A QUALITATIVE EVALUATION OF THE GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP PROGRAMME AT SIGNPOST INTERNATIONAL

2017 EVALUATION REPORT

ALLISON V. HOFFMAN, MSc SOCIAL RESEARCH, THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

ABSTRACT

A qualitative evaluation of the Global Citizenship Programme (GCP) at Signpost International was implemented to explore the impacts of the GCP on programme participants through the experiences and perspectives of the participants themselves. Primary data were collected through semi-structured interviews and focus groups with 24% of GCP participants. Conversations with participants were analysed thematically using NVivo software and conclusions of perceived programme impacts were drawn through inductive reasoning. Five themes regarding GCP impacts on participants were found: new perspectives; appreciation and gratitude; influences on education and career; empathy and community; and philanthropic engagement. The thematic analysis of data also helped to understand students' motivations for participating in the GCP and important components of the GCP, including the GCP fundraising commitment, visits to villages and schools, and reflection activities. While further research is needed to corroborate results, the qualitative evaluation of the GCP provides evidence of positive impacts on participants.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

PREFACE

This research was part of The University of Edinburgh's Work-Based Placement scheme as an option for Master's level students working on their final dissertation. The research topic and focus of the evaluation were proposed by Signpost International with assistance from The University of Edinburgh's Student Development Office and were further refined through meetings between the student and supervisory staff at The University of Edinburgh and Signpost International.

This research project received ethical clearance at Level II from The University of Edinburgh School of Social and Political Science.

CONTENTS

ACRONYMS

GCP: Global Citizenship Programme

MHS: Monifieth High School

SI: Signpost International

UoE: University of Edinburgh

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A Qualitative Evaluation of the Global Citizenship Programme at Signpost International

EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

In 2017, Signpost International requested a Master's level student from The University of Edinburgh to evaluate its Global Citizenship Programme (GCP), an educational programme focused on teaching high school students from the UK about international development and sustainability issues through a two-week international immersion experience. The primary goal of the evaluation was to explore the impacts of the GCP on programme participants through the experiences and perspectives of the participants themselves.

DATA COLLECTION & ANALYSIS

The study utilised a single-stage, non-probability sampling method and participation was completely voluntary. Primary data were collected between April 2017 and June 2017 through semi-structured interviews and focus groups with 24% of GCP participants. A thematic analysis of data was carried out using NVivo software and inductive reasoning to assess impacts.

FINDINGS

Interview and focus group data provided evidence to suggest that the Global Citizenship Programme has positive impacts on participants, as listed below. All participants interviewed for this study spoke very positively, overall, about the GCP and stated that they would recommend the programme to any student thinking of participating.

PERCEIVED PROGRAMME IMPACTS

NEW PERSPECTIVES

All GCP participants interviewed for this study expressed, either implicitly or explicitly, the acquisition of new perspectives following participation in the GCP. This provides evidence to suggest that the GCP may serve as an opportunity for transformative learning, in which prior assumptions and worldviews are challenged and altered to be more open and inclusive.

APPRECIATION & GRATITUDE

Across all interview and focus group data, GCP participants expressed feelings of appreciation and gratitude for their own quality of life in the UK following the eye-opening experience of travelling to a developing country. For some, these feelings of appreciation and gratitude also seemed to inspire new behaviours, such as acts of kindness towards others.

INFLUENCES ON EDUCATION & CAREER

Many GCP participants spoke of various ways the GCP influenced their educational and career pursuits; either on the *choices* made in their education and career or their *success* in those pursuits. In addition to enhancing university and job applications, the GCP also seemed to promote interpersonal and communication skills benefitting participants' career paths.

EMPATHY & COMMUNITY

By interacting with international community members, GCP participants seemed to gain a greater sense of empathy, for example, taking the needs and perspectives of others into consideration when making decisions. Several participants also spoke of community-oriented values observed abroad and how they incorporated these values into their own lives post-GCP.

PHILANTHROPIC ENGAGEMENT

Several participants spoke of continued or increased engagement in philanthropic activities, such as donating to or volunteering for charities. Others admitted that they were not as philanthropic as they would like to be, but planned to donate or volunteer more in the future. Nearly all GCP participants interviewed appeared to have a better overall understanding of humanitarian work.

RECOMMENDATIONS

PLANNING, IMPLEMENTATION, & FOLLOW-UP

The following are recommendations for improving programme planning, implementation, and follow-up per GCP participant feedback:

- TRAINING: Increase training and preparation for teaching English as a foreign language
- FUNDRAISING: Improve transparency regarding the student fundraising commitment and the allocation of funds and allow more time for students to fundraise
- REFLECTION ACTIVITIES: Enhance personal and group reflection activities, including more structure in writing personal and group diaries to document participant experiences
- PHILANTHROPIC PROJECT: Improve philanthropic impact by engaging GCP participants in an organization- or community-wide development project
- FOLLOW-UP: Increase communication efforts with participants post-GCP (e.g. GCP Facebook group), perhaps also implementing alumni activities or events

MONITORING & EVALUATION

The following are recommendations for the continued monitoring and evaluation of the GCP:

- GOALS & OUTCOMES: Clearly define GCP goals, objectives, and desired learning outcomes to guide future monitoring and evaluation efforts
- CONTACT INFORMATION: Regularly collect and update GCP participant contact information to improve post-GCP communications, monitoring, and evaluation efforts
- DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION: Collect participant demographic information (age, gender, university degree, occupation, etc.) to explore long-term outcomes
- QUALITATIVE SURVEYS: Administer pre- and post-GCP questionnaires using a free online survey tool (e.g. SurveyMonkey) and open-ended questions to assess:
    - Pre-GCP: Participant expectations, motivations, and goals for participating
    - Post-GCP: How well the GCP met expectations. perceptions of programme impacts, and suggestions for improvements to GCP implementation

CHAPTER 1   INTRODUCTION

1.1   Background

With the rising popularity of study abroad, international volunteering, and other immersion experiences, experts have sought to understand what impacts these experiences might have on travellers in order to demonstrate their worth (e.g., Alexander, 2012; Murphy et al., 2014; Paige et al., 2009; Rowan-Kenyon and Niehaus, 2011). Prior research has suggested a range of benefits for those who choose to study or volunteer abroad, including: increased levels of global and civic engagement, such as knowledge production and philanthropic activity (Murphy et al., 2014: Paige et al., 2009); increased levels of interpersonal confidence and adaptability to and empathy for international cultures (Rowan-Kenyon and Niehaus, 2011); and even decreased levels of anxiety and depression (Alexander, 2012). On the other hand, few studies have explored the potential negative impacts on travellers and the impacts on the communities in which participants work or study (Guttantag, 2011). Though some have suggested that international travel and service may actually reinforce stereotypes and, furthermore, may objectify international community members, especially those living in abject poverty (Baker-Boosamra et al., 2006).

Although evidence predominately points to benefits for individuals who choose to study or volunteer abroad, as Guttentag (2011, p. 69) stresses, "it is vital to recognise that such benefits are potential – not inevitable – consequences" of international education and service. Indeed, prior findings of impacts on travellers are unlikely to be applicable to all international immersion experiences, given the wide variety of types of programming. For example, international immersion experiences may include: international education (e.g. study abroad); international volunteering (also referred to as volunteer tourism or voluntourism); gap year travel (e.g. backpacking); and international service-learning; the boundaries of which are frequently blurred (e.g. voluntourism undertaken during a gap year; as seen in Lyons et al., 2012). Formal evaluations of specific international immersion programmes are therefore vital, not only to contribute to the growing body of knowledge exploring the impacts of international education

and service but also to determine if the programme under investigation is having the intended impacts on participants.

Recognizing the importance of programme evaluation, Signpost International (SI) requested the assistance of a Master's level student from The University of Edinburgh (UoE) to evaluate its Global Citizenship Programme (GCP), an educational programme focused on teaching high school students about international development and sustainability issues through immersion in and service to international communities. The GCP falls under several categories of international immersion experiences as listed above, combining elements of study abroad, volunteer tourism, and service-learning to provide students with a unique educational experience in hopes of instilling in them a deep understanding of international development and service. For more information about the GCP, see Section 1.2.

The primary goal of this initial evaluation of the GCP was to explore the impacts of the GCP on programme participants through the experiences and perspectives of the participants themselves. In Section 1.2, a brief overview will be given of SI and the GCP, followed by the aims of the evaluation in Section 1.3, and a brief review of relevant literature in Section 1.4 to establish theoretical background and context.

1.2   Programme History & Goals

Signpost International is an international development agency based in Dundee, United Kingdom. Established in 1992, the organisation works to fight poverty and empower communities in various developing countries, including but not limited to India, Uganda, and the Philippines. Community support is provided through partnerships with non-governmental organisations, grassroots organisations, and schools. Signpost International places an emphasis on supporting communities in their efforts to plan and implement their own solutions to their most pressing needs, including such issues as access to clean water, nutrition, and education (Signpost International, 2017).

SI coordinates a range of programmes and projects overseas, including income and food security projects and Water Sanitation & Hygiene (WASH) projects; its Global Citizenship Programme was the focus of the current evaluation. First implemented in 2006, the GCP evolved from a

partnership between SI and Monifieth High School (MHS) to provide students in Scotland with a unique opportunity to immerse themselves in another culture whilst learning, first-hand, about international development and sustainability issues. As part of the programme, every two years, SI and MHS accompany 10 to 15 fifth-year students, aged 16 to 17, on a two-week[1] educational trip to India[2], during which they participate in activities such as sustainability workshops, cultural exchanges, volunteer service, and student teaching. Since 2008, SI and MHS have led five separate trips to India, serving a total of 58 programme participants.[3] Though GCP activities vary slightly from year to year to account for community needs (e.g. cyclone damage), in general, GCP activities include all or some of the following: international development trainings; sustainability workshops and tree planting; visits to local schools, homes, and villages; volunteer and community service; student teaching at children's evening schools; theatre, art, and sports workshops with local community members; and cultural excursions.

By participating in the GCP, SI and MHS hope that students will:

1. Have an increased understanding of international development issues, including but not limited to the causes of poverty and what actions are taken by organisations, like SI, to help solve international development issues.
2. Have an increased understanding of environmental sustainability issues and how they, the students, might incorporate small behavioural changes into their everyday lives to promote environmental sustainability.
3. Gain a broader worldview and an increased awareness of and engagement with international affairs and communities.[4]

While it is recognised that the impacts of the GCP likely extend to the individuals and communities abroad with whom SI works, it is understood that this goes beyond the scope of the

---

[1] GCP trips were originally 3 weeks long, but shortened to 2 weeks in 2014 per participant feedback
[2] The first GCP trip, coordinated in 2006, brought students to Rwanda; however, due to the lack of programme records and contact information for participants of the GCP Rwanda trip, only participants from GCP India trips between 2008 and 2016 were recruited for the current evaluation.
[3] This total does not include participants from the 2006 GCP trip to Rwanda, for the reasons stated above.
[4] These goals were developed with input from SI staff and MHS teachers for the purposes of this evaluation only as SI did not previously have documentation on GCP goals. These goals were not intended to be used as outcomes to measure in the current or future evaluations but were instead used to direct conversations around GCP impacts during interviews and focus groups. Goals may be modified by SI and MHS in the future upon further reflection and upon receipt of evaluation results.

current evaluation. Indeed, the goals stated above only reference the programme's intended impacts on GCP participants, with no reference to the intended impacts on the international communities. Future evaluations are needed to explore the impacts of the GCP on the international communities with whom SI works.

1.3   Aims of the Evaluation

The evaluation of programmes and policies has emerged as a distinctive field of social science research (Patton, 1982). It has become increasingly important, and sometimes even expected, for social service organisations to evaluate their programmes in order to make improvements, to seek funding and support, and to determine whether programming should, in fact, continue (Rossi et al., 1999). Early evaluation research techniques typically relied on quantitative methods, especially experimental and quasi-experimental designs, to evaluate impact (Robson, 2000). However, more recent evaluation experts have advocated for the use of qualitative methods to explore how individuals experience, and thus whether they believe they benefit from, specific programmes (Shaw, 1999). Indeed, participant-led responses through qualitative data collection methods may be more appropriate for understanding the unique perspectives and experiences of programme participants, as opposed to attempting to fit individual viewpoints and experiences into pre-determined criteria, as is often the case within quantitative means (Patton, 1987). In following a conventionalist epistemology, the following qualitative approach to programme evaluation emphasised how participants described their own experiences and perspectives to understand the way they form meaning in their lives and to understand perceived programme impacts (Charmaz, 2006). As Popay and Williams (1998, p. 34) highlight, qualitative research "begins from the premise that experientially there is no single truth – starting instead from the premise that there will be different meanings attaching to the same or similar experiences depending on the social context". For a deeper discussion of the data collection and analysis techniques used to evaluate the GCP, see Chapter 2.

The qualitative evaluation had two primary objectives:

1. To explore the impacts of the GCP on participants through the perspectives and experiences of programme participants.

2. To generate practical recommendations to help SI shape future programme activities and monitoring practices.

The primary research question was: What impacts has the Global Citizenship Programme had on programme participants?

1.4   Literature Review

Several educational theories have been adopted by evaluation researchers to better understand the ways individuals might experience and learn from international immersion programmes, including: Social Learning Theory and how study abroad may foster an internal locus of control (McLeod et al., 2015); the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity and how individuals progress through six stages of perspective-building (Boateng and Thompson, 2013); and Engagement Theory and how learning is promoted through meaningful encounters with others and engagement in worthwhile tasks (Alexander, 2012). To better understand the perceived impacts of the GCP on programme participants, however, an alternate educational theory was identified. In this section, a brief review of Transformative Learning Theory is provided with links to the Global Citizenship Programme.

Transformative Learning Theory, first introduced in 1978 by Jack Mezirow (2003, p. 58) describes a type of learning that "transforms problematic frames of reference – sets of fixed assumptions and expectations (habits of mind, meaning perspectives, mindset) – to make them more inclusive, discriminating, open, reflective, and emotionally able to change". Though originally used to understand the experiences of adult learners in higher education contexts, it can be argued that transformative learning is relevant to a wide range of experiences for younger learners as well, assuming initial frames of reference have already been established. Alun Morgan (2010) suggested that transformative learning might be especially salient within the context of travel. As Morgan (2010, p. 249) explained:

> [B]y undertaking an actual journey involving a profound engagement with unfamiliar places and experiences, a person may experience a degree of disruption to their subjective orientation to the world (worldview or inner consciousness) sufficient to engender transformative learning.

This 'disruption' alludes to the 'disorienting dilemma', a concept first introduced by Mezirow (1994) to describe the first phase of transformation, and refers to an experience which triggers transformative learning. It is argued here that the GCP may offer an opportunity for participants to experience one such disorienting dilemma. Indeed, by removing students from their fixed environment – in this case, their home and school in the United Kingdom – and immersing them in an unfamiliar culture, including a high level of interaction with international community members, the GCP may provide participants a catalyst through which the transformation of prior worldviews and assumptions may occur.

It was important to consider, however, that learning experiences like that of the GCP may only elicit the *beginnings* of a transformation of assumptions, and not necessarily lead to a transformation in full (Fetherston and Kelly, 2007). Furthermore, the effects of transformative learning can easily be undone by subsequent experiences. As Fetherston and Kelly (2007, p. 272) explained of their study of undergraduate conflict resolution students in the United Kingdom:

> [O]nly in a minority of cases did students experience what might be classed as transformative learning—creation of new meanings—subjective and objective, through critical reflection on fundamental assumptions. Even then, these transformations appear to us not as a complete or deep transformation of the self, though there are indications of the beginnings of such processes. Instead, we see this transformative learning as tentative openings to new ways of seeing and being that may be quickly reversed or undone.

Though the GCP may hold transformative potential, it was not assumed that the GCP would elicit transformative learning in its participants, nor was the programme created with this intention. Instead, Transformative Learning Theory was used here to help understand, in greater depth, the experiences of GCP participants, as discussed in the evaluation findings in Chapter 3. Furthermore, the transformative potential of the GCP may also depend on a multitude of individual factors, such as participant personality traits, willingness to change, and space and time for personal reflection. As Morgan (2010) highlighted, personal reflection is perhaps one of the key elements in eliciting the transformative potential of travel.

Since the introduction of Transformative Learning Theory into the educational literature, many researchers have demonstrated its relevance in understanding the impacts of international immersion experiences on travellers (e.g. Abedini et al., 2012; Caldwell and Purtzer, 2015; Moyer and Sinclair, 2016). Some scholars have even begun to highlight alternative ways of understanding transformative learning, diverging from Mezirow's predominantly psychocritical perspective (Taylor, 2008). For example, a psychodevelopmental view of transformative learning emphasizes "epistemological change (change in how we make meaning), not just change in behavioral repertoire or quantity of knowledge" (Taylor, 2008, p. 7). Indeed, the GCP seems to have promoted this type of epistemological change in participants, as apparent in the discussion of perceived programme impacts in Chapter 3.

CHAPTER 2   METHODOLOGY

Chapter 2 summarises the methods used to evaluate the Global Citizenship Programme at Signpost International. Section 2.1 describes the data collection methods employed, Section 2.2 reviews the approach to data analysis and the interpretation of findings, Section 2.3 discusses ethical considerations, and Section 2.4 reviews the limitations of the study.

2.1   Data Collection

Primary data were collected between 26 April 2017 and 21 June 2017 through semi-structured interviews and focus groups with GCP participants, SI staff, and MHS teachers to explore the impacts of the GCP on programme participants.[5] Data were collected in semi-natural settings including the SI office, the MHS campus, local cafes in Dundee and Edinburgh, and via telephone. Additionally, one MHS teacher responded to interview questions via email.[6]

This study utilised a single-stage, non-probability sampling method. Sampling was of a cross-sectional design and involved both convenience and snowballing sampling techniques (Bryman, 2016). Although a random sample would have improved the generalizability of results, due to limited records and insufficient contact information for GCP participants, convenience sampling was deemed most appropriate. Furthermore, through convenience sampling, the study could benefit from snowballing sampling methods, wherein referrals to participate in the research could be made by the research participants themselves, which proved especially beneficial in reaching GCP participants for whom SI and MHS lacked contact information. The sampling frame consisted of 58 GCP participants, two SI staff members, and six MHS teachers, all of whom were considered key stakeholders of the GCP.[7] SI staff and MHS teachers served as the gatekeepers for the research and as first points of contact with GCP participants through face-to-

---

[5] While leadership perspectives regarding GCP impacts were explored in conversations with SI staff and MHS teachers, these were not used to draw conclusions of GCP impacts as presented in Chapter 3. Conversations with leadership were used primarily to provide background and context for the research.

[6] As this respondent's answers were not spontaneous, the reliability of this data source may have been affected. However, as leadership viewpoints were not used to draw conclusions of GCP impacts, the validity of the evaluation findings has not been affected.

[7] Other key stakeholders may include: members of international partner organizations and communities, parents of GCP participants, and other local Dundee and Monifieth community members. Due to the limited time and resources of this preliminary evaluation, however, focus was placed on securing the perspectives of GCP participants, SI staff, and MHS teachers.

face interaction as well as via mail, phone, email, and social media.[8] MHS also helped to coordinate a focus group held on school premises with 2016 GCP participants; these participants were, at the time, still pupils of MHS in their sixth year of study. At the completion of the data collection phase of the evaluation, perspectives were collected from a total of 14 GCP participants (24% of GCP participant sampling frame), two SI staff, and two MHS teachers. The final sample of GCP participants consisted of participants 17 to 24 years of age, 57% female and 43% male, and included GCP participants from programme years 2010 through 2016.[9]

In-depth, semi-structured interviews and focus groups with a focus on open-ended questions were used to explore participant experiences and perceptions of GCP impacts [e.g. Thinking back to the months/years immediately following the trip to India…What do you think changed (if anything) in terms of your behaviour? Your beliefs? Your values?]. During interviews and focus groups, participants were asked to discuss their experiences retrospectively, having taken part in the programme in the past either as a student (i.e. programme participant) or a group leader (i.e. SI staff member or MHS teacher). Interview guides were used to structure conversations (see Appendix C: Interview Guides), but participants were given the freedom to discuss topics that they deemed significant and probes were used for clarification or elaboration to ensure an in-depth understanding of participant perspectives (Charmaz, 2006).

Focus groups were implemented in place of one-to-one interviews when multiple participants from the same GCP year demonstrated an interest in participating in the research. Focus groups were limited to participants from the same programme year to ensure homogeneous group demographics were maintained (Bryman, 2016). Focus groups are thought to help participants in generating ideas around programme impacts and in stimulating recollection, particularly beneficial when a significant amount of time has passed since programme participation (Rossi et al., 1999). They are also considered a form of participatory evaluation and, furthermore, help researchers understand the extent to which participants agree or disagree on items under

---

[8] 14 GCP participants were invited by mail by MHS; 12 GCP participants were invited by mail through records maintained by SI. The remaining 32 GCP participants were invited by e-mail, phone, social media, or snowballing sampling. Due to a lack of updated contact information for GCP participants, it is possible that not all 58 GCP participants successfully received invitation to participate in the research.
[9] Due to lack of updated contact information, no participants from the 2008 programme year were successfully recruited for this study. Recommendations are made in Section 4.3 for improving access to GCP participants for future evaluations.

discussion (Shaw, 1999). However, focus groups were found to be more difficult to schedule and implement than one-to-one interviews, given the limited number of available research participants and their differing schedules and availability. Thus, at the conclusion of the data collection phase of the evaluation, only one focus group of five GCP participants was successfully implemented, the findings of which are included in Chapter 3.

By using qualitative data collection techniques, the evaluation sought to gain an in-depth understanding of the experiences and perspectives of GCP participants. While quantitative methods were considered, due to a lack of sufficient monitoring data and limited time and resources, a qualitative approach was deemed most appropriate for this initial evaluation of the GCP. Indeed, evaluation experts typically recommend qualitative data collection techniques for preliminary or pilot evaluations due to their exploratory nature and emphasis on the perceptions and experiences of programme participants and leadership (Clarke and Dawson, 1999). By collecting in-depth perspectives from programme participants and other key stakeholders, qualitative evaluation techniques help to set the stage for more robust, quantitative or mixed-methods evaluations to follow; for example, by helping to identify appropriate variables for quantitative research and providing content for questionnaires (Popay and Williams, 1998). However, qualitative evaluation techniques are not only recommended for pilot or preliminary evaluations – or to supplement quantitative studies as is often the case in evaluation research (Rossi et al., 1999) – but can also produce significant results and insights in a way that many quantitative measures are incapable of (Hill et al., 1996). Hill et al. (1996), for example, compared data from structured questionnaires with that of in-depth interviews in assessing patient outcomes and found that in-depth interviews uncovered experiences of positive impacts left undetected by quantitative survey methods. As Popay and Williams (1998, p. 35) highlight: "Qualitative evaluations can pick up small but profoundly significant changes in people's conditions resulting from interventions which structured methods could never be sensitive to." In following this trend, the qualitative evaluation of the GCP sought to uncover perceived programme impacts, no matter how seemingly small, through an in-depth look into the experiences of participants.

2.2 Data Analysis & Interpretation of Findings

In preparation for data analysis, interviews and focus groups were recorded and transcribed verbatim, including pauses and verbal slips when deemed significant in understanding the context or meaning of the dialogue (Roulston, 2014). Identifying information, such as participant names, were removed during transcription to ensure confidentiality and all quotes used in the following evaluation report have been used anonymously. Upon completion, transcripts of the interviews and focus group were uploaded to NVivo 11, a computer-assisted qualitative data analysis software (CAQDAS) for coding. Data were coded and analysed thematically using an inductive reasoning approach, including the use of constant comparison and memo-writing techniques from grounded theory to identify significant themes within the data (Charmaz, 2006).

Techniques from inductive reasoning and grounded theory were employed to ensure that the data would guide the interpretation of findings as opposed to testing a specific hypothesis or theory (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). Following in the footsteps of Charmaz (2006), who developed a flexible approach to grounded theory for qualitative research, existing theories (e.g. Transformative Learning Theory) and prior research findings (e.g. benefits of international immersion experiences) were not ignored, but neither were they tested. Instead, the evaluation findings regarding perceived GCP impacts were guided by the data and supplemented by existing theory and research in order to adequately represent participant experiences and perceptions of the GCP. Inductive reasoning also ensured that unexpected programme impacts could be explored.

2.3 Ethical Considerations

Participation in the evaluation was completely voluntary and research participants were given the opportunity to drop out or refuse to answer questions as they saw fit. Information sheets (see Appendix A: Information Sheets) were provided and the purpose of the research was not concealed from participants. All research participants were asked to sign a consent form (Appendix B: Consent Form), or consent verbally, prior to participation. To reduce the risk of social desirability bias, participants were assured that responses would remain completely anonymous and, if quotes were used, they would be used anonymously (Bryman, 2016).

Furthermore, no personal or sensitive information was solicited from research participants. Despite these precautions, additional ethical considerations are briefly explored in this section.

Perhaps the most prominent ethical concern involved the participation of youth in the study. The most recent GCP participants, from the 2016 programme year, were – at the time of the evaluation – in their sixth year of study at MHS and under the age of 18. Individuals under the age of 18 are considered a vulnerable group by definition of the Scottish Government (2009). Therefore, extra steps were taken to protect the rights of these participants, including ethical clearance at Level II per UoE School of Social and Political Science guidelines. For the purposes of the research, any contact with MHS pupils took place exclusively on MHS premises and under the supervision of an MHS teacher or staff member. MHS pupils were not asked to participate in the research outside of school premises.

A final ethical concern involved stakeholder interests in the reporting of evaluation findings. Evaluation research has an elevated responsibility to balance the interests of key stakeholders (Abma and Widdershoven, 2011). In fact, how to present negative evaluation findings while maintaining researcher integrity is one of the most frequently raised issues by evaluators given the pressure on organisations to demonstrate positive programme impacts (Simons, 2006). SI openly expressed interest in gaining positive accounts of GCP impacts in hopes of promoting the programme to additional schools. To minimise the influence of stakeholder interests, research participants were assured that all views – positive and negative – were welcome in the research and, furthermore, that all accounts provided would be kept confidential. Despite these precautions, however, it is possible that stakeholder interests may have influenced participant responses, as discussed in Section 2.4. To further manage the expectations of evaluation audiences, a high level of communication was maintained throughout the duration of the research to ensure that, should any negative evaluation findings arise, SI would be kept informed and up-to-date in preparation for the final evaluation results. Indeed, communication is thought to be the key to managing diverse, and sometimes conflicting, expectations of evaluation audiences, and to ensuring validity and acceptance of evaluation results (Simons, 2006).

2.4 Limitations

The current evaluation relied exclusively on interview and focus group data to evaluate the GCP. Despite the many benefits of in-depth interview methods to assess programme impacts, as discussed in Section 2.1, standard qualitative evaluations typically incorporate a degree of triangulation by collecting not only interview data but also data from direct observations of programme activities and from documentary analyses of open-ended questionnaires, participant diaries, and programme records (Patton, 1987). Observations of programme activities, for example, may have been beneficial for the current evaluation, allowing the evaluator to capture programme data from an insider's perspective (Shaw, 1999). Due to the timing of the evaluation, however, observation of programme activities overseas was not possible, but may be beneficial for future evaluations. Furthermore, due to the lack of availability of GCP records and programme monitoring data, a documentary analysis could not be included in the current evaluation, but recommendations are made in Section 4.3 to improve programme monitoring procedures in preparation for future evaluations.

The evaluation would have also benefitted from a mixed methods approach through the incorporation of quantitative data collection methods to triangulate results and improve data validity (Rossi et al., 1999). Indeed, many qualitative evaluation designs are used primarily to supplement randomised control trials (Rossi et al., 1999). Without quantitative data to confirm the qualitative findings presented here, this evaluation lacks the capacity to assign attribution of perceived programme impacts to the GCP alone. Given the limited number of and access to GCP participants and the limited time, resources, and monitoring data, a quantitative methodology was deemed inappropriate for this small-scale, preliminary evaluation, but may be beneficial for future evaluations of the GCP. Recommendations for the collection of programme monitoring data are provided in Section 4.3. By collecting programme monitoring data, there may be an opportunity for a more robust, mixed methods evaluation of the GCP in the future.

The primary data collected for this evaluation were entirely retrospective and reliant on self-reflection from GCP participants, which may limit the reliability of findings (Hakim, 1987). It is possible, for example, that participant responses were influenced by expectations of the research beneficiaries, given that positive accounts of GCP impacts would benefit SI and MHS more than negative accounts; though this influence may have been lessened by involving an outside

evaluator and by ensuring anonymity of all data received. The data collected were also unlikely to adequately attribute perceived impacts to the GCP alone, given the amount of time since programme participation as well as individual circumstances that may influence participant outcomes (e.g. post-secondary education). Indeed, due to the lack of quantitative methods and triangulation, this study does not attempt to infer causality of programme impacts (Rossi et al., 1999).

Because the sample was small and was drawn via non-random methods, the findings presented here are not considered generalizable to a larger population, nor was this the intention. Furthermore, with a convenience sampling approach to participant recruitment, it is possible that the individuals who volunteered to participate in the evaluation may have skewed results, given their enthusiasm to share their experiences and perspectives of the GCP. It is equally possible that the individuals who chose not to participate may have held quite different views of the GCP and, perhaps for that reason, were less willing to participate in the research. Therefore, this evaluation does not presume to conclude that the perceived GCP impacts identified in Chapter 3 are applicable to all GCP participants.

CHAPTER 3　　　EXPERIENCES OF PARTICIPANTS

Chapter 3 summarises the findings from a thematic analysis of the data collected from interviews and focus groups with GCP participants. Section 3.1 reviews participants' motivations for taking part in the GCP, Section 3.2 introduces important components of the GCP, and Section 3.3 discusses the five themes found regarding perceived impacts of the GCP on participants: new perspectives; appreciation and gratitude; influences on education and career; empathy and community; and philanthropic engagement. Except where referenced, all quotes used in the following chapter are anonymized excerpts of conversations with GCP participants to illuminate the experiences of participants.[10]

3.1　　Motivations for Participating

Motivations for participating in the GCP were explored prior to discussions of GCP impacts to gain a better understanding of participants' expectations of the programme. The majority of participants interviewed for this study learned of the GCP through promotional activity within MHS, including: school-wide assemblies and communication with MHS teachers, friends, or family members. Several GCP participants remarked that they were inspired by the experiences shared by former GCP participants and wanted to experience the India trip for themselves. For all participants interviewed for this study, the GCP trip was their first – and for many only – international immersion experience. While several had travelled to other, primarily European, countries on holiday, few had visited a developing country prior to the GCP. Several participants spoke of the GCP as an exciting opportunity as well as a challenge, as one participant described it: a "trip that takes you completely out of your comfort zone in a place where you don't know how to … get by without the help of people around you." Other motivations stated by GCP participants include: helping individuals and communities through GCP philanthropic activities; gaining global experience and new perspectives; working closely with a new set of peers; and enhancing CV and personal statements for university and job applications.

---

[10] Quotes may include one or more ellipsis (…) to indicate the omission of a verbal slip or filler word, such as 'like' or 'um' or, in a few cases, the omission of a phrase or sentence; in all such cases, the omission does not alter the meaning of the original quote but instead simply improves legibility.

When asked if they would have participated in a similar programme had they not participated in the GCP, many participants remarked that they would likely have sought out something similar, such as a study abroad or gap year programme. However, while many participants seemed to possess this propensity for international education and service, several remarked that, had the GCP not been offered and promoted within their school, they may have lacked the confidence or willpower to seek out a similar programme on their own. Furthermore, were they to participate in an international immersion programme later in life, several participants noted that they did not think this would have had as significant impacts on their development as the GCP, either because of the opportunity to travel to a developing country, specifically, or the young age at which students participated. Indeed, participating in an international immersion experience at such a young age not only seemed to benefit participants' university applications, but also gave them the confidence and experience to secure new opportunities beneficial to their career development (e.g. internships); these and other influences on educational and career pursuits are discussed in Section 3.3.3.

3.2   Important Components of the GCP

Three components of the GCP are highlighted in this section due to their apparent relevance in participants' perceptions of programme impacts, including: fundraising for the GCP; visits to villages and schools; and group 'check-ins' and personal reflection.

3.2.1 Fundraising Commitment

Participation in the GCP not only includes an educational trip overseas but also a fundraising commitment up to 16 months prior to departure. Specifically, students accepted into the programme are expected to fundraise approximately £2,500, individually and through group fundraising activities, to cover travel, accommodation, and other programme costs as well as costs related to a designated philanthropic activity (e.g. market garden project). While the majority of GCP participants interviewed for this study found the fundraising commitment to be challenging and even at times quite stressful, many participants also recognized the importance of the fundraising component of the programme, acknowledging that it made the GCP trip itself

more worthwhile having "worked really hard to get there". Several participants also described the fundraising activities as interesting and fun and highlighted specific interpersonal and communication skills gained from fundraising, as discussed further in Section 3.3.3.

3.2.2 Visits to Villages & Schools

When asked about GCP activities that stood out in their minds as the most challenging, interesting, or fun (see: Interview Question 3.a), the majority of GCP participants spoke in depth about visits to local villages and schools in India and, particularly, interactions with Indian youth. While perceived impacts of these visits varied, all participants seemed to emphasize the importance of meaningful interactions with international community members. Furthermore, participants frequently described their astonishment at seeing, first-hand, the conditions in which children and families lived, worked, and studied in certain villages and schools and the many ways the caste system played a role in Indian society. Although visits to villages and schools appeared to be emotionally challenging for participants, this component of the GCP seemed to serve as a catalyst for various programme impacts. Indeed, participants described these visits as "eye-opening" and "quite hard-hitting" which suggests that this particular component of the GCP may provide the 'disorienting dilemma' through which prior assumptions and beliefs are challenged, as proposed by Mezirow (1994) in Transformative Learning Theory. As one GCP participant explained:

> They allowed us to really see the full graft of … inequality and poverty and everything like that. So, I think the trip itself was super educational in that sense … they didn't hide anything from us and although that was hard to see, I think it was important that we did. Otherwise, it probably wouldn't have had such a strong impact as it did.

3.2.3 Check-ins & Personal Reflection

Many GCP participants interviewed for this study spoke positively of the nightly 'check-ins', or group reflection sessions, which took place at the end of each day during GCP trips. Given that GCP participants were exposed to emotionally difficult situations, particularly in their visits to

villages and schools, the nightly check-ins seemed to serve as a beneficial component of the programme, providing participants the time and space to openly share any feelings, questions, or concerns they may have had as a group and to process the events of the day. Indeed, Morgan (2010) argues that the space and time for personal reflection are vital to promote transformative learning. The reflective component of the GCP was taken one step further for participants who not only participated in group check-ins but also kept personal diaries during their time overseas. Some participants interviewed spoke of how their diaries helped them to process and reflect on their experiences in India and served as a useful document to look back on in the future. This continual memory recall and reflection post-GCP may help in solidifying programme impacts. As Caldwell and Purtzer (2015) note, reflecting on an experience – not just during the immersion experience but also before and after the experience – enhances long-term learning outcomes when students are given the opportunity to question assumptions, capture meaningful memories, and critically examine their thoughts and behaviours. Recommendations are made in Section 4.2 for further enhancing GCP reflection activities.

3.3   Perceived Programme Impacts

The thematic analysis of data collected revealed five key themes of perceived programme impacts on GCP participants, which will be discussed in this section. The themes include: new perspectives; appreciation and gratitude; influences on education and career; empathy and community; and philanthropic engagement. It is recognized, however, that these themes may be closely interrelated, for example, new perspectives may have led to feelings of appreciation and gratitude, which may, in turn, have led to influences on education and career.

3.3.1 New Perspectives

All GCP participants interviewed for this study expressed, either implicitly or explicitly, the acquisition of new perspectives following participation in the GCP. Indeed, the concept of new perspectives seemed to be the common thread perhaps leading to, or at least linking, all other impacts expressed by participants and discussed below. The theme of new perspectives relates

directly to Mezirow's (1994) Transformative Learning Theory, introduced in Section 1.4; transformative learning involves the transformation of fixed assumptions, expectations, or mindsets often brought on by a 'disorienting dilemma' through which prior assumptions are challenged and, thus, altered to be more open and inclusive. Indeed, many of the participants interviewed for this study alluded to new ways of seeing and being as a result of the eye-opening experience of travel to a developing country and high levels of interaction with international community members. This supports Morgan's (2010) claim that travel might serve as a 'vehicle' for transformative learning, particularly when the experience presents an extreme contrast to one's own way of living, their values, and norms. As Morgan (2010, p. 253) purports, when you add to the travel experience "the intellectual challenge of encountering very different sociocultural values and behaviours … the level of personal dislocation can be significant, potentially priming the traveller with a 'mind-set' conducive to transformation".

The theme of new perspectives arose in various contexts in conversations with GCP participants, but is perhaps best represented by the following excerpt:

> I think one of the main things was understanding that, I mean, it's a fairly obvious thing, but for a teenager who is used to a certain way of living and a certain, not ease of life, but … there's not piles of strains … it just kind of … gives you a kickstart to think that, actually, there's other ways. There's other lifestyles that aren't as easy as yours. … It's the drastic differences, I think, that just expose a little bit deeper … I mean… when you go to university, again, you get exposed to more people and … as you grow up you get an awareness of certain situations going on in the world in general, you know, politics and war and all that. You're not really aware of it all as a teenager … but, I think … it's something that you can anchor that particular issue to. And you can say to yourself, this is something that I need to think about on a regular basis … as opposed to just … oh maybe I should think about this differently. It's actually like, well no … if you think about this trip that I went on, situations that I saw, actually, I need to do this differently.

This participant, like several other GCP participants interviewed, seems to have experienced transformative learning in its complete form, under the premise that transformed frames of reference guide subsequent action; as Mezirow (2009, p. 94) describes, "we make a decision and

live what we have come to believe until we encounter new evidence, argument or a perspective that renders this orientation problematic and requires reassessment". In their qualitative study of nursing students in a 10-day immersion experience, Caldwell and Purtzer (2015) also found that participants replaced prior perspectives – including biases towards poverty, illness, and marginalization – with perspectives more adequately aligned to their new experiences, inspiring them to take action, advocating for clients or challenging the status quo. However, not all GCP participants interviewed for this study seemed to experience transformative learning in its complete form in the sense of using new perspectives gained to guide subsequent action, suggesting that, for some, the GCP trip may simply elicit the *beginnings* of transformation. This supports Fetherston and Kelly's (2007, p. 272) claim that, even when an experience has transformative potential, it may not lead to transformation in full, but instead presents "tentative openings to new ways of seeing and being that may be quickly reversed or undone".

3.3.2 Appreciation & Gratitude

New perspectives gained from the GCP experience appear to have contributed to a range of additional impacts on participants; perhaps the most frequently mentioned involves feelings of appreciation and gratitude. Across all interview and focus group data, GCP participants expressed intense feelings of appreciation and gratitude for their own quality of life in the United Kingdom in direct comparison to the living conditions of those with whom they interacted in villages and schools in India; as highlighted in the following excerpt from the focus group discussion:

> Participant 1: We went inside one of the sort of straw hut things … it's one room for a family of like five.
> Participant 2: It's made out of mud. Out of clay.
> Participant 1: We were told that … snakes and rats …burrow in the thatch and then can drop down on you when you're sleepin' at night which, it's not something that we expect.
> Participant 3: I think they said that … when the monsoon season comes, it'll just wash their house away, got to rebuild it. So, again, that kind of … makes you appreciate … the places we stay in … even if there were floods and all, I mean it

wouldn't completely destroy our house, maybe we would get a wee bit of water in

it. But for them it would just, flattens it, and washes it away.

For several GCP participants interviewed, appreciation and gratitude were discussed simply in affective terms and did not appear to lead to the development of new behaviours or actions. Whereas for others, these new-found feelings of appreciation and gratitude seemed to inspire new behaviours following participation the GCP. For example, one participant remarked how a new-found appreciation for her family following the GCP inspired acts of kindness towards family members. For another GCP participant, gratitude for the educational opportunities available in the United Kingdom seemed to inspire a reassessment of personal goals, as reflected in the following excerpt:

I can remember thinking … I'm pretty much getting more education handed to me, if I choose it, and there's so many people I met out there [in India] that don't go to school, but would literally like kill for the opportunity to be educated further. They work so hard, you know, their kids are … workin' full-time so they can help their family and they're almost … self-teaching themselves all these things. And, you know, they don't have any opportunities, and I remember thinkin'… I'm literally being handed so many chances for different opportunities once I leave school and I didn't have any interest in it, and I thought, what am I doing?... So, that's kind of one of the main things, I think, education-wise, is just … being grateful for the opportunities that we are given in the UK and … not taking that for granted.

Research into the impacts of international immersion experiences has revealed similar findings of appreciation and gratitude following exposure to extreme poverty; for example, Gius (2015) interviewed volunteer tourists and found that they began to re-examine and fully realize the depth of their own privilege having witnessed the livelihoods of the less fortunate. While Gius (2015, p. 10) warns that this type of "redemptive appreciation" might contribute to a "simplistic understanding of power relations … functional to defend, in a guilt-free way, their Western lifestyle and privileges", the benefits to the traveller are nevertheless apparent, given the abundance of empirical evidence linking gratitude with well-being (e.g. Sansone and Sansone, 2010; Wood et al., 2010).

3.3.3 Influences on Education & Career

Another significant theme that arose from discussions with GCP participants suggests that the GCP may have had strong influences on participants' educational and career pursuits; ranging from an influence on the *choices* made in educational and career pursuits to their *success* in those pursuits. This theme supports findings from previous studies which suggest that international immersion experiences have positive impacts on academic and career development (Dwyer, 2004; Franklin, 2010; Paige et al., 2009).

In discussions with GCP participants, the ways in which – and furthermore, the degrees to which – the GCP had an impact on academic and career development varied. One participant, for example, spoke of how interactions with a young boy with disabilities living in a village in India influenced both the choice of degree programme and hopes for securing a meaningful career:

> I just sort of thought, you know, sometimes life in developing countries are difficult enough, but then you almost forget that … people are born the same way, they have disabilities and impairments and … they have no medical care, in that sense that can help them, and I think … that was actually partly what kind of aided me in choosing the course that I chose. … I remember thinking … there must be things that can be designed for this boy that are cheap and sustainable and that can help him. And I thought, when I do something at Uni, or what I wanna do when I'm older, I want to do something that's gonna benefit people, you know, the people that are less fortunate.

As Wearing (2001) notes, younger participants of international immersion programmes are more likely to use the insights gained from their education and service abroad to influence the choices made in the development of their career paths. Indeed, several GCP participants alluded to the ways in which participation in the GCP not only helped to secure a position at a university by enhancing their application materials, such as personal statements, but also contributed to their success in university coursework; as highlighted by the following participant:

> In business, I do a lot of sustainable development for business and corporate social responsibility. That side, I think, that class I found so interesting and I understood it really well because I'd been out there and experienced it. So … when proposing

examples in reports, in papers, or in exams, I was able to provide my own examples… and it's interesting because I keep up-to-date reading about that … and obviously there's a lot of focus on those at the bottom of the pyramid and how that can help … businesses become more sustainable. I truly understood that from the first reading, because I'd been out there and seen how initiatives in these countries work … and I had that kind of perspective in my head, if you get what I mean.

Furthermore, for some, the GCP seemed to bring about new educational opportunities through the experience of working with SI in their international development efforts; as one GCP participant explained: "because of the trip, because … I was… working around sustainability and providing a sustainable future for these people in India, I think people offered those opportunities to me rather than me always looking for them, so, I've been quite lucky in that sense." For others, influences on education and career came not just from the GCP trip itself, but also from pre-GCP fundraising and post-GCP promotional activities. As one participant highlighted, the experience gained from organizing and implementing fundraising activities and events promoted both organizational and people skills beneficial to his academic and career development. For another participant, benefits were gained specifically from participation in the promotional activities following the GCP trip:

We came back and we used to go around to every single primary school in the Angus cluster area … a cluster of primary schools who were coming to Monifieth High School. And we'd go and we'd present and it really brought on my people skills, my presentation skills, it helped me find work. I mean, I had to do a big presentation to get the job that I've got now. I really don't think I would've been as successful without that kind of exposure that Signpost gave me.

Increased levels of interpersonal confidence have been identified among participants of similar immersion experiences (Rowan-Kenyon and Niehaus, 2011) and service-learning programmes; Tucker and McCarthy (2001), for example, found that participation in a service-learning course was significantly related to participants' subsequent confidence levels in their ability to give presentations. Not only did GCP participants speak of increased interpersonal and communication skills with regard to their education and career, but also interpersonal skills in relation to empathy and community-oriented values, as discussed further in Section 3.3.4 below.

3.3.4 Empathy & Community

Discussions with GCP participants provided evidence to suggest that the GCP promotes a strong sense of empathy and of community among participants. Indeed, by interacting with international community members during their immersion experience, GCP participants seem to have gained a greater understanding of the needs and perspectives of others. As one participant explained:

> You start to think about other people more often. Like you think, actually, maybe there's something going on with them that I don't know about. Maybe there's an aspect to their lives that I don't understand. I think that was the main thing for me … it was … a general understanding that you need to take other people's feelings into consideration as well as your own.

As this participant's words demonstrate, the GCP seems to have inspired empathic thoughts; yet, it is unclear to what extent those thoughts also led to altruistic behaviours, despite some evidence of this (e.g. philanthropic engagement as discussed in Section 3.3.5). Participants of service-oriented programmes are often found to possess a greater capacity for empathy, especially the ability to understand and get along with diverse groups of people (Bringle and Steinberg, 2010). Empathy is also considered an important characteristic of a civic-minded individual; as Battistoni (1997, p. 153) emphasized: "We all know about the importance of speech, argument, and persuasive communication to democracy. Perhaps even more important is the lost art of listening … citizens need to be able to listen to each other, understand the places and interests of others in the community, and achieve compromises and solve problems when conflict occurs."

Following participation in the GCP, several participants also appeared to engender a greater sense of community. Indeed, many participants spoke of the community-oriented values and actions of those with whom they interacted in India, such as acts of selflessness and hospitality by their hosts and other community members. These selfless acts were often discussed in direct contrast to the individualistic values observed in the United Kingdom; a cultural contrast which is perhaps best represented by the following focus group excerpt:

> Participant 1: I've seen … cultures like ours where it's more like what we have and materialistic, but theirs is … more about … friendship and family … Like the airport was … a good two-hour drive away from this person's house, but he drove

two hours to the airport just to … say goodbye. It was only like a 15-minute goodbye … so he drove two hours for like a goodbye, 'cause friendships are important to them.

Participant 2: Yeah, but their hospitality as well … the guy that would come all the way … we went to his house and it was just mounds of --

Participant 3: They always give you food. Like everywhere we went, they always give you food.

Participant 1: No matter how poor, they always gave us food, … they'd … give you everything. They'd … give you their left arm if they could.

Through meaningful interactions with international community members, students are provided with an opportunity to critically examine assumptions within their own culture in direct contrast to those of a host community, prompting them to question cultural norms and, perhaps, alter prior assumptions, as suggestive of transformative learning (Taylor, 2008). For some participants, however, simply questioning these cultural differences was insufficient. Indeed, several participants reflected on efforts to incorporate community-oriented values into their own lives following the GCP. As one participant explained:

When I was over there, I remember thinkin', oh it's a shame, you know, they don't have … the money to go to school, and they don't have clothes, and … the culture and society is just beyond repair. But they had, like, community, you know, like friends and neighbours and … when I came back here, I just remember thinkin', we don't have that. Do you know what I mean? So, I've always made … a conscious effort to … bring people together, you know, sort of create that [sense of community] … as much as I can.

Adapting the values of a host community is typical of international immersion experiences; as Wearing (2001, p. 9) explains, as the individual "learns and interacts more with the people and the culture of the place in which they are living, the surrounding environment becomes more familiar, and so they naturally absorb, integrate and adopt elements of that environment".

3.3.5 Philanthropic Engagement

Evidence from prior research suggests increased levels of philanthropic activity following participation in a study abroad or other international immersion programme (Murphy et al., 2014: Paige et al., 2009); yet, levels of engagement in philanthropic activities following participation in the GCP varied among participants interviewed for this study. While some participants spoke of continued or increased engagement in philanthropic activities, others admitted that, at the time of the study, they were not as philanthropic as they would like to be, often due to time or financial constraints. Among GCP participants who reported continued or increased engagement with philanthropic activities, the levels of engagement also varied. Some participants interviewed, for example, reported simple acts, such as buying fair trade products; others reported donating funds to one or more charities; some participants reported volunteering their time to charitable causes. When asked if they would have participated in these activities anyway, had they not participated in the GCP, many remarked that they likely would have, or would have hoped to, but several participants described a general lack of confidence in their abilities prior to the GCP; as one participant explained:

> I think I would've definitely still had that interest, but maybe not so much the confidence in my abilities. Like maybe I would've applied for those things but not felt like I would've been very good at it. Whereas, I think because the India trip was so hard-hitting and was a lot tougher than most of the volunteering stuff I've done since … I knew that … the fact that I'd done that and, you know, we had all succeeded, then I could sort of do anything, really, if I at least gave it a go. So, I think … I might have maybe put my name down for one or two things, but maybe not followed through with it 'cause that was what I did before that trip. I never really had the confidence to like fully go all the way. So, I would definitely say it did have an impact in that sense.

In addition to reports of increased confidence levels, many GCP participants interviewed also reported a better overall understanding of and appreciation for humanitarian work following participation in the GCP. As one participant explained: "I kind of had … a sceptical view of charities before. I'd heard a lot of bad things in the media about … not all the money going to the area that needs it. So, working so closely with Signpost gave me an insight that … what actual

charities do, the kind of work that they do and how dedicated, well, Signpost is." For other GCP participants, working with SI in its humanitarian efforts also seemed to promote an understanding of the importance of creating sustainable solutions to community needs. As one participant explained: "You can't just throw money at a situation and hope it gets better … you can give money to all these communities, but you actually need to make sustainable ways for them to make money for themselves, otherwise it's not going to make an impact."

Among participants engaged in little to no philanthropic activities following the GCP, several remarked that they planned to donate or volunteer more in the future. The Theory of Reasoned Action and the Theory of Planned Behaviour both suggest that behavioural intentions serve as clear predictors of future behaviours (Bringle and Steinberg, 2010). Though it is possible that participants were affected by social desirability bias in their reporting of philanthropic engagement and, thus, more research is needed to determine if participant reports of philanthropic engagement indeed match their actions.

CHAPTER 4   CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter 4 provides a brief discussion of the evaluation findings and recommendations for improving GCP implementation and monitoring procedures. Section 4.1 summarizes the evaluation findings and participants' overall opinions of the programme, Section 4.2 provides recommendations for improving GCP planning, implementation, and follow-up procedures per participant feedback, and Section 4.3 provides recommendations for future programme monitoring and evaluation.

4.1   Conclusions

The Global Citizenship Programme at Signpost International was the focus of the current evaluation. The primary goal of the evaluation was to explore the impacts of the GCP on programme participants through the experiences and perspectives of the participants themselves. Qualitative data were collected through semi-structured interviews and focus groups, transcribed verbatim, and analysed thematically using NVivo. Conclusions of GCP impacts were drawn through inductive reasoning. The thematic analysis not only provided evidence of positive programme impacts on participants, but also helped to understand students' motivations for participating in the GCP and important components of the GCP, including the student fundraising commitment, visits to villages and schools, and reflection activities.

Five prominent themes regarding GCP impacts on participants were found: new perspectives; appreciation and gratitude; influences on education and career; empathy and community; and philanthropic engagement. All participants interviewed for this study felt that they gained new perspectives from the GCP experience, suggesting that the GCP provides an opportunity for transformative learning, in which prior assumptions and worldviews are challenged and altered to be more open and inclusive (Mezirow, 2003). GCP participants frequently discussed new perspectives in relation to additional programme impacts, such as feelings of appreciation and gratitude. Specifically, all participants interviewed demonstrated a strong sense of appreciation and gratitude for their own quality of life in the United Kingdom in direct contrast to the living conditions of many of those with whom they interacted overseas. For some participants, the GCP also appeared to influence their educational and career pursuits, either by influencing their choice

of degree programme or career or their success in those pursuits. The age at which students participate in the GCP might be especially salient in this respect, as young participants of international immersion programmes are more likely to use the insights gained from their experience to influence the development of their career paths (Wearing, 2001). A majority of GCP participants interviewed for this study also demonstrated a greater sense of empathy and of community following participation in the GCP, both thought to be important characteristics of a civic-minded individual (Bringle and Steinberg, 2010). Lastly, GCP participants spoke of continued interest in and engagement with philanthropic activities, though levels of engagement varied among those interviewed.

This qualitative evaluation provides evidence to suggest that the Global Citizenship Programme at Signpost International has positive impacts on participants. Indeed, all 14 GCP participants interviewed for this study spoke very positively, overall, about the GCP and several remarked that they would participate again if given the opportunity; as one participant stated: "We definitely grew. We definitely came back different people, more appreciative, more understanding. And it rubs off on other people … and it would motivate us to do it again. I'm sure if you asked … most of them would say, 'yeah, I'd go back again'. I would definitely go back." Furthermore, all participants interviewed stated that they would recommend the programme to other students thinking of participating; as one GCP participant stated: "I loved it. It was honestly one of the best things I've ever done in my life, so … I wouldn't hesitate in sayin' to anybody go and do it and live it."

This study relied exclusively on participant retrospective and self-reported perceptions of GCP impacts, thus more research is needed to assign attribution of programme impacts to the GCP alone. Furthermore, because of participant self-selection into the study, it is possible that participants who did not choose to take part may have had different experiences with the programme and alternate views of GCP impacts. Thus, future evaluations should seek to obtain a more representative sample of the GCP, perhaps including perspectives of programme dropouts or individuals who chose not to participate in the GCP; further recommendations for continued monitoring and evaluation of the GCP are provided in Section 4.3.

4.2   Recommendations: Programme Implementation

While the primary objective of the evaluation was to explore participant perceptions of GCP impacts, suggestions for improvements to the GCP arose organically from conversations with participants; often in response to the interview question: Is there anything else you would like to say about the Global Citizenship Programme, the India trip, or your experience with Signpost International? (see: Interview Question 12) Therefore, participant perceptions of potential improvements to GCP planning, implementation, and follow-up procedures are provided in this section as practical recommendations to help SI shape future programme activities.

With regard to programme planning, several GCP participants suggested increasing participant preparedness for teaching English as a foreign language. Specifically, some participants felt that the materials prepared for English language courses were inadequate for the levels of English exhibited by pupils in India. Other participants would have also liked to receive more training on teaching English as a foreign language prior to the GCP trip, having felt somewhat unprepared to teach such large groups of children. Other recommendations for improving pre-trip procedures centred on the student fundraising commitment. Specifically, some participants would have liked more transparency about the fundraising commitment prior to the application phase of the GCP, more transparency about how funds were allocated to programme expenses and project costs, and more time allotted to fundraising overall.

The majority of participants felt that GCP implementation overseas was excellent, providing students with an appropriate balance between the types of activities while also allowing students the time and space to relax and process the events of the day, for example, through group and personal reflection. As aforementioned in Section 3.2.3, personal reflection is thought to enhance the educational and transformative potential of international immersion experiences, providing individuals with an opportunity to question assumptions, critically examine thoughts and behaviours, and document their own construction of meanings (Caldwell and Purzter, 2015; Morgan, 2010). While nearly all GCP participants interviewed for this study provided positive accounts of GCP 'check-ins' and other reflection activities, such as keeping personal diaries, some participants felt that there could have been more structure to the reflection activities. One participant, for example, recommended a more organized effort not only in keeping personal diaries, but also ensuring regular updates to a group diary to document the experience for the

group. A group diary may also serve as a useful document for GCP participants, SI staff, and MHS teachers to look back on and reference when needed. Indeed, GCP participants would likely benefit from more guidance in their personal reflection activities to engage their critical thinking. As Taylor (2008) emphasized, to encourage development of mature cognition and enhance the transformative potential of a learning experience, it is important to engage students in critical questioning, group dialogue, and reflective journaling; while at the same time taking into consideration individual differences, as some students may benefit more from group discussion than journaling, and vice versa.

Another suggestion for improving the GCP focused on the group philanthropic project. Specifically, several participants expressed concern that the GCP may have had more positive impacts on their own development (e.g. academic and career development) than on the development of the communities they sought to help overseas. Indeed, a few participants seemed to grapple with the realization that perhaps the personal benefits far outweighed benefits to the communities abroad; as one participant stated: "I definitely came away from India thinking … I got out of it a lot more than we gave." And yet participants also appeared self-aware that there was only so much a small group of young students could do in a two-week period. In discussions with GCP participants, however, there is evidence to suggest that participants who made a small contribution to a large development project (e.g. making bricks for the construction of a school), appeared to have more satisfaction with their community service efforts than participants who made a large contribution to a small development project (e.g. market garden project). Perhaps, then, SI could focus on involving GCP participants in an organization- or community-wide project in order to help GCP participants feel that they have made a significant contribution to the needs of the international community.

A final suggestion provided by participants centred on GCP follow-up procedures. Specifically, several participants would have liked more communication from SI following their trip to India, not only to track the development of overseas partnerships and projects (e.g. market garden project), but also to stay up-to-date on the activities of future GCP teams and remain engaged "as part of the team", possibly even through alumni activities or events. Post-GCP communications might be improved, for example, by creating a GCP Facebook group for participants and coordinators to share stories, photos, and events. One issue affecting post-GCP communications,

as evident in the recruitment of participants for the evaluation, involves incomplete records and access to GCP participant contact information. While, historically, participant contact information has been stored within MHS student records, it is highly recommended that SI collect and maintain its own records of GCP participants to improve post-GCP communication efforts. Regular collecting and updating of GCP participant contact information would also benefit programme monitoring procedures and access to participants for future evaluations, as discussed further in Section 4.3 below.

4.3   Recommendations: Monitoring & Evaluation

In this final section, recommendations are made for next steps in the monitoring and evaluation of the Global Citizenship Programme. In preparation for a more robust, perhaps mixed methods, evaluation of the GCP in the future, it is recommended that SI begin to clearly define programme goals, objectives, and desired learning outcomes. As Patton (1982, p. 101) emphasizes, "goals specification remains the most common way to focus evaluation and planning processes". Once GCP goals have been clearly defined, steps could be put into place to collect monitoring data pertaining to those goals. The collection of GCP participant contact information would also help in preparing for a more representative, perhaps random, sample of GCP participants in future evaluations. It is, therefore, recommended that SI collect and maintain GCP participant contact information separate from MHS student records to ensure ongoing communication and monitoring are upheld. Furthermore, it may be beneficial for SI to begin to track GCP participant demographic information (age, gender, university degree, occupation, etc.) in preparation for exploring long-term trends of GCP participant outcomes; perhaps alongside a control group of those who either dropped out of the GCP or chose not to participate in the GCP.

While steps to prepare for a more robust evaluation of the GCP are highlighted above, it is recognized that demographic and monitoring data will take time and effort to compile before sufficient data are obtained for analysis. Thus, additional recommendations are made for implementing qualitative data collection techniques into current monitoring and evaluation practices for the ongoing collection of GCP participant perspectives and experiences. Despite their advantages, interview and focus group designs are typically time-consuming and expensive to administer and analyse, it is therefore recommended that SI incorporate alternative qualitative

techniques, such as qualitative questionnaires using a free online survey tool (e.g. SurveyMonkey), to collect pre- and post-GCP monitoring data. Specifically, SI might send anonymized online surveys to all participants at the time of their acceptance into the programme, including open-ended questions to assess their motivations, expectations, and personal goals for participating in the GCP. At the conclusion of the GCP, SI could then send participants a follow-up online survey, also anonymized, with open-ended questions to assess whether the GCP met their expectations, to collect perceptions of programme impacts and learning outcomes, and to request suggestions for programme improvements. Follow-up surveys at annual or biannual intervals post-GCP may also be beneficial for assessing the long-term potential of GCP impacts and outcomes. It is highly recommended, however, that any surveys administered to GCP participants for the monitoring and evaluation of the GCP be completely anonymous, not only to reduce the effects of social desirability bias but also to encourage open and honest depictions of GCP impacts. In addition to improving programme monitoring and evaluation efforts, qualitative surveys administered before and after participation in the GCP may enhance the overall learning experience for participants. As Wight (1970, quoted in Boydell, 1976, p. 17) emphasizes, "we seldom learn from experience unless we assess the experience, assigning our own meaning in terms of our own goals, aims, ambitions and expectations".

REFERENCES

Abedini, N. C., Gruppen, L. D., Kolars, J. C., and Kumagai, A. K. (2012) 'Understanding the Effects of Short-Term International Service-Learning Trips on Medical Students', *Academic Medicine,* 87(6), pp. 820-828. doi: 10.1097/ACM.0b013e31825396d8.

Abma, T. A. and Widdershoven, G. A.M. (2011) 'Evaluation as a relationally responsible practice', in Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. (eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research,* London: SAGE Publications Ltd., pp.669-680.

Alexander, Z. (2012) 'International Volunteer Tourism Experience in South Africa: An Investigation Into the Impact on the Tourist', *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 21(7), pp. 779-799. doi: 10.1080/19368623.2012.637287.

Baker-Boosamra, M., Guevara, J. A., and Balfour, D. L. (2006) 'From Service to Solidarity: Evaluation and Recommendations for International Service Learning', *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 12(4), pp. 479-500.

Battistoni, R. M. (1997) 'Service learning and democratic citizenship', *Theory Into Practice,* 36(3), pp. 150-156. doi: 10.1080/00405849709543761.

Boateng, A. and Thompson, A. M. (2013) 'Study Abroad Ghana: An International Experiential Learning', *Journal of Social Work Education,* 49(4), pp. 701-715. doi: 10.1080/10437797.2013.812897.

Boydell, T. (1976) *Experiential Learning,* Manchester: Manchester Monographs.

Bringle, R. G. and Steinberg, K. (2010) 'Educating for Informed Community Involvement', *American Journal for Community Psychology,* 46(3-4), pp. 428-441. doi: 10.1007/s10464-010-9340-y.

Bryman, A. (2016) *Social Research Methods.* 5th edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Caldwell, P. and Purtzer, M. A. (2015) 'Long-Term Learning in a Short-Term Study Abroad Program: "Are We Really Truly Helping the Community"', *Public Health Nursing,* 32(5), pp. 577-583. doi: 10.1111/phn.12168.

Charmaz, K. (2006) *Constructing Grounded Theory,* London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Clarke, A. and Dawson, R. (1999) *Evaluation Research: An Introduction to Principles, Methods and Practice*, London: SAGE Publications, Ltd.

Dwyer, M. (2004) 'Charting the Impact of Studying Abroad', *International Educator,* 13(1), pp. 14-20.

Fetherston, B. and Kelly, R. (2007) 'Conflict Resolution and Transformative Pedagogy: A Grounded Theory Research Project on Learning in Higher Education', *Journal of Transformative Education,* 5(3), pp. 262-285. doi: 10.1177/1541344607308899.

Franklin, K. (2010) 'Long-term Career Impact and Professional Applicability of the Study Abroad Experience', *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 19, pp. 169-190.

Gius, C. (2015) 'Facing the pain of others: perspectives on international volunteer tourism between agency and spectatorship, *Current Issues in Tourism*, 23 May 2015, pp. 1-13. doi: 10.1080/13683500.2015.1047330.

Glaser, B. G. and Strauss, A. L. (1967) *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research,* Hawthorne, NY: Aldine Publishing Company.

Guttentag, D. (2011) 'Volunteer Tourism: As Good as It Seems?', *Tourism Recreation Research*, 36(1), pp. 69-74. doi: 10.1080/02508281.2011.11081661.

Hakim, C. (1987) *Research Design: Strategies and Choices in the Design of Social Research.* London: Allen & Unwin Ltd.

Hill, S., Harries, U., and Popay, J. (1996) 'Is the short form 36 (SF-36) suitable for routine health outcomes assessment in health care for older people? Evidence from preliminary work in community based health services in England', *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 50(1), pp. 94-98.

Lyons, K., Hanley, J., Wearing, S., and Neil, J. (2012) 'Gap year volunteer tourism: Myths of Global Citizenship?', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(1), pp. 361-378.

McLeod, M., Carter, V., Nowicki, S., Tottenham, D., Wainwright, P., and Wyner, D. (2015) 'Evaluating the Study Abroad Experience using the framework of Rotter's Social Learning Theory', *The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad,* 26, pp. 30-38.

Mezirow, J. (1994) 'Understanding Transformation Theory', *Adult Education Quarterly*, 44(4), pp. 222-232. doi: 10.1177/074171369404400403.

Mezirow, J. (2003) 'Transformative Learning as Discourse', *Journal of Transformative Education*, 1(1) pp. 58-63. doi: 10.1177/1542344603252172.

Mezirow, J. (2009) 'An overview on transformative learning', in Illeris, K. (ed.) *Contemporary theories of learning: learning theorists -- in their own words.* London: Routledge, pp. 90-105.

Morgan, A. D. (2010) 'Journeys Into Transformation: Travel to An "Other" Place as a Vehicle for Transformative learning', *Journal of Transformative Education*, 8(4), pp. 246-268. doi: 10.1177/1541344611421491.

Moyer, J. M. and Sinclair, A. J. (2016) 'Stoking the Dialogue on the Domains of Transformative Learning Theory: Insights From Research With Faith-Based Organizations in Kenya', *Adult Education Quarterly,* 66(1), pp. 39-56. doi: 10.1177/0741713615610625.

Murphy, D., Sahakyan, N., Yong-Yi, D., and Magnan, S. S. (2014) 'The Impact of Study Abroad on the Global Engagement of University Graduates', *Frontiers: the Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad,* 24, pp. 1-24.

Paige, R. M., Fry, G. W., Stallman, E. M., Josic, J., and Jon, J. (2009) 'Study Abroad for Global Engagement: The Long-Term Impact of Mobility Experiences', *Intercultural Education,* 20(1), pp. 29-44. doi: 10.1080/14675980903370847.

Patton, M. Q. (1982) *Practical Evaluation.* London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Patton, M. Q. (1987) *How to Use Qualitative Methods in Evaluation*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Popay, J. and Williams, G. (1998) 'Qualitative Research and Evidence-based Healthcare', *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine,* 91(35), pp. 32-37.

Robson, C. (2000) *Small-Scale Evaluation: Principles and Practice.* London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Rossi, P. H., Freeman, H. E., and Lipsey, M. W. (1999) *Evaluation: A Systematic Approach.* 6th edn. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Roulston, K. (2014) 'Analysing Interviews' in Flick, U. (ed.) *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd., pp. 297-312. doi: 10.4135/9781446282243.

Rowan-Kenyon, H. T. and Niehaus, E. K. (2011) 'One Year Later: The Influence of Short-Term Study Abroad Experiences on Students', *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice,* 48(2), pp. 213-228. doi: 10.2202/1949-6605.6213.

Sansone, R. A. and Sansone, L. A. (2010) 'Gratitude and Well Being: The Benefits of Appreciation', *Psychiatry (Edgemont)*, 7(11), pp. 18-22.

Scottish Government (2009) *Protection of Vulnerable Groups (Scotland) Act 2007.* Available at: http://www.gov.scot/Publications/2009/11/05140540/3 (Accessed: 5 June 2017).

Shaw, I. F. (1999) *Qualitative Evaluation.* London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Signpost International (2017) *Empowering People: Transforming Communities.* Available at: http://signpost-international.org/ (Accessed: 5 June 2017).

Simons, H. (2006) 'Ethics in evaluation', in Shaw, I. F., Greene, J. C. and Mark, M. M., (ed.) *The SAGE Handbook of Evaluation*, London: SAGE Publications Ltd. doi: 10.4135/9781848608078.n11.

Taylor, E. W. (2008) 'Transformative Learning Theory', *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education,* 119, pp. 5-15. doi: 10.1002/ace.301.

Tucker, M. L. and McCarthy, A. M. (2001) 'Presentation Self-Efficacy: Increasing Communication Skills Through Service-Learning', *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 13(2), pp. 227-244.

Wearing, S. (2001) *Volunteer tourism: Experiences that make a difference.* Wallingford: CABI Publishing.

Wood, A. M., Froh, J. J. and Geraghty, A. W. A. (2010) 'Gratitude and well-being: A review and theoretical integration', *Clinical Psychology Review,* 30(7), pp. 890-905. doi: 10.1016/j.cpr.2010.03.005.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Information Sheets

Information Sheet for GCP Participants

INFORMATION SHEET FOR: A QUALITATIVE EVALUATION OF THE GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP PROGRAMME

<div align="right">
University of Edinburgh
Attn: Allison Hoffman, Rm 1.20
Chrystal Macmillan Building
George Square
Edinburgh, EH8 9LD
</div>

Information for participants: a qualitative evaluation study of the global citizenship programme at Signpost International and Monifieth High School.

What is the purpose of this research?
This research, which is part of my Master's programme at The University of Edinburgh, is intended to benefit organizations like Signpost International and Monifieth High School by exploring the potential impact of the global citizenship programme on those who have participated. You are being invited to share your perspectives on the global citizenship programme through a casual interview (in-person or over the phone) that would last approximately 30 to 45 minutes. Interviews will take place between 26 April 2017 and 20 June 2017.

What will be discussed during the interview?
The format of the interview will be a casual conversation about your experience travelling to India with Signpost International and Monifieth High School and what this experience has meant to you. You will not be asked to recall any activities in detail. Instead, we will discuss what it was like for you to be involved in the programme and any ways in which you think the programme may have had an impact on you (if at all).

Confidentiality and Research Findings
Your name will not be used in any of the research findings nor the final research report which will be presented to The University of Edinburgh and Signpost International. If quotes from our conversation are used, they will be attached to a pseudonym or used anonymously. Please review the attached consent form for additional information and feel free to ask any questions that you may have.

Participation in this study is completely voluntary and you may drop out at any time. If you have any questions or concerns, please don't hesitate to contact me by phone, 0775 445 6270, or by email, s1683735@sms.ed.ac.uk. I hope you will consider participating in this research and I very much look forward to speaking with you.

Yours sincerely,

Allison Hoffman, Student Researcher
School of Social and Political Science, The University of Edinburgh

INFORMATION SHEET FOR: A QUALITATIVE EVALUATION OF THE GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP PROGRAMME

University of Edinburgh
Attn: Allison Hoffman, Rm 1.20
Chrystal Macmillan Building
George Square
Edinburgh, EH8 9LD

Information for participants: a qualitative evaluation study of the global citizenship programme at Signpost International and Monifieth High School.

What is the purpose of this research?
This research, which is part of my Master's programme at The University of Edinburgh, is intended to benefit organizations like Signpost International and Monifieth High School by exploring the potential impact of the global citizenship programme on those who have participated. You are being invited to share your perspectives on the global citizenship programme through a casual interview (in-person or over the phone) that would last approximately 30 to 45 minutes. Interviews will take place between 26 April 2017 and 20 June 2017.

What will be discussed during the interview?
The format of the interview will be a casual conversation about your experience helping to coordinate the global citizenship programme and your perspectives about what impact, if any, the programme has had on the students who have participated. You will not be asked to recall any activities in detail. Instead, we will discuss what it was like for you to be involved in the programme and why you think the programme may, or may not, be beneficial for students.

Confidentiality and Research Findings
Your name will not be used in any of the research findings nor the final research report which will be presented to The University of Edinburgh and Signpost International. If quotes from our conversation are used, they will be attached to a pseudonym or used anonymously. Please review the attached consent form for additional information and feel free to ask any questions that you may have.

Participation in this study is completely voluntary and you may drop out at any time. If you have any questions or concerns, please don't hesitate to contact me by phone, 0775 445 6270, or by email, s1683735@sms.ed.ac.uk.

I hope you will consider participating in this research and I very much look forward to speaking with you.

Yours sincerely,

Allison Hoffman, Student Researcher
School of Social and Political Science, The University of Edinburgh

**A Qualitative Evaluation of the Global Citizenship Programme
at Signpost International**

CONSENT FORM

Please tick the appropriate boxes   **Yes**   **No**

Taking Part

I have read and understood the information sheet provided with this form.   ☐   ☐

I have been given the opportunity to ask questions about the project.   ☐   ☐

I agree to take part in the project. Taking part in the project will include being   ☐   ☐
interviewed and audio recorded.

I understand that my taking part is voluntary. I can withdraw from the study at any   ☐   ☐
time and I do not have to give any reasons for why I no longer want to take part.

Use of the information I provide for this project only

I understand that my personal details, such as name and phone number, will not be   ☐   ☐
revealed to anyone other than the student researcher: Allison Hoffman.

I understand that my words may be quoted in the final evaluation report, but only if   ☐   ☐
used anonymously or with a pseudonym.

_____   _____   _____
Name of participant   [printed]   Signature   Date

_____   _____   _____
Researcher   [printed]   Signature   Date

Project contact details for further information:

Allison Hoffman, The University of Edinburgh
Email: s1683735@sms.ed.ac.uk
Tel: 0775 445 6270

Appendix C: Interview Guides

Interview Guide – Programme Participant

Researcher Introduction:
- Greeting, Personal Intro, Thank You
- Explain purpose of research, Information Sheet, Consent Form – Any questions?
- Interview will last about 30-45 minutes
- No right answers; interested in your personal views and perspectives, positive or negative
- You do not have to answer every question; only share what you're happy to share
- Everything will be kept confidential; I will not use your name
- I'd like to record our conversation so that I don't miss anything you say; is that ok?

Participant Introduction:
- Could you tell me a little about yourself: age, occupation, programme year, marital status, and anything else you'd like to share, e.g. any other countries visited since trip to India

Interview Questions
1. First of all, I'm interested to hear about what (or who) motivated you to participate in the global citizenship programme? (Was it a friend, sibling, parent, teacher? Personal interest?)
   a. Do you remember how you first heard about the programme?
   b. What about the programme seemed interesting to you?
   c. Why did you decide to participate?
   d. What did you hope to get out of it? What were your expectations? (if you can recall)

2. Thinking back to the activities you did leading up to the India trip:
   a. Do you recall what was it like fundraising / planning for the trip?
   b. Was this your first time travelling to another country? Where have your travelled since?

3. Can you tell me about the types of activities you participated in while in India?
   a. What activities stand out in your mind as the most: Interesting? Challenging? Fun?
   b. What was your favourite part of the India trip? Why?
   c. What was your least favourite part? Why?

4. Thinking back to the months/years immediately following the trip to India…
   a. What do you think changed (if anything) in terms of your behaviour? Your beliefs? Your values?
   b. Are these changes still with you today?
   c. Do you think these changes would have happened anyway had you not participated in the global citizenship programme?

5. What do you think is the most important thing you learned from participating in the global citizenship programme?

6. What do you feel was the biggest change for you, personally, as a result of participating in the global citizenship programme?

    a. Do you think this change would have happened regardless of participating in the global citizenship programme?

    b. If none: Why do you think there wasn't much of a change for you?

[If conversation does not progress naturally to ideas of potential programme impacts, the questions below will be used to spark deeper discussion around impact]

7. One aim of the global citizenship programme is to teach about international development issues (causes of poverty; access to clean water, food, education; inequality):

    a. Do you think the programme was successful in teaching you about these kinds of issues? Why or why not? (If yes, what do you think is the most important thing that you learned?)

    b. Are you still involved with these kinds of issues now? How?

    c. What if you hadn't participated in the global citizenship programme; do you think you would still be involved in these kind of issues/activities?

8. Signpost International also talks a lot about environmental sustainability (recycling, conserving food/energy/water, sustainable shopping):

    a. Do you think the programme was successful in teaching you about these kinds of issues? Why or why not?

    b. What kind of sustainable behaviours do you practice now (if any)? (recycle, conserve electricity/water) Can you give some examples?

    c. Do you think you would do these things anyway had you not participated in the global citizenship programme?

9. Sometimes it can feel like we live in our own little bubble (in our own country, town, family, group of friends); Having immersed yourself in a new culture, a new way of living…

    a. In what ways do you think this changed you (if at all)?

    b. What kinds activities (read international news, communicate with individuals abroad, etc.) do you do now to stay in touch with international affairs?

    c. What if you hadn't participated in the global citizenship programme, do you think you would still be involved in these types of activities/behaviours?

Concluding Questions

10. Suppose someone close to you was interested in participating in the global citizenship programme, what would you tell them?

11. Had you not travelled to India with Signpost International, do you think you would have travelled somewhere else with another programme? Maybe a gap year? Study abroad?

12. Is there anything else you would like to say about the global citizenship programme, the India trip, or your experience with Signpost International?

USE PROMPTS: such as 'Why?', 'Why not?', 'Can you tell me more about that?', and 'Can you clarify what you mean by ___?' in response to any of the questions listed above for elaboration/clarification

Interview Guide – Staff

Researcher Introduction:
- Greeting, Personal Intro, Thank You
- Explain purpose of research, Information Sheet, Consent Form – Any questions?
- Interview will last about 30-45 minutes
- No right answers; interested in your personal views and perspectives, positive or negative
- You do not have to answer every question; only share what you're happy to share
- Everything will be kept confidential; I will not use your name
- I'd like to record our conversation so that I don't miss anything you say; is that ok?

Participant Introduction:
- Could you tell me a little about yourself: role at Signpost International, level of involvement in global citizenship programme, and anything else you'd like to share

Interview Questions

1. First of all, I'm interested to hear about how you became involved with the global citizenship programme and Signpost International…
   a. For how long have you been involved with the programme?
   b. What is your level of involvement with the programme?
   c. During which programme years have you accompanied students to India? And what was your process for planning programme activities?

2. Can you talk a little about the recruitment process for the global citizenship programme?
   a. How are students chosen to participate? What are the criteria for participating?
   b. Who determines which students will participate?
   c. What is your opinion of the recruitment process?

3. Can you talk a little about the planning/ fundraising activities leading up to the India trip?
   a. What is your opinion on the student commitment to fundraise for the trip?
   b. How do you think this fundraising commitment affects students (if at all)?

4. Can you talk a little about the activities you helped to coordinate in India?
   a. How do you decide what activities to implement?
   b. What activities stand out in your mind as the most: Interesting? Challenging? Fun?
   c. What do you think are students' favourite experiences during the India trip? Why?
   d. What do you think are their least favourite? Why?

5. What accounts have you heard (either from students, teachers or parents) about what kinds of changes in student behaviours are observed following the trip with the global citizenship programme?

6. What do you think is the most important thing students learn from participating in the global citizenship programme?
   a. What do you think is the biggest impact the programme has on students?

[If conversation does not progress naturally to ideas of potential programme impacts, the questions below will be used to spark deeper discussion around impact]

7. One aim of the global citizenship programme is to teach about international development issues (causes of poverty; access to clean water, food, education; inequality):
   a. Can you talk a little bit about how this is achieved?
   b. What does programme success in this area look like to you?
   c. In your opinion, is the programme successful in teaching students about international development issues? Why or why not? (what evidence – e.g. student behaviours – have you seen or heard about to demonstrate its success?)
   d. Do you think you think students would learn about these kinds of issues anyway had they not participated in the global citizenship programme?

8. Another aim of the programme is to teach about environmental sustainability (recycling, conserving food/energy/water, sustainable shopping):
   a. Can you talk a little bit about how this is achieved?
   b. What kind of sustainable behaviours do you hope students incorporate into their lives as a result of participating in the programme?
   c. In your opinion, is the programme successful in teaching students about environmental sustainability issues? Why or why not?
   d. Do you think students would learn these behaviours anyway had they not participated in the global citizenship programme?

9. A final aim of the programme is to broaden students' worldview, immersing students in a different culture, a different way of life…
   a. Can you talk a little bit about how this is achieved?
   b. What do you hope to achieve by broadening a students' worldview? What does success in this area look like to you?
   c. In your opinion, is the programme successful in immersing students in a different culture? And what impact, if any, do you think this has on students?
   d. Do you think students would still be involved in international affairs had they not participated in the global citizenship programme?

Concluding Questions

10. Suppose someone close to you was interested in participating in the global citizenship programme, what would you tell them?

11. Had the students not travelled to India with Signpost International, do you think you would have travelled somewhere else with another programme? Maybe a gap year or study abroad?

12. Is there anything else you would like to say about the global citizenship programme, the India trip, or your experience leading the programme?

USE PROMPTS: such as 'Why?', 'Why not?', 'Can you tell me more about that?', and 'Can you clarify what you mean by ___?' in response to any of the questions listed above for elaboration/clarification

Researcher Introduction:
- Greeting, Personal Intro, Thank You
- Explain purpose of research, Information Sheet, Consent Form – Any questions?
- Interview will last about 30-45 minutes
- No right answers; interested in your personal views and perspectives, positive or negative
- You do not have to answer every question; only share what you're happy to share
- Everything will be kept confidential; I will not use your name
- I'd like to record our conversation so that I don't miss anything you say, is that ok?

Participant Introduction:
- Could you tell me a little about yourself: role at Monifieth High School, level of involvement with the global citizenship programme, and anything else you'd like to share

Interview Questions:

1. First of all, I'm interested to hear about how you became involved with the global citizenship programme and Signpost International…
   a. For how long have you been involved with the programme?
   b. What is your level of involvement with the programme / with the students?
   c. During which programme years have you accompanied students to India?

2. Can you talk a little about the recruitment process for the global citizenship programme?
   a. How are students chosen to participate? What are the criteria for participating?
   b. Who determines which students will participate?
   c. What is your opinion of the recruitment process?

3. Can you talk a little about the planning/fundraising activities leading up to the India trip?
   a. What is your opinion on the student commitment to fundraise for the trip?
   b. How do you think this fundraising commitment effects students (if at all)?

4. Can you talk a little about the activities you helped to coordinate in India?
   a. How involved are you with the planning/implementation of activities?
   b. What activities stand out in your mind as the most: Interesting? Challenging? Fun?
   c. What do you think are students' favourite activities during the India trip? Why?
   d. What do you think are their least favourite activities? Why?

5. Thinking back to the days and months immediately following the trip to India…
   a. Did you notice any changes in the students' behaviours in school following the trip?
   b. Had these students not participated in the global citizenship programme, do you think you would have observed these changes anyway?

6. What do you think is the most important thing students learn from participating in the global citizenship programme?
   a. What do you think is the most significant impact that the programme has on students?

[If conversation does not progress naturally to ideas of potential programme impacts, the questions below will be used to spark deeper discussion around impact]

7. One aim of the global citizenship programme is to teach about international development issues (causes of poverty; access to clean water, food, education; inequality):
   a. Can you talk a little bit about how this is achieved?
   b. In your opinion, is the programme successful in teaching students about international development issues? Why or why not? (what evidence – e.g. student behaviours – have you seen to demonstrate its success?)
   c. Do you think you think students would learn about these kinds of issues anyway had they not participated in the global citizenship programme?

8. Signpost International also talks a lot about environmental sustainability (recycling, conserving food/energy/water, sustainable shopping):
   a. Can you talk a little bit about how this is achieved?
   b. In your opinion, is the programme successful in teaching students about environmental sustainability issues? Why or why not?
   c. Are there any sustainable behaviours you notice the students exhibiting that they did not before the programme? (Recycle? Conserve electricity/water?) Can you give some examples?
   d. Had these students not participated in the global citizenship programme, do you think they would develop these behaviours anyway?

9. A final aim of the programme is to broaden students' worldview, immersing students in a different culture, a different way of life…
   a. Can you talk a little bit about how this is achieved?
   b. In your opinion, is the programme successful in immersing students in a different culture? And what impact, if any, do you think this has on student?
   c. Have you noticed any international activities that students engage more with since participating in the programme?
   d. Do you think students would engage in these types of activities had they not participated in the global citizenship programme?

Concluding Questions

10. Suppose someone close to you was interested in participating in the global citizenship programme, what would you tell them?

11. Had the students not travelled to India with Signpost International, do you think you would have travelled somewhere else with another programme? Maybe a gap year or study abroad?

12. Is there anything else you would like to say about the global citizenship programme, the India trip, or your experience with Signpost International?

USE PROMPTS: such as 'Why?', 'Why not?', 'Can you tell me more about that?', and 'Can you clarify what you mean by ___?' in response to any of the questions listed above for elaboration/clarification