive CQ T1 score of 4.50“..growing up in Brazil, I grabbed certain elements from them, like being really open to strangers. . .” Sarah’s previous experiences going on STM trips that focused on medical missions, much like the Africa team would be doing, impacted her Motivational CQ T1 of 4.60:

I actually went on mission trips to Guatemala and Honduras and I just worked with teams that were able to do dental and nursing stuff and I was like, I want to do something like that. I want to be able to go into missions but also bring something else into it, of course the gospel is the most important, but I also wanted to bring in something to have impact in that way too.

The participants did not all communicate an overarching CQ dimension that had been developed by those experiences, but three of the five expressed some degree of motivation and confidence to interact cross-culturally because of their previous experiences.

**On-Field Experience**

Data collection for the On-Field Experience consisted of a journal with various prompts related to CQ development, as found in the literature. Questions concerning the participant’s spiritual development during the time on field were also included, as these trips were faith-based
in nature. The same 13 participants who completed Pre-Field Training interviews also completed on-field journals.

The propositional constructs used as a basis for data analysis were (a) orientation to the culture, (b) engagement with the locals, (c) field worker influence, (d) team member and/or team leader influence, and (e) time of reflection. Sub-themes emerged within each major theme to shed more light on how that theme directly influenced CQ development. Changes over time were also noted, as the On-Field Experience spanned 10 days, and some journaling prompts were repeated throughout the on-field time. Rival explanations were also noted during the data analysis. The major rival theme that emerged was that of Christian faith. To be reported as a major theme, the same percentages for participants were used as in the Pre-Field Training stage (Africa – 66%; Asia – 66%; Europe – 75%). This decision allowed for the reporting of themes across a majority of participants. Also, the same percentages were used as a reference when CQ dimensions most impacted were reported. In some instances, a major theme or CQ dimension was only found within one or two cases, but not across all three cases, if the majority percentage was not reached. Appendix T illustrates each participant’s CQ T1 and T2 scores, including individual CQ dimensions, which demonstrate how the specific elements during the On-Field Experience (e.g., engagement with the locals, orientation to the culture) impacted CQ both in measured and narrative form. All participant quotes included in the findings below come from the On-Field Experience journals.
Table 4

Summary of On-Field Experience Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Orientation to the Culture</th>
<th>Engagement with the Locals</th>
<th>Field Worker Influence</th>
<th>Team Member/Team Leader Influence</th>
<th>Time of Reflection</th>
<th>Changes over Time</th>
<th>Faith</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Mitch</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Haley</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Lori</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Felicia</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Megan</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Caleb</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Britt</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Nora</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Tori</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On-field orientation. Five of the six Africa team participants, two of the three Asia team participants, and all Europe team participants noted that the orientation provided by the field workers upon arrival impacted CQ development. The orientations occurred early in the teams’ times in country, usually during the first full day. They included informational sessions about local culture and local ministry with both the field workers and local workers, training in the planned ministry area, meeting with locals, taking public transportation, eating local food, and exploring their city or town. This type of engagement with the culture, as well as intentional teaching about the culture, helped to prepare the team members for their time on field. Thus, the sub-themes of Cultural Learning and Cultural Immersion were the most impactful during the on-
field orientation. The CQ dimensions most impacted due to the on-field orientations were Cognition, Metacognition, and Behavior.

**Cultural learning.** Participants expressed that a focused time of learning about the culture not just from the field workers who may have lived there for an extended amount of time, but also from locals who work alongside the field workers, impacted their knowledge, strategy, and actions when interacting with the culture for the next eight to nine days. It assisted in the participants’ ability to compare and contrast the host culture with their home culture. All team’s average Cognitive CQ T1 scores were low, with Africa averaging 3.10, Asia averaging 2.83, and Europe averaging 3.34. This illustrated the self-assessed need for further culture-general and culture-specific training. Comments taken from the On-Field Experience journals illustrated the benefit this cultural learning provided.

Haley, of the Africa team, expressed how this cultural learning impacted her Cognitive CQ and assessed her T2 score (5.67) at two points higher than her T1 score (3.67). Haley stated, the field workers here are amazing and have done a wonderful job educating us about the culture and what we will be doing here. The training that was given to us by the missionaries definitely improved my understanding of the culture. It allowed me to have a better understanding of why the people would react in certain ways to us.

Sarah also commented that the orientation helped her to be more aware and understanding of the local culture, as it provided culture-specific teaching that included local norms, values, and appropriate interactions between men and women, and between ages, so that Sarah could develop culturally-appropriate strategies. Sarah’s Metacognitive CQ increased from 5.75 to 6.50, and her Cognitive CQ increased by more than two points, from 2.17 to 5.00. This further supports the role the orientation played. Sarah said, “This information was very helpful because
Britt, of the Europe team, increased her Metacognitive CQ from 5.00 to 6.25, and her Cognitive CQ from 3.83 to 6.17. Britt believed the orientation helped her as well, as it broke down the local behaviors into explanations she could understand, both educating her and developing a deeper appreciation for cultural differences. She commented, “It [orientation to the culture] helped me see why these people do the things they do…Just because we do things differently doesn’t mean I have the right to judge them.” Tori experienced growth in both dimensions. Her Cognitive increased from 2.17 to 3.83 and Metacognitive increased from 4.00 to 5.75. Her Behavioral CQ increased as well (4.20/5.40), as the field workers used the orientation to not only educate the team members on the local customs, beliefs, and behaviors, but also provide further context through their own stories for why certain approaches and behaviors are appropriate amongst the North African people. Tori elaborated,

they [field workers] are telling many stories from personal experience about the culture. They covered how they interact with others. . .nonverbal and verbals. . .signal systems. . .to be very observant because the [North African] culture is very much about actions rather than what you say. We talked about certain beliefs and how to behave. All these insights helped so much on understanding how to interact with the people of [North Africa].

In speaking about their team’s orientation, all four Europe team participants said that it helped them develop culturally-appropriate approaches to cross-cultural interactions. While the team’s Metacognitive CQ T1 score was 4.44, they later acknowledged that although they
assumed cultural acclimation would not be too difficult, the orientation showed them how vastly different the north African culture is from the dominant culture.

**Cultural immersion.** All three teams were immediately immersed into the local culture as part of their on-field orientation. This aided in developing the participants’ Cognitive, Metacognitive, and Behavioral CQ, as they observed, practiced, and learned more about how the local cultures functioned. Lori, of the Africa team, journaled about their immediate immersion into the West African culture and the subsequent increase in her Cognitive (3.33/4.33) and Behavioral (4.60/5.40) CQ. This allowed her to observe the culture first-hand through a variety of experiences, such as restaurants, transportation, and other everyday norms:

> Just by throwing us right into the culture through allowing us to stay in [local pastor’s] home. They automatically started training us in the language…customary greetings. . . answered all our questions. . .This information has been beneficial, even necessary, considering how little we knew at the beginning of the trip.

The Asia team was thrown right into the local metropolitan Asian culture, as they were taking public transportation, seeing the city, meeting the field workers, some of whom were of the native culture, and sitting in informational sessions. Felicia recalled how the immediate immersion increased her Cognitive (3.00/3.67) and benefited her Metacognitive (7.00/7.00) CQ, as she was educated in direct ways through formal sessions and indirect ways through cultural observation. This allowed her to carefully consider what type of approaches would be most effective and appropriate:

> It’s prepared us to talk to the college students and to know how to approach them in conversation, which is essentially the purpose of our trip here. . . It improved our understanding of the culture simply by telling us about it. We knew a few ethnic and
relational demographic facts, but not much about the culture and interpersonal relations among the people here.

The first full day in country, the Europe team was also immersed in both the dominant culture and the local North African immigrant culture. Caleb touched on the various learning activities included in their orientation. Caleb said, “These experiences [language classes, traditional meals, local culture experiences, engagement with locals] and more have been very beneficial. We were challenged mentally and physically, and learned a great deal about serving in a culture with which we were not familiar.”

All four Europe team participants also noted that the orientation helped to develop their Behavioral CQ, or the actual actions used to interact cross-culturally. Britt mentioned that her observation of the local North African culture during the time of orientation helped her to not only learn about and plan for interaction, but to practice as well, which was evident in her increased Behavioral CQ, from 6.20 to 7.00. Britt reflected, “I have also showed them love with physical touch because that, and hospitality, is the way they demonstrate love, which is what I was able to observe [through orientation to the culture].” The immersive nature of the Europe team’s orientation afforded them the opportunity to observe the culture and then actually put into practice culturally-appropriate behaviors.

**Engagement with locals.** All participants expressed that time spent engaging with the locals, whether through shopping at the market, one-on-one discussions, church services, or staying with them in their own homes, provided an opportunity for CQ development. All three teams spent considerable amounts of time engaging with the local culture daily. As the aim of the field workers was to invite these teams into what they were already doing on the field, engaging with the local culture was required. The sub-themes of Cultural Exposure and Direct
Interaction emerged, as teams were both exposed to the local culture through restaurants, transportation, and more public activities, but also in the ability to directly engage with the people through conversations, ministry, church services, or other intentional interactions. The CQ dimensions that were communicated as most impacted were Cognition, Metacognition, and Motivation.

The Africa team spent their nine days in country living with a local pastor, participating in local church ministries, assisting with medical clinics, eating at local restaurants, taking public transportation, and spending free time playing in the street with the local children. The only time the team was secluded was at night during their team debriefs.

The Asia team also spent each day fully immersed and engaged in the local culture. The team primarily spent their time on the local college campuses, teaching English, participating in English clubs, playing sports with college students, eating the local food, and taking public transportation.

The Europe team invested the majority of their time in the North African immigrant population, although they did at times interact with the predominant culture. The team spent concentrated time each day teaching English to the North African children, meeting with the women from this culture, eating their food, and spending time amidst North Africans.

*Cultural exposure*. The time spent observing the local culture, shopping in their stores, eating their food, taking their transportation, attending cultural events, and so on allowed for a greater understanding of how cultures are similar and different, but also the ability to understand the local culture’s ins and outs in a specific way. Experiencing exposure to the culture in these ways allowed for participants to increase their culture-specific knowledge and develop their strategy in interacting and confidence to interact as they integrated new-found knowledge into
their frameworks. Sarah, of the Africa team, discussed how the total immersion upon arrival increased her Cognitive CQ from 2.17 to 5.00. Sarah mentioned “. . .being tossed into the midst of ministry, and though it was challenging and stretching, I have never had a more fruitful time of learning the culture and feeling the Holy Spirit in my life.” Lori re-assessed her approach during this time of immediate immersion and continued to tweak and improve her Metacognitive CQ, commenting “. . .this initial introduction to [west African country] made me realize that not only would I have to observe this culture and be around it, I also would have to adapt to their ways.”

For Tori of the Europe team, if it were not for cultural immersion and the benefit that both observation and direct interaction played during this period, she would not have had the knowledge to interact effectively; thus, her Cognitive CQ would not have increased from 2.17 to 3.83, and her Metacognitive CQ would not have increased from 4.00 to 5.75. Tori spoke to this impact:

. . .being around [North African] culture was challenging. They have very different social standards, so I was very uncomfortable. . .I think the male-dominated society is what really made it weird. Observations like this [at lunch in North African restaurant] completely changed my view. I became extremely conscious of my actions when I was with the [North Africans] throughout the week.

Britt also expressed how this engagement altered her view of this culture specifically, but also how it reinforced the similarities shared across cultures and provided for a further refining of her cultural framework, which is a key component of Cognitive CQ. Britt emphasized,

it [engagement] allows me to see us as humans. We are all a divine creation, and we all bring something unique to the table. . .I see how different we are in the way we talk, the
language we speak, the food we eat, the clothes we wear, and in the way we look.

However, we are very similar in the way we express love, laughter, care and excitement.

**Direct interaction.** Having the opportunity to engage with the people one-on-one or in small groups allowed for a deeper level of cultural learning on the part of the participants. Hearing from the people, asking them questions, and working alongside them in different capacities opened the participants’ eyes even more to what daily life is truly like in these cultures, why beliefs are held and how they influence behaviors and practices, and even how the culturally different others view the American culture. These opportunities for direct interaction impacted the Cognitive, Metacognitive, and Motivational CQ of participants.

David, of the Asia team, grew his Cognitive CQ from 2.33 to 4.00 and Metacognitive CQ from 4.00 to 5.75 through intentional engagement, which aided in assessing and developing a more solid approach to interaction. David elaborated,

the orientation was helpful but it wasn’t until I got in the field and plowed the land that I started seeing growth. The mistakes and misconceptions that I had while talking to the people of [Asian country] were changed and it helped me realize my faults.

Felicia reported the same type of growth in her Cognitive (3.00/3.67) and Metacognitive CQ (7.00/7.00) CQ due to direct interaction, “It has given me a better understanding of the culture and helped me to know how to respond to it. By learning the culture, I can interact with it better and understand what is going on.”

For Tori, of the Europe team, the more time spent with the local North African people meant the ability to further develop her Metacognitive CQ because of established relationships, commenting that, “It wasn’t until they showed us part of who they [North Africans] are and we readily accepted them, that we connected. This changed our interactions completely because we
were no longer just Americans to them.” For Nora, the time spent engaging with the people gave her the indication that her Motivational CQ (6.40/6.00) would increase; however, engaging with the people may not have impacted her Motivational CQ in the way she expected, as she stated, “It [interaction w/ people] helps me to realize that it’s not as complicated as I thought. But I also realize that there is more to it than I thought! I will probably be more confident and less intimidated.” Britt summed up the effect this engagement had on her Motivational CQ (5.80/6.60) perfectly when she said, “I now have the genuine desire and courage to approach locals.” Caleb strongly stated that his time immersed in the culture changed his entire perspective, which altered his Metacognitive CQ (3.75), although no T2 score was available to further support it. Caleb reflected on this change:

I entered into this culture with a lot of presuppositions that I was unaware of. Our interaction with this culture left no part of my perception of it unchanged. I switched from caution to compassion. . .I believe this trip has significantly changed my life.

Mitch experienced his fear to interact change to a desire to love (Motivational – 6.60/7.00) (Metacognitive – 4.50/6.50) because of his interactions with the people, explaining that,

I also came to understand that most of my mistakes would be forgiven by the locals since I was a foreigner. The motive to learn the societal/cultural norms was now not of fear of doing something wrong, but now became sprung forth in the way that Paul witnessed to the people and becoming all things to all men, so that by all means, he may save some. That motive of love is so much stronger than the motive of fear.

Field worker influence. All participants noted that the field workers impacted their CQ development, especially related to CQ Cognition, Metacognition, and Motivation. Field workers
served as hosts for the teams. All of the field workers live in the host country, typically for several years, and are themselves expatriates. They plan the in-country itinerary, coordinate and lead teams in their daily service projects and ministry, and act as cultural navigators for the teams. Within the major theme of Field Worker Influence, the sub-themes of Field Workers as Cultural Brokers, Genuine Love for the Culture and People, and Debriefing were identified.

For the Africa team, both a local pastor and expatriates serving there with the ministry organization hosted them. This mixture provided the teams with both expatriates who could identify with the team, and a local who could truly assist in immersing them in the local culture and connecting them with other churches. The Asia team was hosted by an American expatriate who had lived in the country for over 20 years, in addition to four other expats and three locals. For the Europe team, the host team consisted of two expatriates, one local from the majority culture, and one North African.

**Field workers as cultural brokers.** Acting at cultural navigators, the field workers assisted in acclimating the teams to the local culture through on-field orientations, cultural exposure and immersion, and consistent cultural teaching throughout the On-Field Experience. Five of the six Africa team participants and two of the three Asia team participants expressed the field workers as having impacted their Cognitive development. Peter (2.17/3.00) spoke of the field workers teaching them the local language and incorporated it into his culture-specific knowledge base for that West African location, saying that, “So far our leaders have helped us learn the language and are always willing to help us learn each dialect.” Haley commented on the field workers’ influence on her Cognitive CQ growth (3.67/5.67), as they were constantly willing to teach the team about the local culture throughout the On-Field Experience, “The field workers have influenced my view of the culture through their education and understanding of the culture.
They have been so good to teach us about the people and explain why people do what they do in [West African country].”

Megan, of the Asia team, experienced the same type of constant cultural teaching throughout the On-Field Experience, which increased her Metacognitive CQ (5.75/6.50), Cognitive CQ (3.17/4.33), and Motivational CQ (6.00/6.40). Megan said, “All of the team leaders and field workers set an example of how to act as we got involved in the culture. They involved us in it and introduced us to it. They helped us to get comfortable in it by describing it and telling us how to interact in it.”

David, of the Asia team, talked about a story the field worker first shared with the team during orientation involving a bamboo tree’s willingness to be used in whatever way the master wished. This really impacted David and his strategy (Metacognitive CQ – 4.00/5.75) moving forward, as he sought to approach the local culture with a willingness to learn and engage. Through this illustration and the field workers’ intentionality preparing the team, David commented that “[t]he field worker has definitely prepared us for the days ahead!”

_Genuine love for the culture._ Participants expressed that they could clearly see that the field workers had a sincere love for the culture and the people within it. This was illustrated through their interactions with the people, the way they explained why and how the team should interact with the people, and the way they talked about their joy in living and working in that culture. This modeling of love for the culture impacted participants’ Motivational and Metacognitive CQ.

Nora, of the Europe team, expressed her gratitude in the way the field workers exhibited love through their interactions, which affected how she would then approach (Metacognitive CQ – 5.00/5.00) an interaction herself, commenting that,
[male field worker’s] interaction with the kids reminded me that kids are the same everywhere! They like to have fun, play, and laugh. They want to be loved. . .She [female field worker] showed me a true servant’s heart. She was constantly doing for others and loved it! She showed me how to love [North African] women.

Tori agreed that the care and concern the field workers showed for the local people and their culture in how they served them, respected them, and sought to exercise culturally-intelligent behavior themselves both impacted how she interacted (Metacognitive CQ – 4.00/5.75) and why she interacted (Motivational CQ – 5.40/5.40). Tori stated,

[the field workers] obviously love the local culture, so they talked about it constantly. They were very willing to tell us about certain aspects of [both] cultures. All of the information gave us a deeper understanding of the culture. This gave me a greater appreciation for the people.

**Debriefing.** Participants expressed that the willingness of the field workers to debrief with them throughout their On-Field Experience helped them to better process, make sense of, and adjust their frameworks and strategies. As the cultural experts and spiritual mentors during this culturally immersive time, it was helpful for the participants to be able to ask questions, discuss challenges, and hear from the field workers regarding their own experiences adjusting to that culture. These periods of debriefing impacted the participants’ Metacognitive, Cognitive, and Motivational CQ.

Tori, of the Europe team, reported that the field workers led debriefs, answered questions, and allowed the team time to process their interactions that day and work through improved strategies (Metacognitive – 4.00/5.75) for the next day:
[The male field worker] started and ended each day with some kind of debrief period. We always talked about the day, went over things that shocked us, commented on things that we loved, and asked questions. This was very beneficial because it made everything easier to digest and understand. We took the information we learned and applied it to the next day.

Caleb indicated in the journaling prompts that the debriefings helped him grow in his compassion (Motivational – 5.60) for the culture and his understanding of it (Cognitive – 3.17), though no T2 scores were available for further corroboration. Caleb wrote,

our hosts worked to create an environment in which we would be immersed and surrounded by the local culture in meaningful ways. This, and the time we spent discussing and debriefing, gave me greater compassion for and understanding of the culture.

Team member and/or team leader influence. All Africa team participants, two of the three Asia team participants, and three of the four Europe team participants communicated that their fellow team members and/or team leaders effected their CQ development. This was seen in the bond of these teams, and how they consistently encouraged one another, shared both their cultural struggles and triumphs while on the field, and learned from one another. While reviewing the teams’ journals, I noted any reference to how the team had impacted their ability to approach the culture in an effective way, learned about the culture through one another, or developed the confidence and desire to interact with the culture. I also noted team members who recorded that their faith was impacted by their fellow teammates and team leaders, as this impacted their ability to interact effectively. The CQ dimensions that were impacted most were
those of Motivation and Metacognition; however, there was not an agreement on CQ dimensions across the Europe team.

**Team as encouragement provider.** As in the Pre-Field Training, participants expressed the comfort and confidence they found in the support system of their teams. Having others going through the same experience encouraged each participant in dealing with cross-cultural challenges and frustrations, and provided for a sounding board of sorts. It also affirmed faith, as the team was comprised of like-minded Christians who gave advice and encouragement within a biblical context.

Lori, of the Africa team, found her team’s openness as further supporting and encouraging her Motivational CQ (5.20/5.20), although there was no indication of this development in her T2 score. Lori said,

> my team isn’t a team, we’re such a united family. . .constantly changing inwardly with one another, and every step we have had a perspective of total honesty, reliance on God, and openness; this has totally affected our ability to communicate as a body of Christ and reflect and grow together.

Tori, of the Europe team, appreciated the fact that she had her teammates as a support system and allowed this to influence her strategy (Metacognitive – 4.00/5.75) and confidence (Motivational – 5.40/5.40) to interact, saying that, “We talked to each other about what happened during the day. I loved having them there because we were experiencing things and learning together.” Along the same lines, Britt, of the Europe team, commented on how the encouragement her teammates showed her, as well as the loving feedback they provided her, affected her confidence (Motivational – 5.80/6.60) to engage effectively: “As a team, we help
each other out. We have a strong bond so we share experiences and ideas often. This helps us do the best possible job.”

**Team as cultural learning tool.** The team context also provided participants with the ability to observe each other in cross-cultural interactions, ask questions, and re-work their strategies together. This pragmatic purpose of the team was helpful in developing CQ throughout the On-Field Experience, especially in regards to Metacognitive and Motivational CQ.

Peter expressed a boost in confidence by leaning on his teammates as models and sounding boards in relation to his Metacognitive CQ (5.00/4.75), even though he reported a lower T2 score. Peter confirmed,

the team leaders have more been leading the transition because they too are new to the culture. So they are growing with us. This I feel was extremely comforting. . .Growing together through this is extremely helpful because if I don’t understand something, I can see how others have dealt with certain circumstances.

Sarah, of the Asia team, spoke of the impact her team leaders’ modeling of cultural interaction had on her increased Metacognitive CQ (5.75/6.50). Sarah said,

all of the team leaders and field workers set an example of how to act as we got involved in the culture. They involved us in it and introduced us to it. They helped us to get comfortable in it by describing it and telling us how to interact in it.

**Time of reflection.** All Africa and Europe team participants and two of the three Asia team participants found that debriefing with their teams or in one-on-one conversations helped them to process their cross-cultural interactions and re-work their approach to cross-cultural interactions, as well as encouraged and motivated them to interact and built them up spiritually, which affected their desire and confidence to interact. Usually led by the team leaders with the
occasional input of the field workers, teams were walked through the day’s events, how these events made them feel or what they made them think, take-aways or lessons for the next day, and the agenda for the next day. With these faith-based STM trips, team debriefs also incorporated a time for prayer and usually a devotional. Participants most noted impact to Motivational CQ, Metacognitive CQ, and Cognitive CQ during these times of debriefing due to the ability to unpack, process, and make sense of the day’s happening, coupled with a focus on the spiritual nature of their trip.

Caleb, from the Europe team, commented that the times of reflection in group and one-on-one settings allowed for the exchange of ideas and further support from the team, as the participants sought to interact effectively individually and as a team. This provided Caleb with ways in which he could develop his Metacognitive (3.75), Cognitive (3.17), and Motivational (5.6) CQ, even though he did not provide T2 scores to triangulate the narrative data. Caleb wrote,

we were able to reflect on experiences both in group debriefs and individual conversations. Our reflections were very beneficial because they allowed us to see multiple perspectives on the experiences we shared and helped us grow closer as we learned with and from each other.

Sarah said that the team debriefs were a great source of encouragement and opportunity for team unity and that they sustained her desire and confidence to interact (Motivational CQ – 4.60/6.40). “...[B]eing able to talk about our feelings helped each of us know that we weren’t alone. We shared the burdens each of us held and encouraged each other and built each other up,” Sarah said.
Felicia, of the Asia team, covered the different ways in which the team debriefs and one-on-one debriefs had either sustained or increased her Metacognitive (7.00/7.00), Cognitive (3.00/3.67), and Motivational (6.80/6.90) CQ, explaining that,

. . .the most detailed reflections have been between people in one-on-one conversations. We reflected by sharing our experiences, what we learned from them, and how these experiences enticed us to think on a deeper level. It has been beneficial by encouraging us to reflect deeper on what we have experienced and to grow spiritually from them. . .We debriefed with our team leaders by discussing high points. . .They encouraged us in what we were doing that was good and prompted us to do and be better in our work while we were there.

For the Europe team, Nora commented on how their team debriefs helped to re-focus them on God, His power, and that they could lean on Him for the confidence (Motivational CQ – 6.40/6.00) to meaningfully engage with the culture, despite a drop in her T2 score. : “We have been praying together in the mornings and discussing our expectations. It has been encouraging to see how everyone feels so far. It has also been a great way to remember that everything is in God’s hands.”

Christian faith. In reading through the participants’ journal entries for this study, many expressed that their personal Christian faith impacted the development of CQ during the on-field time. As in the Pre-Field Training data analysis, I looked for words or phrases connected to the Christian faith, such as “God,” “Holy Spirit,” “Jesus,” “faith,” “prayer,” “He” when speaking about God, “the Lord,” “servant’s heart,” and “God’s will.” Participants recorded instances when their personal faith sustained them during difficult cross-cultural interactions and provided motivation and confidence to carry out interactions. The common faith of the team as a whole
served to maintain the focus of the trip, which was to show the love of God to the local culture through word and deed. Participants noted that their trust in their faith to guide and sustain them most impacted their Metacognitive and Motivational CQ development.

Relying on God for the confidence and motivation to interact within their respective cultures while seeking guidance and wisdom in those interactions was found across these participants’ journal entries. Haley, of the Africa team, stated that her faith was a driving force behind her Motivational (7.00/7.00) and Metacognitive (7.00/6.75) CQ development on this trip, although her Metacognitive CQ was lower in the T2. Haley commented in the Post-Field Debriefing interview that her high initial T1 scores were driven by her excitement for this experience and trust in God’s guidance. However, the vast difference of the West African culture from her own proved to be very challenging, as she realized there were some limitations and barriers that would take more time to overcome:

My faith has proved to be a big influence in my everyday interactions. The ministry we have done. . .would not have mattered without the power of God behind it. Our actions without faith would be for ourselves and our glory instead of the glory of God. Because of my faith, I can show Christ’s love in my actions, little or small.

Lori also saw an impact on her faith through the On-Field Experience. Witnessing God’s hand at work, her confidence and desire (Motivational – 5.20/5.20) to interact was sustained by her faith, which continued to influence the ways in which she approached the culture:

Day one I was so overwhelmed. I was so hesitant but by now I’ve seen what Jesus can do and I have prayed with strangers, witnessed to strangers, spent my heart on these people and I wholeheartedly know and find my confidence in the fact that Christ can do anything He wants to those. . .
Felicia, of the Asia team, looked to her faith and its driving purpose of love for others as her main strategy (Metacognitive - 7.00/7.00), which was sustained throughout the on-field and post-field debriefing time: “My faith has led the way I talked to people and interacted with them. My faith made every conversation I had important and led me to be intentional about having deep discussions with the people.” Tori also claimed that her faith was at the core of how (Metacognitive – 4.00/5.75) and why (Motivational – 5.40/5.40) she engaged with the local culture, stating that,

My faith made all the difference when interacting with others, even my team. I went in with the idea that the trip was for God’s work only, so that mindset directed my actions…I had to rely on God completely so that my actions reflected Him, not my current mood.

She also added:

A lot of the children we worked with are angry and act out. When we treated them with love, and were patient with them, they completely opened up and became friendly.

Reflecting Christ was key when we were with the kids.

**Changes across the on-field time.** All participants stated that throughout their time in the field they saw a steady development of their CQ. In looking at participants’ CQ T2 scores, every participant but one saw an increase in CQ, with the smallest increase at .14 and the largest at 2.49. Even in the case of the participant who saw a decrease, that decrease was only .05. Though these STM trips were only for a maximum of nine days, certain aspects of the experiences such as the intentional consistent engagement with the culture, opportunities for processing through team debriefs, and leadership of knowledgeable and experienced field workers presented the participants with ways in which to develop CQ during a short span of
time. Most notably, participants reported development in their Motivational, Cognitive, and Metacognitive CQ over the span of the trip, although not all necessarily agreed on the same dimension. The factors that directly influenced CQ development through the span of this time were Prolonged Immersion in the Culture and Consistent Engagement with the Locals.

**Prolonged immersion in the culture.** The ability to stay in the same cultural setting for the duration of the on-field time allowed the participants to continue to learn, interact, and adjust their strategies throughout the experience. Moving to a different cultural context after a few days would have required them to cease CQ development related to that specific cultural context and begin again with the newly introduced one. Participants expressed that they could see marked changes from beginning to end and throughout the on-field time because of the prolonged immersion in the same cultural setting, especially in reference to Motivational, Cognitive, and Metacognitive CQ development.

Britt, of the Europe team, increased her Motivational CQ (5.80/6.60) by the trip’s end, as the consistent immersion in the culture provided for ways in which she could interact, assess, interact, and assess again, giving her greater confidence with each interaction. Britt stated, “I have such courage that I did not have Day 1...I have been changed! I’m not the same! I now have the genuine desire and courage to approach locals.”

Lori, of the Africa team, described her time in Africa as one of greater knowledge, perspective, and understanding of the West African culture, which increased her Cognitive CQ (3.33/4.33). Lori reflected,

I have had a lot of my skepticism removed after spending time in these communities. I used to automatically think my ways, my family’s ways, America’s ways were all true
and right, but obviously as I grow, I knew differently. . .[African country] helped take some of that away from me. . .made me realize that society is what determines the norm.

Caleb, of the Europe team, indicated in a journal entry a greater perspective (Cognitive – 3.17) on culture in general because of the consistent cultural immersion, although a T2 could not confirm this. He commented, “I can see a significant difference in my thoughts regarding cross-cultural interactions. I know now what it feels like to be a minority and I have a greater respect for all people’s humanity.” Tori spoke to how this time in country gave her greater insight into her own thinking and how to alter it for the better in regards to future cross-cultural interactions.

Tori increased in both Cognitive CQ (2.17/3.83) and Metacognitive CQ (4.00/5.75), as expressed here:

I am much more aware of differences. Before [the trip], I knew that they [cultures] would be different, but I didn’t know how. Now I know what things to look for. I am more conscious about my American mentality and I try to be more open-minded. It’s changed the way I look at cross-cultural interactions. Before, I wanted to make an impact on others. Now, I want to learn from the locals and experience their culture.

**Consistent engagement with the locals.** Incorporating daily engagement with the local people allowed for continued opportunities to practice interacting and to grow in the confidence to do so. Megan referred to the consistent engagement with college students as having influenced her knowledge of the culture (Cognitive – 3.17/4.33) and her ability to effectively approach it (Metacognitive – 5.75/6.50):

After spending 4 days in class with the local college students. . .we had figured out the best way of using that class time. . .I continued to understand culture and the best/easiest
ways to have a conversation with the students. I also have learned the best ways to phrase things and be mindful of translation error.

Tori, from the Europe team, highlighted the consistency of interacting with the people as a factor sustaining her confidence, or Motivational CQ (5.40/5.40), as she maintained a somewhat high initial score throughout the On-Field Experience. Tori stated:

I was more confident in my approach towards the end of the trip. By that point, we knew some locals by name and could have a conversation with them. We also knew what things we had in common with them. It was definitely less stressful at the end.

Post-Field Debriefing

The Post-Field Debriefing stage included an in-person interview and a post-field CQ self-assessment six to eight weeks following the participant’s return. Table 5 shows the participant’s T1 and T2 scores for each CQ dimension and CQ overall. All but one participant experienced an increase in overall CQ, ranging from a difference .14 to 2.49. The other participant, Peter, experienced a slight decrease at a change of .05. When I asked Peter about this decrease, he explained that once he was in the culture, he realized that his CQ was not as high as he had originally thought. In completing the CQ T2, Peter scored himself lower in three of the CQ dimensions, as he then had a more realistic assessment of his ability to engage effectively in intercultural settings. Most participants increased in each CQ dimension; however, there were those, like Peter, who had a more realistic assessment of their CQ towards the end and so consequently scored themselves lower in some areas on the T2. As stated in Chapter Three, the propositional constructs used as a basis for data analysis were (a) discussion of experiences, (b) time for contemplation, and (c) application to participant’s life. Rival explanations were also noted and are discussed below. Those were (a) religious faith and (b) team influence. Changes
over time were taken into consideration, as the participants were not interviewed until at least six weeks after their return. This allowed them the opportunity to process their On-Field Experiences and settle back into their daily routines. The factors and conditions that impacted CQ development relating to the major themes are provided.

Twelve participants completed all data collection in this stage, with the exception of Caleb. Because of this, I looked for two of the three Europe team members to agree on a major theme in order to report it as a major finding below. As evidenced in Table 6, application to participants’ life and Christian faith were significant across all participants, in addition to changes over time that allowed for a prolonged period in which to process experiences. All participant quotes included in the findings below come from the Post-Field Debriefing interviews.
### Table 5

*Cultural Intelligence T1/T2 Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Metacognitive</th>
<th>Cognitive</th>
<th>Motivational</th>
<th>Behavioral</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>3.00 6.75</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Mitch</td>
<td>4.50 6.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>5.00 4.75</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Haley</td>
<td>7.00 6.75</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Lori</td>
<td>3.75 4.50</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>5.75 6.50</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>6.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>4.00 5.75</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Felicia</td>
<td>7.00 7.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Megan</td>
<td>5.75 6.50</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Britt</td>
<td>5.00 6.25</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>6.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Nora</td>
<td>5.00 5.00</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Tori</td>
<td>4.00 5.75</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

*Post-Trip Debriefing Themes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Discussion of Experiences</th>
<th>Time for Contemplation</th>
<th>Application to Participant’s Life</th>
<th>Religious Faith</th>
<th>Team Influence</th>
<th>Changes over Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Mitch</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Haley</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Lori</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Felicia</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Megan</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Britt</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Nora</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Tori</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion of experiences.** Four of the six Africa team participants, two of the three Asia team participants, and all three Europe team participants said that the ability to discuss their experiences with others impacted their CQ development during the Post-Field Debriefing stage. Participants noted that although not everyone could empathize with their experiences, the opportunity to simply talk about what happened and verbally process it helped to legitimize and unpack the experience. Participants expressed that both talking with those on their team, and others such as friends and family, benefitted them during the post-field time. When discussing the ability to process their on-field time with others, participants directly and indirectly alluded to a deeper understanding of the experience and a settling of their uneasiness, frustration, and stress in returning home, which provided them with perspective and resulted in a greater
appreciation for and desire to interact cross-culturally. The sub-themes of Discussion with Team Members and Discussion with Non-Team Members are included, as well as how each sub-theme influenced Motivational CQ development.

All participants noted above expressed that the ability to talk with others most impacted their Motivational CQ. In comparing CQ T1 and T2 scores, seven participants reported an increase in Motivational CQ, ranging from .10 to 1.8, three reported no difference, and two reported a decrease of .40 each. Even though five saw no increase, more than half of the participants (n = 7) did. Being able to verbally process their experiences, work through questions and concerns, express joys and triumphs, and even talk through future desires in the cross-cultural arena gave them greater motivation to continue to interact with others from various cultural contexts. It reinforced already-held desires to work in a cross-cultural setting.

**Discussion with team members.** Participants expressed that discussing their on-field experiences and how they processed them with fellow team members allowed for greater understanding and empathy. The shared experiences of the team members provided further affirmation and encouragement as they sought to make sense of their on-field time and how it should be applied to their lives.

Lori, of the Africa team, desired to process her experience with others and felt only those who could truly empathize would help, saying, “So I just didn’t realize the importance of talking through all that kind of stuff. How much I was feeling and not able to communicate with anyone around me.” Finding those who could understand what she recalled and walk her through debriefing was a way for her to stay motivated to move forward with cross-cultural interactions.

Britt, from the Europe team, found that meeting with her teammates to talk through their shared experiences and her own personal processing of them helped to keep things fresh in her
mind and reminded her of her initial excitement for this cross-cultural experience (Motivational CQ T1 – 5.80) and how the On-Field Experience only increased this desire (Motivational CQ T2 – 6.60). Britt explained,

it was like, because you are with them for so long and then you don’t meet up with them, so you are just like, ‘Oh my gosh, remember these people? Remember when we did this?’ So, we talked for three hours straight about Spain, which helped because they understand, whereas my friends get sick of it.

Discussion with non-team members. While participants saw the benefit of talking about and processing through their on-field experiences and what they were currently going through with their fellow team members, some benefitted just as much when speaking with family and friends.

Mitch, of the Africa team, found that the ability to talk through his experiences with other friends and family enabled him to continue in his desire for cross-cultural interactions (Motivational CQ – 6.60/7.00):

It’s good to process by yourself, but God created two persons, not one person, so I think He did that for a reason. . .sometimes we are not the only one and knowing we are not the only one helps you and comforts you a little. . .that is almost a stronger way of processing because you are getting over a bridge or a barrier but you are getting over it with someone.

Although Haley saw no change in her Motivational CQ score (7.00/7.00), she articulated that the ability to share with those who were not on the trip still fueled her excitement to continue in cross-cultural experiences. She knew that despite their ability to empathize, it was still a beneficial way to maintain her excitement and motivation:
It’s just been an amazing experience to be back here and to just talk to people about the trip. That is always an exciting thing to tell people about it and then they get excited about it too with you.

**Time for contemplation.** All Asia team participants spoke specifically about their own personal times of processing and how they had played a role in moving them forward in CQ development. While not all participants agreed on a specific dimension of CQ as most impacted, they agreed that processing on one’s own helped them in a different way than talking with others. The time of mental processing gave them greater insight into their faith and how to use what they learned both in the present state and in the future. When I asked David about how his personal processing had been going and how he would recommend other introverts to process, he responded,

I would say just sit down, and as an introvert, and think about the process, pray to God to give you a sign on what He is saying to you, on what just happened and that just because you come back to America, pray that you don’t get stuck in the American dream of just working for success in yourself and trying to achieve the highest amount of money, and ask God to help you go through these processes and after that, talk about it, actually verbalize it, and tell Him how excited you were about what you did, what was interesting and what was weird, some of the weird foods, your hardest day.

David saw the benefit in taking the time to personally debrief before talking with others. Megan shared about her own personal time of debriefing and how she was processing:

You know, it goes back and forth [processing] to like, ‘I really want to go back’ to being content, ‘ok, it happened and I learned so much from it and now I am in this position.’

Like, it definitely, within the first two weeks, I was very upset to be here and not there,
because there it was all about kingdom work. So working, in doing stuff for others and for God, which is like such a big part of my heart and my passion. When you are back here, everything is about me and I was like, ‘I don’t want to be here doing this while I can be over there doing other stuff’ and so just like processing through ‘ok, God has placed me here for this time, right now.’

Felicia also took the time to process her experiences as an opportunity to learn more about how she could use them in moving forward. She said:

It was definitely a lot harder in the beginning. Culture shock, coming back was just kind of like, ‘what just happened?’ kind of thing. So I just keep slowly trying to process. . .I keep looking back into experiences, just trying to think through them and think about what I learned. I think that’s how I have handled a lot of it, just trying to think of what I have learned about relationships and people I meet there on social media.

**Application to participant’s life.** In listening to how participants processed their time after returning, all indicated that either using what they had learned on the field back home, taking those experiences into a future endeavor, or purposefully seeking out new cross-cultural experiences helped to both carry them through the debriefing period and also maintained and continued to grow their CQ. In looking at sub-themes, participants most noted Career Application and Personal Application. Eleven of the 12 participants reported development in Motivational CQ in the qualitative data, and seven reported an increase in T2 scores, three maintained the same T2 scores, and two decreased their T2 scores.

**Career application.** Participants identified ways the STM trip process applied to their careers. This made the experience a part of their lives; it would have a lasting effect, thus maintaining and growing their desire to interact cross-culturally.
Haley, of the Africa team, commented that although her Motivational CQ score remained at 7.00, she felt it was stronger now, stepping away from a second STM trip with an increased desire to pursue a medical mission career:

It’s [Motivational CQ] definitely greater especially after experiencing it twice! It gets better and better each time and you definitely have to work hard to understand things more and it’s easier to apply to your life. . .I know for sure I want to go back overseas at least once or twice a year for a certain amount of time to do nursing work over there.

Lori also wanted to take her career into a cross-cultural context, and referenced her sustained Motivational CQ (5.20/5.20) during the STM trip process, which confirmed her desire to pursue medical missions. This pushed her to work more intentionally in her schooling and to pursue other cross-cultural interactions that will prepare her even more:

So kind of just having to tell myself, especially because this is what I want to do now, so just telling myself that this is the time for me to be here now, like you are running a race to fulfill and you are persevering in what you want to do in the future.

David (6.00/6.40), of the Asia team, was so motivated by this experience that he even went as far as to change his minor to Global Studies so he will be better equipped to practice personal training in a cross-cultural setting. David spoke to his long-term plans:

I am definitely desiring to do mission work or cross-cultural long-term, so overseas long-term. I actually changed my minor to global studies so I can see if I can do something overseas with exercise science. I am excited about that and I just want to bring my knowledge overseas and being able to share the gospel while also doing something I love with training or how to work out and being as healthy as possible and help them be the best person they can be.
**Other practical application.** While not all participants applied these experiences to their career paths directly, they all strove to incorporate what they learned into other areas of their lives by pursuing future cross-cultural opportunities both at home and abroad. Matt (4.40/6.20), of the Africa team, developed a new perspective on how to use his free time and is motivated to pursue intentional cross-cultural experiences while on vacations. He said, “I remember thinking when I was there, ‘why would I do vacations if I can just do this?’ So, just like help people and enjoy it at the same time.”

Megan (6.00/6.40), of the Asia team, considered how to incorporate lessons learned from the on-field time into her daily interactions, commenting, “It [time in country] has given me some insight on how to tailor what I am saying to other people. . . .to be able to tailor to how a person’s life is, I have seen how important that is.” Along the same lines, Felicia (6.80/6.90) was also motivated to continue pursuing cross-cultural opportunities in the present: “At the same time, I have taken the experiences I learned there and I am using them more for now and my life here.”

From the Europe team, Tori’s (5.40/5.40) on-field experiences sustained her motivation to interact cross-culturally:

I am going to try to travel a lot more and just put myself out there. Because I think that is the best way. You can only read so many books, and because people prepped me for the [North African] people, but I didn’t really understand til I was around them, so I guess I am just going to put myself out there.

**Christian faith.** Every participant stated that his or her Christian faith impacted the development of CQ during the Post-Field Debriefing stage in some way. While analyzing the Post-Field Debriefing interviews, I noted words or phrases connected with the Christian faith,
such as “God,” “Jesus,” “Holy Spirit,” “Bible,” “prayer,” and “He” when used in reference to God. When talking about their faith’s impact during the Post-Field Debriefing stage, participants spoke of God guiding them through the debrief time, helping them process, teaching them lessons about their on-field time, showing them opportunities to continue to show love to others, and speaking to them about how they still needed to continue to grow personally and in relation to others. Participants’ faith most impacted their Motivational CQ, as they sought encouragement, wisdom, and confidence from God to continue their cross-cultural interactions.

Because CQ spans a variety of cultural contexts, it correlated easily to the Christian faith for these participants, as they linked their desire to engage cross-culturally with their Christian call to love and serve others. This desire to be the hands and feet of Jesus acted as another motivating tool in cross-cultural interactions. It was not surprising when all participants agreed that the CQ dimension most impacted by their faith during this stage was Motivational CQ.

This time of Post-Field Debriefing impacted both Britt’s (5.80/6.60) trust in God’s power, and her confidence and motivation to engage with others, commenting that:

I guess motivationally I would say that it [debriefing period] opened my eyes to the approach to cultures, I guess where salvation and God is concerned. I think it showed me that it’s possible, so how it’s not about me, so I need to get out there because that is what God wants.

Tori (5.40/5.40) utilized personal reflection to hear from God about His will for her life:

I think personal debriefing helps me with my own personal goals and my relationship with the Lord and where He wants me to go. So in that personal debrief there is a ton of prayer because it’s like, “teach me what you want me to learn.”
Felicia (6.80/6.90), of the Asia team, saw her on-field time impact her own personal faith, which impacted how she lived out her faith back home. During the six or so weeks she had been back at university, she took what she learned and experienced in Africa and held it up to what she had known, integrating the two:

It’s really impacted my spiritual walk. Even as I’m worshipping in Convo, I have been taking the lyrics so much more deeply and so much more personally. It’s so easy to keep singing those songs and keep God the same way I have all these years. But going across seas and seeing a place where religion isn’t taken for granted and the ability to worship God freely is not taken for granted has definitely affected my personal walk. Just seeing how they live every day has really made me realize how different our lives are.

David (6.00/6.40), although planning to work cross-culturally in the future, realized that he can engage and serve others while he’s in university. His faith was strengthened by the fact that he can still be effective in his home country; his experience in Asia gave him further confidence and motivation. David said:

. . .we are back here and we can do the same thing here, preach the Word. We don’t have to do it overseas and we are not worthless because we are not on the mission field anymore because this is still a mission field.

Matt, of the Africa team, increased his Motivational CQ (4.40/6.20) by almost two points during the STM trip process. He identified a shift in his own view of worldwide Christianity during the time since he’s been back because of the different ways of worshipping, fellowshipping, and being in communion with God he encountered during his time in Africa. Matt said:
…one of the big things is that seeing in such a culture different than our own, how similar those Christian values are…It’s so interesting to just see that it really is just a worldwide family or common spiritual belief. Overall, those are kind of the biggest things I learned out of it.

**Team influence.** During the Post-Field Debriefing time, all Africa and Asia team participants said their team influenced their CQ development. Other than the weekly team debriefs, the team met informally for meals, were invited to the team leaders’ houses, participated in group texts, and were intentional to stay in touch. The way in which the team dynamic impacted the participants was most clearly evidenced in Motivational CQ, as excitement to experience other cultures only increased. The sub-themes illustrated in Team Influence were those of Formal Team Gatherings and Informal Team Gatherings. Three of the Africa team participants increased from the CQ T1 to T2, two experienced no change, and one saw a decrease of .40. The two participants who experienced the increase grew their scores by 1.8 each. For the Asia team, all reported an increase in Motivational CQ, ranging from a difference of .10 to .40.

**Formal team gatherings.** Unique to the Africa team was that the team leaders scheduled weekly team debriefings for the six weeks following their return. The debrief meetings were based around a re-entry devotional that helps faith-based trip participants process their experiences. Although not mandatory, several team members attended and commented that this time was a positive factor in processing their on-field experience. The CQ dimension noted for the theme of team influence was that of Motivational CQ.

Lori (5.20/5.20), of the Africa team, said her team kept her excited about her on-field experiences and other interactions moving forward. Lori said:
It’s been the best thing to have our team here and being able to meet once a week too, because we have that, and just being able to talk out stuff and be like, ‘this is what I’m dealing with it’s so stressful right now and I can’t concentrate because all I can think about is [Africa].’

Mitch (6.60/7.00), too, credited his close-knit team with helping him process during this time by keeping him positive about cross-cultural interactions and influencing future interactions. Mitch stated:

And I guess what helped my process was I interacted with my team almost every single week. We understand each other and we understand each of what we are going through and that has kind of helped with processing and resolving with what happened. We know each other, we trust each other, we can be open about anything and we know that none of us are to, I mean, we call our team the Ghana family and that’s how we feel!

**Informal team gatherings.** Considered just as important as the formal team debrief meetings were times of informal get-togethers, like meeting for lunch in the school cafeteria, hanging out at the team leaders’ homes, and keeping in touch through group texts. These “gatherings” of sorts sprang from a continued desire to be in community with the team, as participants had shared a truly unique experience together. These informal gatherings continued to impact participants’ desire to interact cross-culturally, as they reminisced about their on-field time and discussed how they were seeking out new cross-cultural opportunities.

David, of the Asia team, expressed his gratitude for his team leaders’ care in how the team processed their experiences during the Post-Field Debriefing. David said:

[Team leaders] Just making us feel more comfortable. It’s like the temperature they have been on, so they still feel the same weird feeling of being back home and being able to be
truthful and grow, letting us know we are not the only ones and invite us to their apartment, just eat and talk.

Megan (6.00/6.40) echoed this sentiment. She said the team and team leaders were necessary in her debriefing, as they re-focused her difficulty processing to the joys of cross-cultural experiences. Megan stated:

I think definitely a good things to do is stay in touch with your team members because I can’t even imagine what it would be like to debrief just on my own without them. . Because you know, to have them there not only encouraged me to like really be able to process through things well or really go to them and be like, ‘guys I really am struggling with my feelings right now,’ but also in the joyful things and the celebratory things.

Changes across the debriefing period. All participants found that during the time between their return until the six-week mark of the in-person interview, they saw changes in their CQ development. These changes occurred over a span of time through the themes listed previously: (a) discussion of experiences, (b) time for contemplation, (c) application to participant’s life, (d) religious faith, and (e) team influence. This time span allowed participants to deeply consider their time on the field. Thus, the sub-theme of Prolonged Period for Reflection is included below, which enabled the other factors during the Post-Field Debriefing to be implemented and experienced, which impacted CQ development.

The in-person interviews were another avenue through which participants could further process their experiences. These interviews allowed them to apply on-field changes in CQ to their current CQ assessment. Because the CQ T2 was completed within six to eight weeks after each team’s return, the immediate effects of the on-field time may not have affected the scores. The themes reported during the Post-Field Debriefing time, though, continued the On-Field
Experience CQ development in participants. By the six to eight-week mark when participants completed the CQ T2, all but one had increased in overall CQ, with scores ranging from a difference of .14 to 2.49. Only one participant, Peter, decreased in overall CQ. Peter attributed his decrease of .05 to his lack of awareness of how challenging the West African culture would truly be, and therefore assessed himself in the T1 in a naïve light. Regarding the effect of time on CQ development, participants noted most Cognitive CQ, Motivational CQ, and Metacognitive CQ.

**Prolonged period for reflection.** Every Africa and Europe team participant and two of the three Asia team participants noted that the span of time between their trips’ ends and the time of their interviews produced a greater realization of the similarities and differences between cultures. While the On-Field Experience provided in-the-moment cultural lessons, a span of several weeks may have allowed these similarities and differences to ‘sink in’ more completely, especially once one starts comparing the on-field culture with American culture. This period of reflection further impacted participants’ Cognitive, Motivational, and Metacognitive CQ.

Lori, of the Africa team, worked to reconcile these cultural differences over her first few weeks back and further developed and increased her Cognitive (3.33/4.33) and Metacognitive (3.75/4.50) CQ. Lori stated,

> I think just adjusting spiritually... it’s different here because you actually have to build relationships... it’s been hard to readjust to that and remember that Americans are a little less friendly and they are not as susceptible to that kind of easy way of evangelism. I’ve had to adjust some things towards my bitterness too, coming back I’m like, ‘oh that’s not right, that’s not how we do it in Africa and stuff,’ but then obviously this is how we do things in America and stuff.
Peter also strived to integrate his new-found cultural knowledge with his previous cultural framework and increased his Cognitive CQ (2.17/3.00). Peter reflected on his new understanding:

. . .by being in Africa and just experiencing different views, how they worship and just how they approach you, I have seen a new view of what it means to be a Christian. They have basically resurrected my idea of what that reality is. We have our idea of reality only towards our culture and I think I have said this before in a previous interview, but I have more of an understanding of that now.

Haley talked through what she learned since the trip regarding her Cognitive (3.67/5.67) CQ, which saw a substantial increase, and her Metacognitive CQ (7.00/6.75), which she acknowledged was scored too high in the T1:

Approaching cross-cultural, you definitely have to have an open mind. Like, you have to try to understand where they are coming from instead of just looking back on what you experienced too. . . you have to make sure that you know before you interact with someone that the major points of interaction that they have that are different from yours.

**Summary of Findings**

This study sought to explain how the short-term mission (STM) trip process impacts CQ development in undergraduate students at a Christian liberal arts university in the southeastern United States. The purpose of this study was to explore the STM trip process both in its three individual stages of (a) Pre-Field Training, (b) On-Field Experience, and (c) Post-Field Debriefing, as a whole, and how CQ is thus impacted. The use of a pre and post CQS, interviews, and journaling allowed a collection of data from participants, nested within three
Thirteen participants completed data collection in the Pre-Field Training and On-Field Experiences stages, and one opted out of the Post-Field Debriefing interview. The conceptual framework guiding this study included the model of Cultural Intelligence (Ang & Earley, 2003) and short-term mission trip and study abroad research and practices. Through the use of coding and comparison to uncover thematic patterns at the embedded case (individuals) and team case level as espoused by Yin’s (2012) pattern matching in collective case studies, a fuller understanding of how CQ is developed during and across the STM trip process was discovered. The research questions for this study are answered as follows.

**Research Question One: How does the Pre-Field Training impact CQ development in undergraduate students participating in a STM trip?**

Through the use of Pre-Field interviews and a Pre-Field CQ self-assessment, the elements of the Pre-Field Training that impacted CQ development were discovered, and with how the individual participants, individual cases, and STM trip process as a whole was affected. Across all three teams, the themes of experiential learning, team member and/or team leader influence, religious faith, and personality were found to impact CQ development.

Eleven of the 13 participants noted that the use of informational sessions, team-directed research, and the anticipation of experiential learning impacted their knowledge, or Cognitive CQ, of cultures in general, as well as the specific target culture. Average Cognitive CQ T1 and T2 scores across participants (n = 12), were 3.11 and 4.43, and one participant reported a decrease in Cognitive CQ on the CQS. Participants expressed knowing more about cultural practices, including behavioral elements, language, and religious practices by the end of the study. Further, participants noted that the lack of experiential learning activities contributed to not being as knowledgeable about the culture as they would have liked. When asked what they
would have liked to have seen in the Pre-Field Training, several noted they desired to see more opportunities for engaging with the culture, either through hands-on learning, research projects, or other forms. This would have helped to increase their knowledge of the culture going into it.

Twelve of the 13 participants found that their Motivational CQ was impacted in a positive way through the support system of their team and team leaders, as was evidenced in the qualitative data. However, although average Motivational CQ (n = 12) rose from 5.92 to 6.33, only seven participants reported an increase in Motivational CQ scores. Three remained consistent in score and two decreased in scores. Having team leaders who truly cared about the welfare of the team, kept in regular contact leading up to and following the trip, and acted as spiritual mentors illustrated the investment of these leaders. Having a group of people journeying together, learning together, and sharing their anxieties and excitement created a sense of community that motivated the participants to interact with the culture, and also gave them greater confidence to do so.

Participants expressed that their personal Christian faith anchored them during this entire process and provided a source from which to draw inspiration, encouragement, strength, and wisdom, which impacted both Metacognitive and Motivational CQ. For Metacognitive CQ, the overall average (n = 12) increased from 4.98 to 6.0. Eight participants reported individual increases, two reported no change, and two reported a decrease. Many participants expressed that relying on their faith to guide their interactions was the main strategy they would employ on the field, as well as asking God to help them in checking their interactions and being aware of what is needed in the moment. Trusting that there was a higher power guiding them gave participants greater confidence in future interactions, as well as the drive to demonstrate their faith through words and actions.
Personality, or one’s natural inclinations, impacted both Metacognitive and Motivational CQ development, as the participants noted this influence in how they would approach a cross-cultural interaction. In developing a strategy, or in thinking through how one would assess an interaction, one’s already-developed bent towards introversion or extraversion, observational tendencies, and social preferences play a part in how an individual would approach an interaction. Moreover, participants shared that knowing how they would naturally approach a situation, whether excitedly or hesitantly, impacted their desire and confidence to interact. Participants very much expected to see their personality play out in their cultural interactions.

**Research Question Two: How does the On-Field Experience impact CQ development in undergraduate students participating in a STM trip?**

Participants completed on-field journals that asked them about various elements of their On-Field Experience, in order to better understand how that time impacted their CQ development. Several themes were found during the On-Field Experience; however, not all themes were found across a majority of the participants in every team. Engagement with the locals impacted all participants and their Cognitive CQ, as it exposed them first-hand to the culture. Cognitive CQ development was indicated in the qualitative data and supported by the CQ T1 and T2 scores, as only one participant reported a decrease. Interacting with the local population, using their transportation, eating their food, sleeping in their homes, and serving alongside them informed the participants about the culture to a greater degree. Participants absorbed more of the language, behavioral dos and don’ts, and norms and values, as well as developed a more refined framework for comparing and contrasting different cultures. Experiencing the culture first-hand allowed the participants the opportunity and ability to build
their culture-specific knowledge base, which in turn affected their actions, confidence, and strategy.

All participants noted field worker influence, and at least a portion from each team reported field worker impact on Cognitive CQ, as the field workers served as cultural guides for the teams, teaching and training them as they went throughout the week. Also, changes over time were reported by all participants; however, no overarching CQ dimension appeared. Participants across all three teams found that an orientation to the culture, team members’ and/or team leaders’ influence, a time of reflection, and their own personal Christian faith impacted CQ development. Although these themes were not found across all participants, many expressed that the ability to be introduced to the culture through both formal lecture and experiential learning activities impacted how they interacted with the culture. The team and team leaders continued to be a strong support system for participants as they navigated the culture together, learning and reflecting as a community. This communal time of debriefing was part of why many found that a time of reflection, or debriefs, was so instrumental while on the field. Processing through the experiences together allowed the teams to discuss how certain experiences made them feel or think, as well as how to use those reflections for future interactions. These times were also utilized to encourage one another in their faith and re-focus on the greater purpose of living out their faith while on the field. Lastly, the theme of religious faith, or a personal faith, continued to impact participants, as they relied on God to sustain them, encourage them, and give them wisdom.

**Research Question Three: How does the Post-Field Debriefing impact CQ development in undergraduate students participating in a STM trip?**
Through the use of individual interviews and a post-field CQ self-assessment, I investigated how the time following the STM trip continued to impact CQ development. All participants but one experienced an increase in CQ from the Pre-Field CQ T1 to the Post-Field CQ T2. Difference in scores ranged from .14 to 2.49. The participant who experienced a decrease in CQ only experienced a minimal decrease—.05. This participant seemed to process his experience in Africa very seriously and expressed a desire to more intentionally and carefully approach cross-cultural interactions; he believed that the vast difference of the West African and his own culture required more CQ than originally anticipated. His previous experiences in western European countries, which more closely mirrored his home culture, may have caused him to assess himself as having a high CQ, as he was able to function more easily within those cultures. I would hypothesize that he assessed himself more conservatively on the CQ T2, which could account for the decrease in overall score. Only two themes were found across participants—those of application to participant’s life (Motivational CQ for 11/12 participants; average scores increased from 5.92 to 6.33) and Christian faith (Motivational CQ for 12/12 participants; average scores increased from 5.92 to 6.33). All participants experienced changes in their CQ over the span of time from their return home to the six to eight week mark, specifically Cognitive CQ for 11 of the 12 participants (average CQ scores increased from 3.11 to 4.43) and Motivational CQ for 11 of the 12 participants (average scores increased from 5.92 to 6.33). Participants noted that when they sought to put into practice what they learned during the on-field time, or thought through how they could further develop their CQ skills in the present or a career in the future, they were motivated to continue to learn about other cultures, seek out opportunities to interact cross-culturally, and find other ways to integrate a cross-cultural lifestyle into their personal and professional lives. While some participants were already
planning to do so (e.g., through international nursing careers), others made an intentional choice to seek out cross-cultural interactions with international students on campus, or even pursue a Global Studies minor to be better equipped for cross-cultural interactions. Finding a way to apply what they experienced on the field enabled participants to not only prolong that experience, but also continue with subsequent cross-cultural interactions due to the desire and confidence they developed.

In pursuing God’s purpose for their lives after the on-field time during this STM trip, participants found that their desire to serve God through continued cross-cultural experiences impacted their desire and confidence to do so. Seeking God’s will for their lives through group devotionals, individual quiet times, prayer, and talking with other Christians sealed in participants the belief that God used the on-field time to grow them spiritually. Many communicated that they now approached people differently, had either a new or strengthened desire to interact with those from different cultures, or were seeking God’s guidance in a future cross-cultural endeavor. The fact that their faith played such an important role in re-affirming God’s desire for them to love others and serve others from a variety of cultural contexts impacted their CQ motivation during the Post-Field Debriefing time and after.

Two other themes emerged during data analysis, but did not appear in all participants. The theme of discussion of experiences was found in nine of the 12 participants, with Motivational CQ reported in all nine instances. Participants noted that talking through their on-field time with others helped them process their experiences. The Africa team took part in a voluntary weekly team devotional that utilized a faith-based re-entry devotional, which participants noted helped in their re-adjustment. The devotional addressed many of the re-entry issues, normalizing what the team members were experiencing and further helping them process.
Others found benefit in meeting with friends and family who asked questions about their trip and what it meant personally. This verbal processing continued to re-enforce the importance of the experience, while deconstructing it to further see how it would apply to their lives now and in the future. The verbal processing with friends and family continued to develop participants’ desire to interact cross-culturally and the confidence to so, as they reflected on obstacles they had overcome on the field and how they hoped to continue it in the future. The Africa team also reported that team influence, specifically formal team gatherings such as team debriefs, along with informal team gatherings such as lunch, group text messages, and other get-togethers, continued to impact their excitement and motivation to engage cross-culturally, as these times allowed for further discussion of the On-Field Experience and each person’s future plans regarding cross-cultural opportunities.

The theme of time for contemplation was found in all participants on the Asia team and in two of the three Europe team participants, who noted that taking personal time to think and pray through their experiences impacted their CQ. While no one CQ dimension was found across all participants, every participant expressed that the intentional personal reflection played a part in how they considered their future cross-cultural interactions.

**Chapter Summary**

I performed close examination of both individual (i.e., embedded cases) and team experiences (i.e., cases) on three separate STM trips to establish findings for this study. Within each case, participants provided their experiences through various data collection methods during three separate stages: (a) Pre-Field Training, (b) On-Field Experience, and (c) Post-Field Debriefing. The examination of the participants’ experiences during these distinct stages, both at the embedded case level and at the case level, provided a deeper understanding of how the STM
trip develops CQ. A myriad of themes emerged from this research, through both pre-established propositional constructs and rival themes reported by participants within the context of CQ development.

Although each STM trip case in this study possessed characteristics and practices unique to itself, such as team leaders, team meeting content, and location of the trip, the cases also contained similar properties such as required workshop attendance, field worker hosts, consistent engagement with the local culture, an all-team debriefing meeting after the team’s return, and belonging to the same short-term mission trip program from the same bounded system (Lynwell University). This goal of this research was to identify common themes within each case and across all cases for the varied stages of the STM trip process and the process as a whole. Findings were included if at least 66% of participants from a case reported the theme; CQ dimensions were reported at the same minimum percentage. Changes over time were also recorded to note the development of CQ within the context of time.

Findings indicated that during the Pre-Field Training participants reported the following themes, sub-themes, and CQ dimension(s) indicated in parentheses: (a) experiential learning (cultural learning; anticipated cultural immersion) (Cognitive CQ), (b) team member and/or team leader influence (focus of team meetings; team as support system) (Motivational CQ), (c) Christian faith (Metacognitive and Motivational CQ), and (d) personality (personal characteristics; personal interests) (Metacognitive and Motivational CQ). A majority of the Africa team participants also reported a theme of previous cross-cultural experiences but could not agree on the CQ dimension most impacted. The theme that was reported by all participants was team leader and/or team member influence, with 12 of the 13 participants reporting Motivational CQ as the dimension most impacted.
Findings indicated that during the On-Field Experience, the following themes and sub-themes in parentheses impacted the specific CQ dimension(s) indicated: (a) orientation to the culture (cultural teaching; cultural immersion) (Cognitive CQ; Metacognitive, Cognitive, and Behavioral CQ for Asia and Europe), (b) engagement with the locals (cultural exposure; direct interaction) (Cognitive CQ, Metacognitive and Motivational CQ for Africa and Europe), (c) field worker influence (field workers as cultural brokers; genuine love for the culture; debriefing) (Cognitive CQ for Africa and Europe; Motivational CQ for Europe; and Metacognitive CQ for Asia and Europe), (d) team member and/or team leader influence (team as source of encouragement; team as cultural learning tool) (Metacognitive and Motivational CQ for Africa), (e) time of reflection (Motivational CQ; Cognitive CQ for Asia; and Metacognitive CQ for Europe), and (f) Christian faith (impact of individual faith; impact of corporate faith) (Motivational CQ; Metacognitive CQ for Asia and Europe). All participants also reported changes across the on-field time. All participants reported (a) engagement with the locals and (b) field worker influence. In addition, all participants reported Cognitive CQ as most impacted in regards to engagement with the locals.

Findings indicated that in the Post-Field Debriefing, the following themes and sub-themes in parentheses impacted CQ development and the specific CQ dimension(s) indicated: (a) discussion of experiences (discussion with team members; discussion with non-team members) (Motivational CQ), (b) time for contemplation (no overall CQ dimension indicated), (c) application to participant’s life (career application; other practical application) (Motivational CQ), and (d) Christian faith (Motivational CQ). All Africa team participants also reported the theme of team influence (formal team gathering; informal team gatherings), specifically impacted their Motivational CQ. Changes across the debriefing period (prolonged period for
reflection) were also found in all participants, and all reported an impact on Cognitive CQ. The
two themes that emerged across all participants were (a) application to participant’s life and (b)
Christian faith. In regards to the theme of Christian faith, all participants believed that their
Christian faith impacted their Motivational CQ.

Across the entire STM trip process, Christian faith impacted CQ development, as
participants consistently referenced their individual Christian faith’s ability to guide them,
comfort them, and bond them as teams. In some instances, themes and CQ dimensions appeared
at the individual participant or case level, but not across all cases. A discussion of the findings
and their implications, limitations, and recommendations for future research are provided in
Chapter Five.
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

Overview

The purpose of this study was to examine the short-term mission (STM) trip process in stages (Pre-Field Training, On-Field Experience, and Post-Field Debriefing) and as a whole in order to learn how CQ development was impacted. Three separate STM trip teams (Africa, Asia, and Europe) served as cases in this collective case study and operated out of the same STM trip program within Lynwell University. Within each case, individual student participants ($N = 13$) served as embedded cases and provided data through individual interviews, journaling, and a Cultural Intelligence T1 and T2 pre and post assessment. Data was collected and analyzed within each case and compared across all three cases for each stage of the STM trip process. Emergent themes appeared during each stage of data collection and were compared across the entire STM trip process. This allowed for overarching themes across the entire process and provided a deeper understanding of how they impacted CQ development.

Summary of Findings

Data collected during each stage of the STM trip process provided a more thorough understanding of how CQ development was impacted during that time. While findings were not unanimous across all participants in each case or across all cases, themes emerged that illustrated a majority of the participants’ experiences and how CQ was affected. Findings corresponded with both the propositional constructs derived from a review of the literature and through rival explanations communicated by participants. In order to be identified as a theme for each case, a majority of participants needed to report it. Four of the six participants for the Africa case constituted a majority, two of the three participants for the Asia case constituted a majority, and
three of the four participants for the Europe case constituted a majority. The same majorities were used in the reporting of CQ dimensions.

For the Pre-Field Training stage, findings indicated that a majority of participants from each case reported (a) experiential learning (cultural learning; anticipated cultural immersion) (Cognitive CQ), (b) team member and/or team leader influence (focus of team meetings; team as support system) (Motivational CQ), (c) Christian faith (Metacognitive and Motivational CQ), and (d) personality (Metacognitive and Motivational CQ) as most influential in CQ development, with the corresponding CQ dimension(s) in parentheses. Within each major theme, the sub-themes indicated in parentheses were developed to further explain how and why CQ developed in the participants during the Pre-Field Training stage. Africa team participants also reported a majority finding of the theme of previous cross-cultural experiences, but were varied in their reporting of CQ dimensions. All participants communicated that their team leaders and/or team members influenced their CQ development, and 12 of the 13 participants reported Motivational CQ as the dimension most impacted.

During the On-Field Experience, participants reported the following themes, along with the most prominently indicated sub-themes and CQ dimension noted in parentheses: (a) orientation to the culture (cultural learning; cultural immersion) (Cognitive CQ; Metacognitive, Cognitive, and Behavioral CQ for Asia and Europe), (b) engagement with the locals (cultural exposure; direct interaction) (Cognitive CQ, Metacognitive and Motivational CQ for Africa and Europe), (c) field worker influence (field workers as cultural brokers; genuine love for the culture; debriefing) (Cognitive CQ for Africa and Europe; Motivational CQ for Europe; and Metacognitive CQ for Asia and Europe), (d) team member and/or team leader influence (team as source of encouragement; team as cultural learning tool) (Metacognitive and Motivational CQ
for Africa), (e) time of reflection (Motivational CQ; Cognitive CQ for Asia; and Metacognitive CQ for Europe), and (f) Christian faith (Motivational CQ; Metacognitive CQ for Asia and Europe). In addition, all participants experienced changes to their CQ during the On-Field Experience, with Cognitive CQ as the most prominent dimension developed. All participants reported (a) engagement with the locals and (b) field worker influence as CQ development influencers and noted Cognitive CQ in regards to engagement with the locals.

Upon assessing the Post-Field Debriefing, the required majority of participants noted the following themes and their related sub-themes and CQ dimensions: (a) discussion of experiences (discussion with team members; discussion with non-team members) (Motivational CQ), (b) time for contemplation (no overall CQ dimension indicated), (c) application to participant’s life (career application; other practical application) (Motivational CQ), and (d) Christian faith (Motivational CQ). The entire Africa case also reported the rival theme of team influence (formal team gatherings; informal team gatherings) and specifically identified Motivational CQ. As in the On-Field Experience, all participants experienced changes to their CQ during the six to eight week span of the Post-Field Debriefing stage, with Cognitive CQ rising above the other CQ dimensions. The two themes that emerged across all participants were (a) application to participant’s life and (b) Christian faith. In regards to the theme of religious faith, all participants experienced a development in Motivational CQ.

In summary, all participants noted team leader and/or team member influence for the Pre Field Training, with 12 of the 13 participants noting Motivational CQ; for the On-Field Experience, all participants reported engagement with the locals and field worker influence, with all reporting Cognitive CQ as most impacted in regards to engagement with the locals and all participants experiencing CQ development over the span of the On-Field Experience, with
Cognitive CQ as most influenced; and for the Post-Field Debriefing, all participants reported application to participant’s life and Christian faith, with Motivational CQ most developed through Christian faith, as well as having experienced CQ development over the span of the Post-Field Debriefing stage, with Cognitive CQ most impacted. Across the entire STM trip process, Christian faith appeared in every stage.

**Discussion**

Reviewing the STM trip process in each of its respective stages and also as a whole sheds light on the implications of how the structure, personnel, and intentionality of the STM trip plays a role in shaping an individual’s effectiveness in cross-cultural interactions. Each stage contained specific components designed to foster CQ development, deepen participants’ faith, and create unity among team members. With the continued growth of STM trip programs, this study adds to the empirical research that has recently been lacking in regards to assessment of STM trip outcomes (Lough & McBride, 2012; Machin, 2008; Sherraden et al., 2008) and addresses ways in which programs can be intentional in their operations, personnel choices, and long-term community partnership (Smith & Font, 2015). Each stage of the STM trip process is detailed below, with references to previous research, how this study adds to it, and ways in which this study furthers current findings.

**Pre-Field Training**

For this specific STM trip program, participants found that intentional times of corporate training with fellow teammates and other teams, in addition to individual team meeting times, impacted CQ development during the Pre-Field Training stage, as was illustrated in the sub-theme of cultural learning, and provides for further research in how CQ develops among individuals in relation to cross-cultural training and pre-departure courses (Harrison & Brower,
The Department of Global Engagement (DGE) fully believed in preparing students holistically for their experiences abroad, and required workshops focused on CQ, safety and security, and faith integration, which informed and trained the students to engage responsibly and appropriately within a cultural context. Bennet and Eberts (2015), Kamdar and Lewis (2015), and Woods and St. Peters (2015) called for more well-rounded Pre-Field Training that would ultimately produce desired outcomes through short-term volunteer trips. Team leader trainings, team member trainings, and team meetings all helped the DGE to re-emphasize the overall desired outcome of an increased understanding, appreciation, and love for culturally different others within the Christian context; this is a marriage of CQ and faith, which echoes Priest’s (2006) finding that ethnocentrism could be decreased when short-term Pre-Field Training incorporates intentional cross-cultural learning exercises. Communicating this outcome to all participants in DGE’s program via various routes set a desired outcome in place that could be assessed during all stages of the STM trip. Also, the length of training, typically for five to six months prior to departure, added to the literature that assessed the ideal amount of time needed to influence CQ development (MacNab, 2012).

All participants noted that their team members and team leaders impacted their CQ development, primarily Motivational CQ, evidencing the important role these individuals play. Participants expressed that both the focus of the team meetings and the role that the team played as a support system specifically related to their CQ development. Priest (2006) found that incorporating peer and social support, and collective reflection, which occurred in team meetings, may influence cross-cultural effectiveness on the field. Priest’s findings were further supported in the reporting of the team as a support system. Participants noted that team leaders and team members helped to develop Motivational CQ both before and during the trip, as the
social support of others impacted their confidence and ability to interact. This further supports Moynihan, Peterson, and Earley’s (2006) research that found that CQ development is positively related to group cohesion, efficacy, and trust. These team leaders shape expectations about the STM trip, its goals, and how it’s carried out, all of which affects the development process of CQ in the Pre-Field Training stage (Livermore, 2013; MacNab, 2011). The importance of team unity, as it reflects the Christian body of believers, was affirmed throughout trainings and meetings. Getting all team members on the same page and in the same spirit of unity from the beginning aligned each team’s overarching goal of serving together on field. It is no surprise that Motivational CQ was the dimension most impacted, as it relies on ones self-efficacy and intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Team members and leaders served to both provide extrinsic motivation and contribute to self-efficacy, as the anticipated shared experience of cross-cultural work eased anxiety and created excitement. As a study by Chirkov, Safdar, de Guzman, and Playford (2008) indicated motivation predicts psychological and sociocultural adaption over time, so the development of Motivational CQ can be quite beneficial to the On-Field Experience. The six to seven months these teams had to prepare together created relationships that would benefit the entire time on field.

**On-Field Experience**

The On-Field Experience contained intentional elements such as orientations, field hosts who have lived and worked within the cultural context for an extended period of time, and consistent engagement with the local people. These elements impacted participant CQ development in the DGE’s experience, but also in previous research (Crawford-Mathis, 2010; Crowne, 2007; MacNab, 2011; Woods & St. Peters, 2014), and addressed the lack of research regarding other elements besides length of stay and number of countries visited that positively
impact CQ (Tarique & Takeuchi, 2008). This study found that cultural exposure and consistent direct interaction specifically impacted CQ development, as elements such as local transportation, cuisine, educational settings, homestays, and daily conversing with the local people were deemed highly beneficial. This adds to the limited research on types of cultural exposure that affect CQ (Ang et al., 2007; Crowne, 2013; Woods & St. Peters, 2014), especially as consistent direct interaction with people was one of the most effective methods of growing CQ. Studies have highlighted the positive impact direct interaction with the local culture has had on cultural knowledge acquisition, like homestays and working alongside the locals (Priest et al., 2004), as well as how cultural distance is a single significant predictor of adaptation problems (Ward, 2011). These types of first-hand cultural encounters, both planned and organic, have been shown to decrease ethnocentrism and impact CQ (MacNab, 2011; Priest et al., 2006). Joplin’s (1995) Experiential Education Model suggests concrete experiences provide for cultural adaptation and adjustment. These concrete experiences (e.g., conversations, transportation, meals, observations, etc.), along with team debriefs throughout the On-Field Experience that are necessary when engaging in new cultural experiences according to Cultural Learning Theory (MacNab, 2011), impacted the participants’ CQ and allowed for a deeper understanding of how and why CQ develops.

The impact of the field workers who hosted the teams throughout their entire stay in country sheds more light on the role these hosts play in participants’ CQ development. Specifically, participants benefitted from the field workers who served as cultural brokers, guided them through their On-Field Experience, translated both language and experiences, answered questions, and taught them how to act through verbal instructions and intentional modeling. Crowne (2008) raised the question of whether there is more impact on Cognitive CQ
when training is received in the home culture versus the host culture. With participants commenting that they would have liked to have had more pre-field experiential learning opportunities but then championing the on-field orientations and the role the field workers played in teaching them about the culture first-hand, including immersive activities around the city, continual in-the-moment training, and purposeful debriefs so that the participants could process and make sense of the culture, this study illustrates the need for both. Even if a highly knowledgeable person from that culture provided pre-field training, the learning opportunities available in the country will always provide a more authentic learning experience. However, the added opportunity for growth comes through those that are guiding the learning experience.

**Post-Field Debriefing**

The Post-Field Debriefing is another intentional time in the process of the STM trip. Participants noted that both formal team gatherings such as team debrief meetings, and informal team gatherings such as lunches, group text messages, and study sessions provided for times in which community could continue to be fostered, on-field experiences could be discussed, and future cross-cultural opportunities could be brainstormed. As in the Pre-Field Training stage, this further supports Moynihan et al.’s (2006) findings that group cohesion is positively tied to CQ development. As the hope of the DGE is to see students transformed in some way or another by these STM trips, a formal team debrief offers an opportunity to discuss, unpack, and process through the on-field time. As many STM trip returners often feel frustrated, indifferent, or upset with their home culture, most referred to a reverse culture shock. These times of debriefing allow participants to share their processing experiences and receive affirmation that they are not alone. As the last step in the experiential education model (Joplin, 1995), debrief, or reflection, is absolutely necessary in making sense of what was experienced and what it means for the future.
This is also echoed in Cultural Learning Theory, which states that reflection is necessary when engaging with new cultural experiences (MacNab, 2011). This was confirmed when participants reported debriefing as instrumental in the application of the trip’s outcomes to their lives. Without the ability and opportunity to question, consider, and assign meaning to the international experience, no application can take place—that is the “what this means for the future” part. Participants noted that both the ability to apply the STM trip experiences to their majors and in the future to their careers, along with other practical application, gave the experience new meaning and provided for anticipation of future cross-cultural opportunities.

Many participants noted how helpful the re-entry devotional provided by the DGE was, as it spoke directly to their post-field experiences, thoughts, and feelings while always asking, “What is God communicating through this all?” The fact that all participants reported Christian faith as most impacting CQ development makes sense, as all participants wrestled with the outcome of their cross-cultural experiences and how God wanted to use it in their lives. The marrying of CQ development and spiritual growth, a desired outcome of the DGE in these trips, was evidenced through the entire STM trip process.

Upon examining participants’ CQ T1 and T2 scores in relation to their narrative reporting, participants admitted that their initial CQ self-assessments may have been unrealistically high, as they became more aware of the challenges of interacting cross-culturally once immersed in the culture. In a study by Fischer (2011), student’s Cognitive and Metacognitive CQ decreased after several sessions of intercultural training, which suggests that those experiences enhanced their awareness of actual cross-cultural interactions. Allowing the participants to self-assess in a variety of ways (interviews, journaling, CQS) before, during, and
after the STM trip provided a more informed perspective from which to reflect and authentically develop CQ.

**STM Trip Process**

The intentionality of each stage in the STM trip process worked together as a whole to develop students in their ability and desire to interact cross-culturally, but also in their spiritual walk. Throughout the entire STM trip process, Christian faith emerged as a rival explanation. The foundational belief and trust in God’s hand in participants’ lives, in the wisdom He would provide, and in the people He placed in the entire trip process were key factors in how and why CQ developed through this specific STM trip model. Many expressed that God’s prompting and leading were the ultimate reasons why they joined their respective teams. The team leaders entered into their positions with similar motivations of God’s leading, thus placing the overarching theme of Christian faith at the center of each team. Believing that God had created them to love and serve others propelled them to engage. This finding extends the theory of CQ, as a deeper purpose was referenced in regards to interacting cross-culturally. While much of this study placed the rival theme of Christian faith under the Motivation CQ dimension, the desire and calling to interact with those who are culturally different can arguably be classified as distinct from Motivational CQ. Motivational CQ considers intrinsic and extrinsic interests when interacting cross-culturally, but professing one’s faith as a motivation itself does not necessarily fit within either type of interest, as the purpose was to glorify God and not for personal benefit. Other religions beyond the Christian faith serve and interact with culturally different others in the same vein as well, attributing their service to a greater purpose beyond their own selves. This separate or even central dimension drives the desire and ability to interact cross-culturally.
Whether an intrinsic, extrinsic, or a separate source of motivation altogether, the desire and willingness to engage is clearly evident in the 10 million volunteers who traveled during 2015 (Georgeo, 2016), and the 22,000 U.S. college students who traveled abroad from 2013-2014 in service capacities. While not all motives are pure, as a stigma surrounds volunteer tourism and the selfish desires of participants (Wesby, 2015), the desire to help and love others is there, however small and imperfect. Secular and faith-based organizations are calling for more regulations in the volunteer tourism sector, as the commercial drive of the industry overshadows the adverse effects these trips have on the local populations or their own participants (Georgeo, 2016).

It is interesting to note that the findings of this study suggest that the most impactful components of the trip relate to some type of relationship, whether between teammates, team members and team leaders, the team and the field hosts, team members and the locals, or the team members and God. Cultural Intelligence gauges, informs, and improves an individual’s ability to relate to another human being from a different cultural context. The fact that relationships were reported as impacting that ability most illustrates that CQ cannot be developed apart from intentional interaction with others, which adds to the qualitative literature on how a variety of cross-cultural interactions affects CQ (Ang et al., 2007). In order to understand and appreciate another, a desire and willingness to enter into relationship must be present. These findings echo prior research that established that true cultural understanding and cross-cultural interaction is developed through intentional engagement (Crawford-Mathis, 2010; Crowne, 2007; MacNab, 2011; Woods & St. Peters, 2014). While exposure to cultural sites, artifacts, and other representations can certainly increase one’s CQ, engagement with people from the culture allows for a more realistic and holistic development experience and answers the lack of
Crowne’s (2013) study examined how cultural exposure influenced emotional and cultural intelligence in 371 students from a large university in the northeastern United States. While no significant relationship was found between cultural exposure and emotional intelligence, Crowne found that cultural exposure had significant influence on cultural intelligence, in regards to both depth of experience and breadth of experience. This study provided further data to support not only the number of trips abroad, but also intentional consistent engagement with the locals as contributors to Cultural Intelligence. Crowne also illustrated the necessity for further studies that use different research methods, including narrative forms to better understand this relationship.

The extent to which participants communicated the benefit of their teammates and team leaders cannot go unnoticed. The fact that all participants spoke of the impact their teammates had on their Motivational CQ illustrates how instrumental a supportive, encouraging, and like-minded team is in an experience like a STM trip, which further supports Priest’s (2006) findings that peer and social support impact cultural effectiveness. Being surrounded by those experiencing the same excitement, anxieties, questions, and preparation created a shared experience for the teams, which bonded them even further. This shared experience encouraged the team members and gave them confidence for their future cross-cultural interactions. Meeting months before the teams even departed for their international locations, each team was able to establish common goals, build and strengthen the team bond, and develop individual relationships with each other that would then carry them through their on-field time. While not all STM trip teams have this advantage or even understand the importance of such preparation for their on-field time, much can be learned through these participants’ experiences in doing so.
Implications and Recommendations

This study provides a deeper understanding of how the STM trip as a whole, and in its distinct stages, develops CQ in undergraduate students. The individual stakeholders in the STM trip process certainly affect the students’ experiences, preparation, spiritual growth, and CQ development. In this section, implications found through this study are discussed in regards to the individual stages of the STM trip process and the stakeholders involved.

Pre-Field Training

The stakeholders involved in the Pre-Field Training stage impact how participants will develop CQ. These stakeholders include those working to coordinate and execute STM trips, the students or participants, themselves, and the team leaders that will both facilitate training and build team unity before the trip, but also guide team members throughout the On-Field Experience and Post-Field Debriefing stages.

STM trip programs and staff. For those overseeing STM trip programs, volunteer trip programs, or even study abroad programs, the implications for practice drawn from this study are many. Intentionality within any type of transformative experience like short-term international trips will drive the content, practice, preparation, and type of personnel involved. All programs need to start with the creation of desired outcomes. Without an end goal in mind, it is impossible to design and implement a holistic and transformative program experience. This specific department set out with the goal of exposing students to a variety of cultural settings and experiences within an immersive and service-oriented context, thus developing CQ, spiritual growth, and a continued desire to be involved in cross-cultural interactions. With this goal at the forefront of planning, locations, field workers, time of year, training, and team leaders were all carefully chosen in an effort to facilitate the goal. Program providers would benefit from
identifying both the overarching vision and mission of the organization or university, along with their own department or program’s mission, in order to ensure that both align in the facilitation of the STM trip program. Also, open discussion among key players in the organization and program office would ensure that policies and procedures are followed as the program office sets out to develop program-specific trainings, team leader criteria, participant requirements, or other areas within the STM trip program structure.

In the Pre-Field Training stage, STM trip programs must carefully consider and select trip locations. Locations where teams had previously traveled and consistently returned a good report by the students, team leaders, and field hosts were first on the list for that year’s trip locations. A good report constituted consistent engagement with the local population, holistic service opportunities that engaged the students physically, mentally, spiritually, and emotionally, and were part of a long-term effort by the field workers, who utilized these trips to mentor and disciple the students and could serve as a possible site for global internships. If a location had not been used before, a thorough questionnaire was administered to the field hosts that included questions in all of the aforementioned areas. Personal references were sought from those who had visited those locations and/or worked with the field workers. These criteria used by the DGE serve as a starting point for new STM trip programs, and can certainly help in evaluating established program’s location selection procedures. In addition, the ideal time of year for the trip was explored through surveying the field workers and looking at the time needed for travel versus the length of the school break. Although a team did go to Africa for a somewhat short amount of time (eight days in country), the field workers had requested this time of year because of the high temperatures during the summer and the absence of field workers during the Christmas holidays. The time of year should be carefully considered by STM trip providers, in
conjunction with those on the field who know the culture best, its weather patterns, holidays, and their own availability, as well as total length of the time in country versus the total amount of travel time needed. Program providers should take into consideration the ultimate goals of the program and how those goals will be facilitated through a five-day stay in Africa versus a 10-day stay in Europe, when only a short university school break is available. Longer amounts of cultural exposure and engagement have been shown to develop CQ, which would favor travel during a longer school break.

Once locations had been secured for the school year, the STM trip program staff began looking through a list of past team leaders and recommended new team leaders. These leaders had to have proven themselves as responsible, experienced international travelers who were employed by the university and could help foster spiritual growth and assist in preparing the students ahead of time, process the students’ experiences in country, work alongside the field workers in a productive manner, and debrief with the students upon return. These criteria helped to facilitate the goals set in place by this program, as team leaders would be driving much of what the team did before, during, and after the trip. STM trip providers should identify the specific responsibilities and expectations of a team leader in their program, including the Pre-Field Training, On-Field Experience, and Post-Field Debriefing, so that a realistic set of criteria is in place when either developing a team leader application or recruitment process. Also, having a team leader agreement in place that outlines the specific expectations of team leaders, including required meetings and trainings, team meeting expectations, behavior expectations, and consequences for when expectations are not met, provides further communication to team leaders of their role in the STM trip program. As was evidenced in this study, the participants
credited portions of their CQ development to their team leaders, who fulfilled the role of spiritual
guide, training facilitator, support system, and debrief lead.

Training in any international trip program is of utmost importance, as cultural training,
safety training, and spiritual training is necessary for the intentional, holistic development of
participants. This specific office employed several required training workshops that focused on
fundraising, safety and security, CQ, and the gospel and personal testimony, which can certainly
be added to, or altered, as a religious or secular STM trip program would see fit. In addition,
each team was required to meet at least once a week so that culture-specific training, team
bonding, discussion, and prayer could take place. Participants noted that the trainings were
beneficial in preparing them for the field time ahead, both in how they should approach a
different cultural setting and how they could effectively share their faith while maintaining a
respectful and safe presence in the community. STM trip programs absolutely must include some
sort of pre-trip orientation, training, or meeting that brings the team together for a time of
introduction, practical cultural and travel training, and an opportunity for questions. I would
recommend at least one team meeting a month prior to the team’s departure, in addition to two to
four specific trainings related to international travel and the program’s goals (e.g. spiritual
growth, volunteering, working well within a team, etc.), but have seen instances where intensive
training weekends have been beneficial as well.

**Students.** Students should be given adequate opportunities to ask questions and seek
advice in applying for a STM trip program. Short windows for the application process can inhibit
a student’s ability to make a sound decision and actually follow through with their commitment.
However, having too open of an application window can inhibit commitment; a “sweet spot”
should be discussed and instituted by the program office. Students should seek out ways in which
they can find out more about the opportunities available to them through proactive means, such as attending travel fairs, visiting the program office, and talking to those who have traveled previously. Program providers should allow for these opportunities through promotional events, informational booths in high-traffic student areas, and adequate office hours for in-person visits and calls.

The student participants in this program were screened and interviewed prior to acceptance to a team. In doing so, the program staff were able to evaluate a student’s motive for participation, previous international experience, and medical history in relation to the potential challenges of the requested trip. They would then review references and speak to the student in person about the trip, its demands and training requirements, and allow for questions from the student. In looking at the program’s ultimate goal to develop students holistically, this time of evaluation allowed for a careful examination of the personalities going into such a team-oriented and service-oriented, culturally immersive experience and how they would function. Students and program providers should consider a student’s suiting for a STM trip, being realistic and open to other possible options.

Students were required to attend training workshops alongside their own and other team members, as well as attend one to two team meetings a month. Students also had the option to attend culture-specific trainings with fellow teams, such as Islam and Hinduism workshops. Participants in this study commented that these culture-specific trainings were very beneficial in helping them to further understand the culture in which they would serve. Team meetings provided time in which to grow closer as teammates, share international experiences, learn more about their anticipated culture, and bond spiritually through prayer and Scripture, as they focused their efforts on being the hands and feet of Jesus. These times provided the confidence both in
themselves and their team to carry out meaningful interactions and times of service on the ground, which illustrates the need for students to take seriously the purpose of these meetings and be willing to be open and honest with their teammates. STM trip programs should also try to communicate the importance of these team meetings and training times, as it will ultimately prepare them to engage cross-culturally within a team dynamic.

**Team leaders.** Team leaders were carefully selected by the program staff based on previous experience and recommendations. Those that had either served in a STM trip leader capacity previously, had lived overseas, or traveled internationally and been connected with the office were asked to lead a trip. Team leaders met similar training requirements, including the same workshops as the students, team meetings, team leader meetings that involved all team leaders, and meetings with the trip’s coordinator. These times of accountability, training, discussion, and bonding allowed for the development of team leaders and teams that could foster spiritual growth, oversee safety and security measures during the trip, facilitate debriefs on the field, lead intentional and productive team meetings, and follow-up with team members after the trip concerning their experiences and what God was teaching them. Setting and communicating expectations for team leaders during the application and recruitment process is vital of STM trip programs, as they seek to send out teams with capable and effective leaders at the helm. Also, requiring team leaders to not only attend the same trainings as team participants but also trainings with their fellow team leaders, is a benefit in further developing and encouraging them to share challenges and gain wisdom from both new and experienced team leaders and leader-specific training.
On-Field Experience

The On-Field Experience includes the same stakeholders as the Pre-Field Training stage, but with one important addition, the field hosts. These field hosts oversee the entire in-country time, guiding participants through cultural exchanges, which will impact how they develop CQ during this portion of the STM trip process.

STM trip programs and staff. STM trip programs should have an emergency protocol in place during the On-Field time, since they are ultimately responsible for the well-being of the participants. The larger organization or university should also have some sort of risk management department in place that seeks to provide guidance and oversight of international travel-related risks. While safety and security training is helpful to prepare teams, a plan of action is needed in the event something were to happen in transit or in country.

Students. During the On-Field time, students were expected to participate in daily activities with their team and field hosts. Team leaders and field hosts consistently reminded them to remain flexible, as the field time might not always turn out like planned. This helped students to maintain a sense of ease, as they realized that they could not be in control during this time. Also, much of what the students experienced during the week was covered in orientations given by the field hosts and helped to set realistic expectations from the beginning. Students found that engaging in the various activities and events provided them with increased Motivational CQ, which carried them into an intentional week of subsequent engagement. To help students make the most of these experiences, team leaders and field hosts should communicate expectations at the beginning of the trip, but also remind students of the ultimate purpose for being there, while encouraging them to interact and modeling healthy CQ. Students
should enter into this experience with a flexible, team-oriented attitude, that will make the experience that much more enjoyable and beneficial.

**Team leaders.** Team leaders served in multiple capacities on these STM trip teams, as safety czar, psychologist, parent, cultural guide, and sometimes mediator. Having the students’ well-being at heart, while also respecting the authority and experience of the field hosts, helped the team leaders to balance their On-Field Experience responsibilities well. This came from clear expectations given by the DGE before the teams departed and helped the team leaders to understand that their co-lead was their greatest resource. Team leaders relied on each other for wisdom in dealing with team dynamics, health concerns, and cultural navigation. Team leaders should have a plan in place for who oversees what responsibilities while in country, in addition to protocol for how to handle different kinds of situations. As every team leader pairing or group is different, team leaders should understand and know how those pairings may affect their actual ability to lead when in country.

**Field hosts.** Field host influence was another theme that all participants reported as impacting CQ for On-Field Experience. The experience of the field hosts within their respective cultures, and usually within the team’s home culture, provided a unique bridge between cultures. All field host teams contained a mix of expatriates and locals, which allowed for the opportunity to learn from individuals from the culture and those who had learned to navigate it already. This afforded the participants a variety of cross-cultural interactions, which further developed CQ. It also gave them different perspectives of the local culture, which built and re-built their cultural framework. Field hosts should absolutely play to the strength of their varied ages, life experiences, genders, ethnicities, and cultures. Each field host should be given both the opportunity to speak to the STM trip team as a whole, and to showcase his or her work or
ministry within the culture, as participants will often personally connect with a specific trait or interest of a field host.

The field hosts coordinated the entire on-field time, being as intentional as they could to expose the teams to different facets of the local culture each day. They coordinated the entire On-Field Experience for months in advance, while maintaining an attitude of flexibility and daily communicating the need for that attitude to the team. The participants could sense the careful consideration that went into their experiences and commented on the benefit these field workers were to the entire time in country. This allowed for a high level of trust in the field workers, their judgments about certain situations, their wisdom during times of debrief, and the ultimate purpose they were serving in that community as role models to the students. Field hosts should seek to plan intentional immersive experiences for the students that illustrate their love for that culture and its people, as well as their desire to see the STM trip team learn and grow through their engagement with the culture. Field hosts can also benefit from connecting with the STM trip team ahead of time through video-chat to become more familiar with the team, its interests, strengths, and expectations.

**Post-Field Debriefing**

During the Post-Field Debriefing stage, STM trip staff, students, and team leaders, all play a part in continuing to develop CQ in the students. Each has a unique role in the STM trip process, and will affect how the students process their On-Field Experience.

**STM trip programs and staff.** This specific STM trip office offered and required several Post-Field Debriefing activities, such as team debriefs, team leader debriefs, and a celebratory event where all teams attended and were able to present what they experienced and learned from their time in country. These opportunities further facilitated the program goals of
developing participants’ hearts for other cultures alongside their ability and desire to interact cross-culturally. STM trip programs should plan for purposeful times of debriefing and celebration after a trip, so that participants, team leaders, and the program staff can hear how these STM trips impacted the students personally. This not only encourages those involved, but provides ways in which processing can occur and feedback can be gathered to improve the program itself.

**Students.** Students used the debriefing time to meet corporately with their teams, alone for personal reflection, and with friends and family to process their experiences. A debriefing devotional was provided by the DGE so that participants would have a resource during the re-acclimation period. As some had trouble transitioning back into their home culture, this resource, along with different forms of debrief, were shown to bring support and comfort to participants. Both students and program providers should seek out ways in which participants can meaningfully process and make sense of their STM trip experiences for at least the eight weeks following a STM trip, as research has shown that as the mark at which participants either have experienced a genuine development in CQ, or will revert to their pre-field attitudes (Livermore, 2013).

**Team leaders.** After the trip was over, team leaders were debriefed together by the trip’s coordinator in order to gather feedback about all aspects of the trip process, answer any questions, and to their ability and willingness to lead in the future. Team leaders see the value in these debriefs, as it allows them to openly discuss their role as a leader, including the challenges, pitfalls, and privileges that come with leading young people in such a unique experience. All STM trip programs would benefit from holding team leader debriefings as a way to assess the
field hosts, location, team leaders, and students, but also to further encourage the team leader’s own CQ development as they process their experience.

As was evidenced in this study, a cross-cultural trip that is consistently immersive and engaging is a necessary component in helping students to more realistically assess their own CQ. In their T2 scores, participants noted that the On-Field Experience allowed them to truly measure their CQ in real-time, as they interacted within a cross-cultural setting. Working through cultural barriers, re-working cultural paradigms, and attempting to approach culturally-different others through appropriate and effective strategies and behavior within the context of CQ development necessitate cross-cultural experiences to do so. This will then enable students to accurately assess their own CQ and develop a plan for continued growth.

**Delimitations and Limitations**

In every study, delimitations and limitations are directly or indirectly applied and impact the degree to which data can be collected and analyzed, and therefore, ultimately how far-reaching it will be. Delimitations for this study included the status of students included, as only undergraduate students served as participants and a minimum GPA of 2.0 was required. Students also had to be a part of one of the teams selected for study. The setting for the study, Lynwell University, an evangelical Christian university, served as the bounded system for this study. The cases themselves all operated out of the same short-term mission trip program at Lynwell and required certain criteria of the participants, such as a personal testimony to conversion. The time of year the trips traveled, during spring break, was chosen so that participants would have adequate time on campus after the trip’s return to complete Post-Field Debriefing data collection.
Limitations of this study included the individual nuances of the participants and team leaders, the location of the STM trips, and the work and ministry of the team once on the field. Participants and team leaders both brought personal nuances with them, such as cross-cultural experience and STM trip experience, which could affect the beginning CQ of participants and how the team leaders approached Pre-Field Training. Some locations of the STM trips may have lent themselves to more engagement with the local population, easier language acquisition, or other cross-cultural experiences that not all of the STM trips possessed. This could lead to a greater impact on a student’s CQ development. Also, the DGE only sends trips to South America, Asia, Europe, and Africa, thus limiting the possible cases, in addition to the spring break trips not including a South America option. Lastly, the planned work or ministry on the field by the field hosts may have presented greater opportunities for CQ development, as well as greater involvement of the field hosts with the team. This may have presented more opportunities for questions, discussions, and other learning opportunities that could have impacted CQ development.

In this study, the small sample sizes of each case presented limited qualitative data, which impacted the degree to which themes could be found within and across cases, as was evidenced in the Asia team. Enlarging the sample sizes would have allowed for a deeper saturation of the data. Including data collection from the team leaders, on-field hosts, and others involved in the STM trip process would also have provided for different perspectives and further triangulation of the data. The fact that participants removed themselves from the study at different points in the data collection or did not complete all data collection instruments, also limited the findings.

Because CQ is an interrelated concept, with all dimensions flowing into and out of each other while also remaining distinct, the probability of participants discussing their CQ in light of
more than one dimension at a time was high. This was evidenced in comments that were dual-loaded with more than one CQ dimension and therefore coded as such. Data analysis had to take these instances into account, which at times limited how findings could be reported. Also, the Cultural Intelligence Scale was a self-report assessment, which limits the validity and accuracy of the scores. In some cases, participants scored themselves lower in the CQ T2, as they realized that their initial T1 scores were naively inflated. Including other forms of data collection at different points in the STM trip allows participants to more accurately reflect on CQ development from an informed perspective and through both qualitative and quantitative methods. Although participants expressed CQ development through their narrative data sources, their scores, in some instances, reflected a decrease. This may be attributed to the reporting of unrealistic T1 scores in the beginning, whereas a truly accurate score would corroborate that growth in CQ as well. A self-report measure, although useful, can muddy the validity of findings.

Lastly, human error comes into play when analyzing qualitative data. Exercising human discernment in how to code data, despite using objective measures, can result in mis-coding. While I referenced CQ literature and other research when coding, there is still a possibility to interpret and analyze data incorrectly, or to analyze it in different ways depending on circumstances.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

For future studies, I would recommend a more focused concentration on each of the STM trip stages, with studies conducting thorough investigations into all of the various aspects of each stage. As research has called for more well-rounded and intentional Pre-Field Training time, a multiple case study could compare and contrast different STM trip programs and their Pre-Field
Training, including length of preparation, type of trainings, team meeting content, team leader development, and program staff contribution. It would be interesting to compare a program like the one in this study to a traditional mission organization that offers STM trips, and also to a church that runs STM trips. Focus could be put on the stakeholders involved, such as the participants, team leaders, program staff, and workshop trainers. In comparing these different program providers, the dynamic of each allowing different ages of participants than just undergraduate university students could prove problematic, but also provide interesting insights into how these ages impact the team as a whole, and how different maturity levels approach and process CQ development. Participants’ prior travel experiences and the extent to which those were immersive could provide for a deeper understanding of how CQ is developed in subsequent cross-cultural experiences. Personality traits, Emotional Intelligence, and family structure could all be considered in relation to how participants develop CQ. A different focus could be on the training and preparation itself, as research has shown that experiential learning leads to a deeper understanding of and respect for cultural interactions (MacNab, 2012). As some participants noted the lack of experiential learning in the Pre-Field Training and the desire to have more culture-specific training, the effect of different types of training programs could be explored.

For the On-Field Experience, a deeper look at the host culture and how it aligns or differs from the home culture could provide for understanding in how CQ develops more easily in some locations than others. A grounded theory study examining CQ development in American participants in a western culture versus an eastern or African culture would provide richer insights into the type of Pre-Field Training and On-Field Experience components necessary for CQ development in each. A quantitative study taking into consideration participants’ experience with a culture prior to the trip, versus those who have had no prior experience, and their
subsequent CQ development, could provide for a closer examination in how to utilize those participants in affecting others’ CQ development on the trip. The field host component should also be a point of focus, as the environment they create for participants, the support they show, and their intimate connection to the host culture all play a part in how the student will interpret, process, and interact within it. Again, a multiple case study could be performed, comparing field hosts from various sites or within the same organization, both religious and secular, in an effort to examine how their experience, training, personalities, work in the county, family structures, and external support systems impact their ability to host short-term trip teams.

The Post-Field Debriefing should be researched beyond the six-to-eight week timeframe in a longitudinal study, as long-term effects of the trip experience are noted, including continued CQ development, career choices, volunteer efforts, and cross-cultural involvement. A grounded theory study, or narrative, could be completed for those students who had ultimately gone from a STM trip in their undergraduate career to an international assignment. Also, debriefing practices should be examined, as it was clear in this study that personal and group processing played an important role in participants’ abilities to re-acclimate to their home culture and make sense of their experiences. Factors such as type and setting of debrief, characteristics of those with whom participants can most effectively debrief, and length of the debriefing period are all areas of future research.

**Conclusion**

The purpose of this collective case study was to examine how the STM trip develops CQ in undergraduate students. Through varied data collection methods throughout each of the three stages of the STM trip process (Pre-Field Training, On-Field Experience, and Post-Field Debriefing), participants reported specific themes that impacted their CQ development. Across
the entire STM trip process, participants reported religious faith as having impacted their desire and ability to engage in cross-cultural interactions. Participants consistently communicated this in both the Pre-Field Training and Post-Field Debriefing interviews and the On-Field Experience journals. Participants credited their Christian faith with instilling in them a deeper purpose to interact cross-culturally, which then drove their desire to interact and to improve in CQ. Their faith also supplied them with the confidence, wisdom, and comfort needed to effectively and intentionally engage with culturally-different others, and helped them process their experiences in a meaningful and applicable way. Many walked away with a newfound respect, love, and interest in the culture they experienced, with either a continued or newly-formed desire to pursue cross-cultural experiences. This finding is significant because it illustrates how faith provides for a deeper purpose in cross-cultural interactions, in that connecting with humanity out of a desire to know them personally and understand their culture is an important primer to CQ development.

In the Pre-Field Training stage, all participants reported team member and team leader influence on their CQ, with 12 of 13 reporting an impact on Motivational CQ. Peer support in this stage over the course of five to six months helped to create team unity and trust that could be seen in the increased confidence and desire to interact cross-culturally, both as individuals and as a team. Pre-Field Training that involves concentrated and intentional time with the team can produce higher levels of belief in one’s ability, simply by having a solid support system that can empathize.

For the On-Field Experience, all participants found that engagement with the locals through transportation, discussions, educational settings, restaurants, and cultural activities among other things developed their CQ, specifically their Cognitive CQ. Building a cultural framework requires actual engagement with a culture to truly learn about and understand the
inner-workings of a culture. Participants found that the daily, immersive nature of these trips led to greater culture-general knowledge and culture-specific knowledge. Also, all participants communicated that the field workers influenced their CQ development with the wisdom they shared regarding the culture, the intentional planning of the time in country, and the care they showed in debriefs to help participants more fully process their experiences. This gave participants a greater desire and ability to engage with the culture. These findings illustrate the importance of carefully planned On-Field Experience time that will seek to develop CQ on a daily basis, especially for such a short time in country. While a tour or vacation can certainly expose one to a culture, it cannot benefit the participant in the same way immersive engagement can.

For the Post-Field Debriefing stage, all participants noted both application to their lives and religious faith as influencing CQ development, with all also noting Motivational CQ in regards to religious faith. Once returned from their travels, participants began the arduous journey of unpacking their experiences and making sense of them all. Compounded by the busyness of school, work, friendships, and other obligations, the task of trying to process through what they had experienced, what it had taught them, and how they could carry those lessons with them was aided by turning to their Christian faith. This deep-held belief in a power and purpose greater than themselves provided an avenue through which to seek wisdom and understanding. It also led them to see God’s purpose in these experiences and how He would use them in both the present and the future. Confirming the already-held desire to engage cross-culturally, their faith grew this desire even more as they were led to explore new cross-cultural opportunities, even as far as declaring a Global Studies minor and seeking out international internship possibilities. On a smaller scale, participants identified local ways they could engage cross-culturally, like
interacting with international students and seeking out cultural events, thus applying the impact of the STM trip experience to their lives and continuing the development of CQ. As faith played a major role in helping participants to process, fellow team members, team leaders, and family and friends were also key in bringing about a deeper understanding of their experiences. The support system available after the trip is key in facilitating meaningful debrief and subsequent application in STM trip participants. An intentional time and system of debrief is necessary in the transitioning of STM trip participants into their home culture and on a path of continued CQ development.

The findings of this study continually echo the importance of intentionality throughout the entire STM trip process. Each stage of the STM trip process and its components are vital in the development of CQ, as participants will be impacted in different ways. Creating a truly immersive, engaging, and reflective international experience that develops CQ requires a team of people that values the transformation of participants, which will bring about intentional practices and programs.
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CONSENT FORM

THE ROLE OF THE SHORT-TERM MISSION TRIP PROCESS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF CULTURAL INTELLIGENCE IN UNIVERSITY STUDENTS: A COLLECTIVE CASE STUDY

Ashley Haygood
Education Department

Your Global Team, and specifically a sample of its team members, are invited to be in a study of how the short-term mission trip process develops Cultural Intelligence in undergraduate students. Your team and its members were selected because you will be traveling during the 2014-2015 Spring break and the team members are undergraduate students. A sample of your team members will be asked to participate in this study, after you have given consent to allow your team to participate. Potential participants will also be given a consent form similar to this. I ask that you read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to be in the study.

This study is being conducted by Ashley E. Haygood, School of Education.

Background Information:

The purpose of the study is to discover how, if at all, the short-term mission trip process develops Cultural Intelligence in undergraduate students. There are three research questions. How does undergraduate students’ Cultural Intelligence develop through participation in pre-field training of a short-term mission trip? How does undergraduate students’ Cultural Intelligence develop through participation in the on-field experience of a short-term mission trip? How does undergraduate students’ Cultural Intelligence develop through participation in the post-field debriefing of a short-term mission trip?

Procedures:

If undergraduate team members agree to be in this study, they will be asked to do the following things:

- Before your first team meeting, complete a Cultural Intelligence scale and demographic survey, which will be emailed to you and each will take no more than 20 minutes to complete. Both items can be emailed back to the researcher.
- Between your last team meeting and team’s departure in February or March, 2015, be interviewed by the researcher. The interview is semi-structured (there is a specific list of questions that will be asked to each person) and should take between 30 and 60 minutes. The interview will be audio recorded so it can be transcribed. The audio recording and the transcription will be kept on a password protected external hard drive in the
researcher’s home. Each participant will be allowed to review the transcription of the interview for accuracy.

- Complete journaling prompts while on your trip, which should take between 10 minutes to one hour, depending on which prompts are listed each day. Some days may have no prompts to answer for that day. Journaling may be done in written format, or digitally on a computer, or other device. Completed journals are asked to be returned within one week of your team’s return.

- Within six weeks after your team’s return, complete a post-Cultural Intelligence scale. This will take no more than 10-20 minutes and will be emailed to you by the researcher. It can be emailed back to the researcher upon completion.

- Within six to eight weeks after your team’s return, be interviewed by the researcher. The interview is semi-structured (there is a specific list of questions that will be asked to each person) and should take between 30 and 60 minutes. The interview will be audio recorded so it can be transcribed. The audio recording and the transcription will be kept on a password protected external hard drive in the researcher’s home. Each participant will be allowed to review the transcription of the interview for accuracy.

Risks and Benefits of being in the Study:

The study has minimal risks. Your team, and the team members specifically, are being asked to participate to help mission trip coordinators, higher education institutions, and Cultural Intelligence researchers understand how the short-term mission trip process develops Cultural Intelligence. The data collected from this study will help those coordinating short-term mission trips to improve training and practices related to Cultural Intelligence development. The risks of this study are no more than you would encounter in everyday life. Participants in the study (the university, the Global Teams, and team members) will all be given pseudonyms to protect their identity.

The benefit to participation is the opportunity to help academic institutions understand how the short-term mission trip can develop Cultural Intelligence in undergraduate students, thus develop globally-minded graduates. You will increase the level of professional knowledge about Cultural Intelligence, pre-field training practices, on-field experience elements, and post-field debriefing practices.

Confidentiality:

The records of this study will be kept private. In any sort of report I might publish, I will not include any information that will make it possible to identify a subject. Research records will be stored securely and only the researcher will have access to the records.

All participants (the university, Global Teams, and team members) will be given pseudonyms to protect their identity. Printed data will be kept on a password protected external hard drive in the researcher’s home. Data will be kept for 3 years in accordance with federal law. Printed data will be shredded and electronic data will be deleted after 3 years. Audio recordings will be kept on a password protected external hard drive and will be deleted after 3 years. Audio recordings will not be used in any manner other than for transcription.
Voluntary Nature of the Study:

Participation in this study is voluntary. Yours and the team members’ decisions whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with Liberty University or the Center for Global Engagement. If team members decide to participate, they are free to not answer any question or withdraw at any time without affecting those relationships. If they withdraw from the study, the audio recordings and the transcriptions of the audio recordings will be deleted.

Contacts and Questions:

The researcher conducting this study is Ashley E. Haygood. You may ask any questions you have now. If you have questions later, you are encouraged to contact her at aehaygood@liberty.edu or 434-592-6797. My dissertation chair is Dr. Cindy Spaulding, lsspaulding@liberty.edu or 434-592-4307.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study and would like to talk to someone other than the researcher, you are encouraged to contact the Institutional Review Board, 1971 University Blvd, Suite 1837, Lynchburg, VA 24502 or email at irb@liberty.edu.

You will be given a copy of this information to keep for your records.

Statement of Consent:

I have read and understood the above information. I have asked questions and have received answers. I consent to participate in the study.

(Note: Do not agree to participate unless IRB approval information with current dates has been added to this document.)

☐ (Check) I agree to allow the interview to be audio recorded.

Signature: ________________________________ Date: ________________

Signature of Investigator: ________________________________ Date: ________________

IRB Code Numbers:

IRB Expiration Date:
APPENDIX D: Consent Form for Participants

CONSENT FORM

THE ROLE OF THE SHORT-TERM MISSION TRIP PROCESS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF CULTURAL INTELLIGENCE IN UNIVERSITY STUDENTS: A COLLECTIVE CASE STUDY

Ashley Haygood
Education Department

You are invited to be in a study of how the short-term mission trip process develops Cultural Intelligence in undergraduate students. You were selected as a possible participant because you are participating on a Global Team during the 2014-2015 Spring break period. I ask that you read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to be in the study.

This study is being conducted by Ashley E. Haygood, School of Education.

Background Information:

The purpose of the study is to discover how, if at all, the short-term mission trip process develops Cultural Intelligence in undergraduate students. There are three research questions. How does undergraduate students’ Cultural Intelligence develop through participation in pre-field training of a short-term mission trip? How does undergraduate students’ Cultural Intelligence develop through participation in the on-field experience of a short-term mission trip? How does undergraduate students’ Cultural Intelligence develop through participation in the post-field debriefing of a short-term mission trip?

Procedures:

If you agree to be in this study, I would ask you to do the following things:

- Before your first team meeting, complete a Cultural Intelligence scale and demographic survey, which will be emailed to you and each will take no more than 20 minutes to complete. Both items can be emailed back to the researcher.
- Between your last team meeting and team’s departure in February or March, 2015, be interviewed by the researcher. The interview is semi-structured (there is a specific list of questions that will be asked to each person) and should take between 30 and 60 minutes. The interview will be audio recorded so it can be transcribed. The audio recording and the transcription will be kept on a password protected external hard drive in the researcher’s home. Each participant will be allowed to review the transcription of the interview for accuracy.
- Complete journaling prompts while on your trip, which should take between 10 minutes to one hour, depending on which prompts are listed each day. Some days may have no prompts to answer for that day. Journaling may be done in written format, or digitally on
a computer, or other device. Completed journals are asked to be returned within one week of your team’s return.

- Within six weeks after your team’s return, complete a post-Cultural Intelligence scale. This will take no more than 10-20 minutes and will be emailed to you by the researcher. It can be emailed back to the researcher upon completion.
- Within six to eight weeks after your team’s return, be interviewed by the researcher. The interview is semi-structured (there is a specific list of questions that will be asked to each person) and should take between 30 and 60 minutes. The interview will be audio recorded so it can be transcribed. The audio recording and the transcription will be kept on a password protected external hard drive in the researcher’s home. Each participant will be allowed to review the transcription of the interview for accuracy.

Risks and Benefits of being in the Study:

The study has minimal risks. You are being asked to participate to help mission trip coordinators, higher education institutions, and Cultural Intelligence researchers understand how the short-term mission trip process develops Cultural Intelligence. The data collected from this study will help those coordinating short-term mission trips to improve training and practices related to Cultural Intelligence development. The risks of this study are no more than you would encounter in everyday life. Participants in the study (the university, the Global Teams, and you) will all be given pseudonyms to protect their identity.

The benefit to participation is the opportunity to help academic institutions understand how the short-term mission trip can develop Cultural Intelligence in undergraduate students, thus develop globally-minded graduates. You will increase the level of professional knowledge about Cultural Intelligence, pre-field training practices, on-field experience elements, and post-field debriefing practices.

Confidentiality:

The records of this study will be kept private. In any sort of report I might publish, I will not include any information that will make it possible to identify a subject. Research records will be stored securely and only the researcher will have access to the records.

All participants (the university, Global Teams, and team members) will be given pseudonyms to protect their identity. Printed data will be kept on a password protected external hard drive in the researcher’s home. Data will be kept for 3 years in accordance with federal law. Printed data will be shredded and electronic data will be deleted after 3 years. Audio recordings will be kept on a password protected external hard drive and will be deleted after 3 years. Audio recordings will not be used in any manner other than for transcription.

Voluntary Nature of the Study:

Participation in this study is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with [blank] or the [blank]. If you decide to participate, you are free to not answer any question or withdraw at any time.
without affecting those relationships. If you withdraw from the study, the audio recording and the transcription of the audio recording will be deleted.

Contacts and Questions:

The researcher conducting this study is Ashley E. Haygood. You may ask any questions you have now. If you have questions later, you are encouraged to contact her at ______________________. My dissertation chair is Dr. Cindy Spaulding, ______________________.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study and would like to talk to someone other than the researcher, you are encouraged to contact the Institutional Review Board, 1971 ______________________.

You will be given a copy of this information to keep for your records.

Statement of Consent:

I have read and understood the above information. I have asked questions and have received answers. I consent to participate in the study.

☐ (Check) I agree to allow the interview to be audio recorded.

Signature: ___________________________ Date: ________________

Signature of Investigator: ___________________________ Date: ________________

IRB Code Numbers:

IRB Expiration Date:
## APPENDIX E: Demographic Survey

### Questions

1. Please list the following:
   - a. Full name:
   - b. Year in school:
   - c. Major and Minor (if applicable):
   - d. Age:
   - e. Race or Ethnicity:
   - f. Hometown:

2. What are your post-college goals? Where do you see yourself after college?

3. Have you ever traveled outside of the U.S.? If so, to where, for how long, and in what context?

4. Describe your experience with other cultures (languages, travel, cross-cultural events, interaction with international students, etc.).

5. Why did you decide to participate in the (Name of team) team?

6. What expectations do you have for this team, including before your time overseas, during your time overseas, and after your return?

7. Please describe how your faith relates to your desire to participate on this team?
APPENDIX F:

The Cultural Intelligence Scale can be found at the website:

http://www.linnvandyne.com/shortmeasure.html
## APPENDIX G: Pre-Field Training Interview Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>CQ dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Tell me why you decided to study at Liberty. Why the area of study you’re pursuing?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. As we discuss culture, could you please give me your own definition of culture? How would you describe the culture you’ve grown up in? What are some of your cultural norms, values, etc.?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Discuss why you assessed your Cultural Intelligence the way you did. I see that you have spent time overseas, lived overseas, etc. (Will be unique to each participant).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Tell me about your team’s Pre-Field Training. What have you really enjoyed? What has been really helpful in preparing you for time on the field?</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How has the Pre-Field Training made you think of the cultural knowledge you bring into cross-cultural situations? Give examples. What types of activities or informational sessions have helped you to be more aware of the cultural knowledge you bring into cross-cultural situations?</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How do you see yourself interacting with the local culture? How do you see yourself checking and possibly tweaking these interactions?</td>
<td>Metacognitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How has your team learned how to act appropriately in this culture? Have these (activities, scenarios, videos) been beneficial? Why or why not? How could have the Pre-Field Training better prepared your verbal and non-verbal behavior for interaction with this culture?</td>
<td>Behavioral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How confident and motivated are you to interact with the people in this culture? How has the Pre-Field Training affected your motivation and confidence to interact with this culture?</td>
<td>Motivational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Describe how your team specifically learned about the culture you’re traveling to. Was this beneficial? Why or why not? How could have the Pre-Field Training helped more in learning about the culture?</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. How has the Pre-Field Training prepared you for culture shock, if at all? Do you foresee yourself going through culture shock? Why or why not? How will you handle culture shock?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. How has you learned that contextualizing the gospel is better needed where you are going? Coming out of your</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-trip training, how have you learned to share your faith, verbally or non-verbally, with the local culture?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. How has your team spiritually prepared for this experience? How has it affected your own personal preparation for this experience? How are you anticipating your faith affecting your ability to interact with and serve the local culture? How are you anticipating this trip will affect your faith?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX H: On-Field Experience Journaling Prompts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Day of trip to complete</th>
<th>Dimension of CQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How are the field workers orienting you to the culture? What type of information have they covered? Has this been beneficial? Why or why not?</td>
<td>Day 2 or 3, depending when orientation occurs</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How do you feel this orientation improved your understanding of the culture, and participation in it?</td>
<td>Day 2 or 3, depending when orientation occurs</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Discuss how you have interacted with the culture thus far, such as observationally, verbal interaction with the locals, dining, traveling, etc.</td>
<td>Days 4 and 9</td>
<td>Metacognitive, Behavioral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How did this interaction influence or change your thoughts about the local</td>
<td>Days 4 and 9</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>culture? How does it influence or change how you will approach the culture now?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. How does direct interaction with the culture, (e.g. speaking, eating, shopping, etc.) affect your view of the culture, and influence or change the way in which you now interact with it?</strong></td>
<td>Days 4 and 9</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Discuss the ways in which either the field workers or your team leaders debriefed with your team thus far. Was this beneficial? Why or why not?</strong></td>
<td>Days 4 and 9</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. How were you and your team able to reflect on your experiences so far, either personally or as a team? If</strong></td>
<td>Days 4 and 9</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Days</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you have reflected, how has it been beneficial?</td>
<td>Days 4 and 9</td>
<td>Motivational, Metacognitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How has your faith affected the way in which you’ve interacted with and served the local people?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Describe how the field workers and/or your team leaders influenced or changed your view of the local culture.</td>
<td>Day 9</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. How has your time on the field affected your confidence to interact with the locals? Can you see a difference from Day 1 to now? Why or why not?</td>
<td>Day 9 or 10</td>
<td>Motivational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. How has your time here influenced your understanding that cultures can be both similar and different? What are some</td>
<td>Day 9 or 10</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>similarities and differences you see?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. How are you now approaching a local person? Is it at all different than before? Why or why not?</td>
<td>Day 9 or 10</td>
<td>Metacognitive, Motivational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. How has your time on the field affected how you behave cross-culturally? Can you see a difference? Why or why not?</td>
<td>Day 9 or 10</td>
<td>Behavioral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I: Post-Field Debriefing Interview Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>CQ dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Tell me about the past six weeks. How have you been processing your time in (location name)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Describe how the team has debriefed since returning. How have you personally debriefed your experience?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What have your team leaders focused most on during this brief period? How has this affected you personally?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How has this debriefing period affected your motivation and confidence to interact cross-culturally? What future opportunities, if any, will you pursue cross-culturally? Why?</td>
<td>Motivational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How has this debriefing period affected how you approach a cross-cultural situation?</td>
<td>Metacognitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Would you consider personal or team debriefing to be more beneficial?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Discuss your CQ scores.</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX J: Rival Explanations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Pre-Field Training</th>
<th>On-Field Experience</th>
<th>Post-Field Debriefing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Faith, Personality, Past Experiences</td>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>Faith, Team, Current Obligations**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitch</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Faith, Personality, Past Experiences</td>
<td>Faith, Previous Experiences</td>
<td>Faith, Team, Previous Experiences***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Faith, Personality, Past Experiences</td>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>Faith, Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haley</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Faith, Personality, Nursing Faculty</td>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>Faith, Team, Previous Experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Faith, Personality, Past Experiences</td>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>Faith, Team, Host Culture****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Faith, Personality, Past Experiences</td>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>Faith, Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Faith, Personality, Past Experiences</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Faith, Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felicia</td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Faith, Personality</td>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>Faith, Team, Previous Experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan</td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Faith, Personality</td>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>Faith, Team, Previous Experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britt</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Faith, Personality, Past Experiences</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Faith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nora</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Faith, Personality, Past Experiences</td>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>Faith, Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tori</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Faith, Personality</td>
<td>Faith, Degree of Cultural Difference (Home vs. Host)*</td>
<td>Faith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caleb</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>Did not participate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Degree of Different (Home vs. Host) – Tori’s CQ development was impacted through the ease to which she took to the majority culture, as it somewhat mirrored her home culture. However, when interacting with the minority North African culture, she had to work harder at acquiring cultural knowledge, strategizing how to interact, and performing appropriate behaviors.

**Current Obligations – Matt identified his current level of school and ROTC obligations as impacting his ability to process his on-field experience and thus develop his CQ.

***Previous Experiences – Participants noted that their previous experiences entering and exiting cultures had somewhat prepared them for the post-field debriefing stage.

****Host Culture – The host African culture’s friendliness and hospitality was still impacting her desire to interact cross-culturally.
### APPENDIX K: Data Analysis Stages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Case 1</th>
<th>Case 2</th>
<th>Case 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-Field Training</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CQS</td>
<td>Scores for each dimension are given to further add to the qualitative findings</td>
<td>Scores for each dimension are given to further add to the qualitative findings</td>
<td>Scores for each dimension are given to further add to the qualitative findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Interviews</td>
<td>Within-case analysis</td>
<td>Within-case analysis</td>
<td>Within-case analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cross-case synthesis including CQ scores and interviews</td>
<td>Cross-case synthesis including CQ scores and interviews</td>
<td>Cross-case synthesis including CQ scores and interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On-Field Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-field journaling</td>
<td>Within-case analysis</td>
<td>Within-case analysis</td>
<td>Within-case analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cross-case synthesis</td>
<td>Cross-case synthesis</td>
<td>Cross-case synthesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-Field Debriefing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Interviews</td>
<td>Within-case analysis</td>
<td>Within-case analysis</td>
<td>Within-case analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Field CQS</td>
<td>Scores for each dimension are given to further add to the qualitative findings</td>
<td>Scores for each dimension are given to further add to the qualitative findings</td>
<td>Scores for each dimension are given to further add to the qualitative findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cross-case synthesis including interviews and CQ scores</td>
<td>Cross-case synthesis including interviews and CQ scores</td>
<td>Cross-case synthesis including interviews and CQ scores</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX L: Individual Pre-Field Interview Analysis Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiential Learning</th>
<th>Length of Training</th>
<th>Time of Reflection</th>
<th>Team Member/Team Leader Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>META</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX M: Individual Rival Explanations Analysis Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rival 1</th>
<th>Rival 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>META</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX N: Pre-Field Interview Within-Case Analysis Table (Europe)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member/Team Leader Influence</th>
<th>Experiential Learning</th>
<th>Length of Training</th>
<th>Time of Reflection</th>
<th>Rival</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caleb</td>
<td>COG</td>
<td>MOT</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>META MOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britt</td>
<td>META COG MOT BEH</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>META</td>
<td>MOT BEH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tori</td>
<td>COG</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>META COG MOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nora</td>
<td>META COG MOT</td>
<td>COG</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>COG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX O: Individual On-Field Journal Analysis Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Orientation to the Culture</th>
<th>Engagement with the Locals</th>
<th>Field Worker Influence</th>
<th>Team Member/Team Leader Influence</th>
<th>Time of Reflection</th>
<th>Changes Over Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metacognitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX P: On-Field Journal Within-Case Analysis Table (Africa)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Orientation to the Culture</th>
<th>Engagement with the Locals</th>
<th>Field Worker Influence</th>
<th>Team Member/Team Leader Influence</th>
<th>Time of Reflection</th>
<th>Changes Over Time</th>
<th>Rival</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haley</td>
<td>COG</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>COG</td>
<td>MOT</td>
<td>MOT</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>Faith MOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>META COG BEH</td>
<td>META MOT BEH</td>
<td>META</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>Faith ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>META COG</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>MOT</td>
<td>MOT</td>
<td>Faith MOT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitch</td>
<td>META COG BEH</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>COG MOT</td>
<td>META MOT BEH</td>
<td>META MOT BEH</td>
<td>Faith MOT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>META COG MOT</td>
<td>MOT</td>
<td>MOT</td>
<td>MOT BEH</td>
<td>Faith MOT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>COG</td>
<td>COG MOT</td>
<td>COG</td>
<td>META MOT BEH</td>
<td>META</td>
<td>Faith MOT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: COG = Cultural Orientation, BEH = Behavioral Engagement, MOT = Motivation, META = Metacognition.*
APPENDIX Q: Individual Post-Field Interview Analysis Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Discussion of Experiences</th>
<th>Time for Contemplation</th>
<th>Application to Participant’s Life</th>
<th>Changes Over Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metacognitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX R: Post-Field Within-Case Analysis Table (Asia)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Discussion of Experiences</th>
<th>Time for Contemplation</th>
<th>Application to Participant’s Life</th>
<th>Rival</th>
<th>Changes Over Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>MOT</td>
<td>META COG MOT</td>
<td>META COG MOT</td>
<td>Faith - MOT</td>
<td>COG MOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>MOT</td>
<td>META COG MOT</td>
<td>Faith – MOT TEAM – MOT Previous Exp – META, COG</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felicia</td>
<td>COG MOT</td>
<td>META COG MOT</td>
<td>META COG MOT</td>
<td>Faith – COG, MOT TEAM – COG, MOT Previous Exp - MOT</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX S: Across-Case Analysis Table (Post-Field)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Discussion of Experiences</th>
<th>Time for Contemplation</th>
<th>Application to Participant’s Life</th>
<th>Rival</th>
<th>Changes Over Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>7/9 MOT – 7/7</td>
<td>Asia – 3/3 COG – 2/3 Europe 2/3</td>
<td>12/12 MOT – 11/12 FAITH – 12/12 MOT – 12/12 TEAM – Africa (6/6) MOT – 6/6</td>
<td>12/12 COG – 12/12 MOT – 11/12 META – Africa (5/6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX T: Pre-Trip Training Session Descriptions

Support Development Workshop: Trip participants were taken through the Biblical approach to support raising, referencing how the early church supported those who would travel to proclaim the gospel, plant new churches, and encourage fellow Christians at other churches, while partnering in work. Several examples taken from Scripture, and from modern-day, were presented to participants which helped them to develop their own support development plan. Participants were given the homework assignment of writing a support letter, which was then submitted to the office staff for printing.

Safety and Security Workshop: Trip participants were given information regarding general international travel safety precautions. Participants are also required to watch a Child Safety video produced by the International Mission Board and answer questions, which were reviewed afterwards.

Cultural Intelligence Workshop: Trip participants were to arrive with their CQ Self-Assessment, which is overviewed by the facilitator, after a presentation on CQ, its dimensions, and applications of it to Pre-Field Training and On-Field Experience. Activities were also completed by participants to help them understand the concept of CQ further.

Gospel and Personal Testimony: Trip participants were taken through the narrative of the Bible, including the gospel of Christ. Participants were taught how to develop a short personal testimony that could be shared with others, including the need for cultural contextualization when presenting to those of different cultures.