

RUNNING HEAD: PROGRAM EVALUATION

Program Evaluation:
Focus International Training Program
Monica Lima
&
Erin Lind
CSA 592, Spring II
Azusa Pacific University

Executive Summary

This program evaluation examined the redesigned Focus International Training Programs' ability to prepare participants for their upcoming missions experiences by evaluating the participants' attainment of and growth in the learning outcomes of the program. The four learning outcomes for the program encompass the understanding of the Biblical basis of missions, the concept of the Global Church, living a missional lifestyle, and spiritually preparing for a missions experience. Analysis of data from a pre and post quantitative and qualitative survey from 67 of the participants was conducted. Results showed that students who participated in the Focus International Training Program grew significantly in the following areas: understanding the spiritual preparedness needed for a missions trip, understanding the concept of the Global Church, and living a missional lifestyle. Participants did not significantly grow in their understanding of the Biblical basis of missions as a result of the training program. Important differences between leaders and members also emerged. Members showed growth in three of the four learning objectives, indicating the training program catered to the needs of the member. Leaders, on the other hand, did not experience significant growth in any of the four learning outcomes. The leaders' results showed a decrease (though not significant) in their understanding of the Biblical basis of missions, knowing how prayer impacts missions' work, and understanding the spiritual discipline of fasting. A new approach to training the leaders should be implemented in order to challenge and meet their distinctive needs.

Introduction

The Office of World Missions has been the crux of Azusa Pacific University's mission since it was founded in 1899. The university was founded by Mary Hill as a training school for Christian workers, with the focus of the curriculum being training students to serve. In order to train students to expand their worldview, a short-term mission program called Focus International was established.

The 2007-2008 academic year has been a time of refining and redefining for the Office of World Missions. For several years the mission statement for the office has been "Developing hearts and minds for missions." This year, in conjunction with the overarching Institute of Outreach Ministries, the Office of World Mission developed the following mission statement: As part of the Institute for Outreach Ministries, the Office of World Missions provides young adults with opportunities to understand God's global mission that they may develop a more incarnational lifestyle while partnering with the Global Church.

The Focus International Training Program was designed as a preliminary training for students who participate in short-term missions trips during spring or summer break. In the past, Focus International participants would undergo weekly team meetings, eight All Focus meetings (with all participants present), and a four-day training retreat in Ensenada, Mexico. In the spring of 2007 an extensive outcome evaluation was conducted for the retreat portion of the Focus International Training Program. This assessment indicated that learning outcomes had not been clearly established prior to implementation of the training. The evaluation also showed that expectations of growing in preparedness

for the missions experience were high, but several key factors of participant development were left unmet.

Due to the results of the assessment and the confidence built from the Focus International Coordinator's second year of service, the Focus International Training Program was redesigned for the 2007-2008 academic year in order to better prepare participants for their missions experiences. The most extensive change in the training program came through the establishment of learning outcomes for Focus International. In order to accomplish the Office of World Missions' mission statement, the following four program goals were established: Focus International participants will 1. understand the Biblical basis for missions 2. understand what the Global Church is and how they play a part in the Global Church 3. develop and live an incarnational lifestyle and 4. understand how to spiritually prepare for a missions experience. The newly established learning outcomes were used to plan and implement all aspects of the ALL Focus meetings and the training retreat. The current training program consists of weekly team meeting, four All Focus meetings, and a three day training retreat. The training retreat was redesigned to focus on the participants' attainment of and growth in the learning outcomes. Instead of traveling to Ensenada, Mexico with the purpose of unifying teams and doing service, participants engaged in multiple experiential learning activities at a retreat center in Santa Barbara, California.

With the new mission, learning outcomes, and Focus International Training Program, this year was the opportune time to conduct the first extensive program evaluation of the entire training process. The results could prove helpful in assessing how the program changes have prepared participants for service.

Literature Review

Short-Term Missions

For centuries, missionaries have traveled the world sharing the news of salvation and bringing humanitarian aid to millions of people. Almost all of these missionaries were appointed with the expectation of career, or lifelong, service. Yet, over the last 20 years, there has been a growing trend in missionaries serving for limited, planned terms of only a few months or years (Jaffarian, 2008). Many of these individuals, who were then called short-termers, were students or young adults. The rise in popularity was so great that the decades of the 1980s and 1990s were known as the era of the “short-term mission boom” (Walling et. al, 2006). Many high school youth groups host yearly international trips which offer opportunities for evangelism and service. Short-term mission trips are becoming important aspects of post-secondary Christian education. Thousands of American, Christian college students participate in school sanctioned or required international mission projects (Tuttle, 2000). Today, as many as four million Americans take short-term mission trips out of the country annually; and American churches now spend as much on short-term mission trips as on long-term missionaries (Peterson, Aeschliman, & Sneed, 2003).

Multiculturalism

Multiculturalism is a popular topic at institutions of higher education at the present time (Lopez-Mulnix & Mulnix, 2006). In most cases, the research is aimed at whether or not diversity is beneficial to the student body (Blimling, 2001) and/or the extent to which the campus environment (faculty, staff, and student affairs professionals) is competent in the area of multiculturalism (Cheng & Zhao, 2006).

Lopez-Mulnix and Mulnix (2006) define multiculturalism as “the effective awareness, sensitivity, and practices that embrace human diversity through recognizing strength in different cultural values, styles of communication, interactions, and time constructions” (p. 7). The question becomes, how does one gain the ability to be aware of, sensitive to, and embrace diversity? According to Pope and Reynolds (1997), multicultural competence is gained through awareness, knowledge and skills. Livermore (2007) uses the term “cultural intelligence” (p. 5) and lists four intelligences that build upon one another to bring about cultural intelligence. The first of the four intelligences is “knowledge” (Livermore, p. 111) or the level of comprehension and insight one has about another (or other) cultures. The second intelligence, “interpretive” (Livermore, p. 111), is closely linked to the first and consists of the ability to correctly interpret the cultural cues one experiences while interacting cross-culturally. “Perseverance” (p. 111), the third intelligence, is defined by Livermore as the “level of interest, drive, and motivation” one has “to adapt cross-culturally” (p. 142). The final intelligence, “behavioral” (Livermore, p. 111), is a culmination of the first three intelligences and can be defined as the ability to act and behave in an appropriate manner when engaging in a culture different than one’s own. When it comes to living and/or working in another culture, even for a short period of time, it is imperative that individuals be knowledgeable and sensitive to the surrounding sights, sounds and body language to help them leave the best impression possible.

Cross-Cultural Training

With the growth in popularity in short-term missions comes the ever-present concern that the funds and resources of the church are being depleted by an untrained

quest for “spiritual adventurism” (Dearborn, 2003). Countless resources have been developed to meet this need and efficient training in cross-cultural sensitivity and awareness is necessary (Livermore, 2007). Walling et al. (2006) explains the need for preparing students for mission trips through effective education and information sharing. During training, students should be informed of the stresses of international travel, the potential culture shock that might occur as a result, and the negative feelings that might result as they reenter their own culture (Walling et al.). As short-term missionaries prepare to return home they should embark in a debrief experience in order to promote support and to frame their experiences in short-term missions within a larger context to continue exploration (Walling et al.). Priest & Priest (n.d.) recognize the need for essential training by working closely with academics. They suggest that every seminary and Christian college offer a course on the subject of short-term missions- attempting to bring the best of missiological insight and understanding to bear on the set of practices associated with short-term missions (Priest & Priest).

Although a class might not be offered, training is essential and vital in transforming practical knowledge to application. Cross-cultural training has long been advocated as a means of facilitating effective cross-cultural interactions (Brislin, 1991). Yet, despite the normative arguments for the use of cross-cultural training, its use in American business organizations is not very widespread (Black & Mendenhall, 1990). Whether used in the corporate or academic sense, cross-cultural training normally encompasses three different dimensions. These include skills related to the maintenance of self (mental health, psychological well-being, stress reduction, feelings of self-confidence), skills related to the fostering of relationships with host nationals, and

cognitive skills that promote a correct perception of the host environment and its social systems (Mendenhall & Oddou, 1985).

Social learning theory is used as the theoretical framework for understanding cross-cultural learning and training (Black & Mendenhall, 1990). This learning model explains why individuals who received cross-cultural training reported higher levels of confidence and other self-hygiene factors than those who did not (Mendenhall & Oddou, 1985). Training can serve as an important vicarious learning experience for the trainee and can result in a gain of cognitive skills as well as efficacy and positive outcome expectations (Black & Mendenhall). Throughout training, behaviors such as being tolerant of ambiguity or reserving judgment about the actions of those of the other culture and the consequences of such behavior can be modeled.

Fowler and Parks/Spiritual Development/Faith Development

Fowler and Parks' theories work together to give deeper insight into what the majority of college students go through in regards to faith development. Fowler's faith can be defined as how one interprets "the events and relations that surround" (Holcomb & Nonneman, 2004, p. 95) them and is not tied to any specific religion. Fowler's theory has seven stages, but the following three are significant to development during the college years: "Mythical-literal", "Synthetic-conventional", and "Individuative-reflective" (Holcomb & Nonneman, p. 96). The Mythical-literal stage is commonly attributed to children, but there are adults who are at this stage and/or stay at this stage throughout the remainder of their life. This stage is characterized by an inability to critically think and being controlled by one's feelings. In the Synthetic-conventional stage, outside sources are the authority on what one believes and what is believed is lived out,

but there has been no critical thinking done about the world view held. The fourth stage, Individuative-reflective, is one where the individual is able to critically examine the customs, principles, and philosophies they hold. This examination tends to put individuals in a place where they “see the world in terms of black and white” (Holcomb & Nonneman, p. 96). Parks’ model on faith development comes into play between the Synthetic-conventional stage and the Individuative-reflective stage. Parks theory suggests “that the transition between stages three and four, an arduous and somewhat lengthy process, is actually a stage in and of itself” (Holcomb & Nonneman, p. 97). This transition phase, it is believed, is brought on by a “crisis” which causes the individual to explore what they hold to be true. (Holcomb & Nonneman) The Focus International Training Program seeks out individuals who are further along in their spiritual development in hopes that they can maturely handle the situations encountered throughout their training and missions experience. However, the program also desires to see participants grow in their spiritual development because of their participation.

Holcomb and Nonneman’s (2004) study, examined the spiritual development that occurred during the undergraduate experience at Christian colleges and universities. They found that the majority of freshman enter college at either the Mythical-literal or Synthetic-conventional, while a small percentage come to college at the transition between the Synthetic-conventional and Individuative-reflective stages. Approximately half of the seniors were found to be in or past the transition phase. Those students, both freshman and seniors, who were farther along in their faith development, tended to report encounters with individuals who held different world views, cultures other than their own, and/or some type of emotional crisis (Holcomb and Nonneman).

Global Church

In his first inaugural speech, former President Bill Clinton stated that “there is no longer a clear division between what is foreign and what is domestic. The world economy, the world environment, the world AIDS crisis, the world arms race - they affect us all” (1993, A15). Globalization can be defined as “growth to a global or worldwide scale” (www.dictionary.com, retrieved February 25, 2008), the effects of which allow for people, cultures and nations to be shaped by events that occur a world away (Crossman, 2003). Just as the world is becoming united through the process of globalization, so is the church.

The idea of the Global Church is not new, in fact the first glimpse of the Global Church can be found in Genesis 22:17-18. In these two verses are a promise from God to Abraham that God will give Abraham a multitude of descendants and all nations will be blessed because of his descendents (referring to Jesus coming as the Savior). In Matthew 28:19, Jesus commands His disciples to go into all the world and make disciples. The concept of the Global Church is solidified in Revelation 7:9 where it is recorded that in heaven there will be people “from every nation, tribe, people and language, standing before the throne and in front of the Lamb.” God has been and will continue to be at work in every part of the globe and that means the Church (as an organism, not a building) is called to be global as God is global.

Method

Participants

All individuals participating in a mission trip, in 2008, through Azusa Pacific University's (APU) Focus International program were asked to participate in this study.

For the 2008 year, there are a total of 155 participants. The participants in this program evaluation were primarily traditional undergraduate students enrolled at APU. However, some participants were graduate students, professors, and/or staff at the university. Due to conflicts in schedule, classes, and other prior engagements certain participants were not able to attend all of the Focus International Training sessions and therefore did not participate in the pre and/or post-survey. A total of 107 individuals participated in the pre-survey, a response rate of 69%. The total number of participants for the post-survey was 110, a response rate of 70.9%. The number of useable surveys for analysis (both pre/post-survey filled out completely) was 67, a response rate of 43.2% of the entire population.

Instrument

A pre (Appendix A) and post (Appendix B) quantitative and qualitative paper and pencil outcome evaluation were used. In both the pre and post evaluations, participants were asked to rate their response to statements using a 4 point Likert Scale. On both instruments a rating of 1 indicates the participant strongly disagrees with the statement and a rating of 4 indicates the participant strongly agrees with the statement. The instruments measure the participants' perceptions of their degree of understanding in the following areas: the Biblical basis for missions, spiritual preparedness for a missions experience (the spiritual disciplines of prayer and fasting were emphasized), importance of the relationship with an in-country host, and the concept of the Global Church. To evaluate the extent to which training brought awareness to a "missional lifestyle" both surveys contain a question regarding the extent to which the participant has considered serving on a long-term mission.

Qualitative open-ended questions were asked to gain a more in depth understanding of what the participants view as the Biblical basis for missions, how they believe they could support their in-country host, and how they define the Global Church.

Procedure

The pre-test was distributed at the very beginning of the first All Focus Training session, which was required for all participants. The participants were given specific directions as to how to fill out the survey. Participants completed the survey within a ten minute time period and were asked to pass them in immediately after completion.

The post-test was distributed at the end of the last All Focus Training session, which was also required for all participants. The participants were given specific instructions as to how to fill out the survey. Participants were given as much time as needed to complete the survey and were asked to hand them in upon completion or as they left the meeting.

Analysis

The pre and post-surveys were analyzed using inferential statistics. A paired samples t-test was used to compare means and analyze the growth of participants' understanding of the Focus International learning outcomes before they began the training and their understanding of those same learning outcomes after the training. In order to evaluate this further, a paired samples t-test was conducted to investigate the growth in level of understanding of team members and team leaders separately.

The qualitative data from the pre and post-surveys was analyzed for increased depth of understanding. Each participant's response prior to the training was read and

compared with their response after the training. Two researchers independently read these responses to identify any change over time.

Results

Of the 67 surveys that were usable (both pre and post evaluations completed) 49 were filled out by team members, 17 were completed by team leaders, and one participant did not specify their affiliation.

The paired samples t-test revealed several significant areas of growth in the Focus International participants' understanding of the learning outcomes. Five out of the six questions related to participants' understanding of the spiritual preparedness needed for a missions trip had significant test results. By the end of Focus International Training participants were significantly more likely to know how prayer impacts missions work ($t=-2.137, p<.05$) and how to spiritually prepare for a missions experience ($t=-5.295, p<.001$). Upon completion of the training participants also reported they were significantly more likely to pray for missionaries and foreign nations ($t=-2.792, p<.05$) as well as being able to clearly explain to someone why they are taking part in a Focus International trip ($t=-3.108, p<.05$). The only question where participants did not show significant growth, in regards to spiritual preparedness, was understanding the spiritual discipline of fasting.

All three of the questions related to the participants' understanding of the global church had significant results. At the end of the training participants reported they were significantly more familiar with the term "unreached people group" ($t=-3.895, p<.001$) and knowledgeable about how to support their in-country host ($t=-4.815, p<.001$). The qualitative data for the question "What are some ways that you can support your in-

country host?” were not conducive to the finding that participants grew significantly in this area. Though there was a statistically significant difference between the pre and post self-reported scores on the Likert scale for participants’ knowledge in how they can support their in-country host, the answers to the open-ended question about supporting their in-country host did not indicate growth in knowledge. As can be seen in the following examples, participants’ answers carried similar themes on both the pre and post survey.

Pre-survey: “be open and willing to serve their needs when I am there”

Post-survey: “Ask them their needs, be humble, serve, be respectful, help in anyway, pray”

Pre-survey: “We are seeking to provide encouragement and support/refreshment to our host.”

Post-survey: “We want to humbly encourage them and build friendships.”

Pre-survey: “Respecting them; Helping serve them in anyway they need”

Post-survey: “Doing as I’m told and respecting them. Not complaining and showing God’s love.”

Pre-survey: “Prayer!! Submission/obedience”

Post-survey: “Submission, obedience, joy”

The participants also reported they had a significantly better understanding of the concept of the Global Church ($t=-3.691$, $p<.001$). The qualitative data for the question “How would you explain the Global Church” was not conducive in supporting this significant finding. Though there was a statistically significant difference between the pre and post self-reported scores on the Likert scale for a participants’ understanding of the concept of the Global Church, the answers to the open-ended question about the Global Church did not indicate growth in depth of understanding. As can be seen in the following examples, the large majority of the pre-survey answers carried the theme of the Global Church

being the unified body of Christ-followers all over the world; the post-survey answers carried the same theme as the pre-survey.

Pre-survey: “God has one church. One universal global church”
 Post-survey: “God has 1 church”

Pre-survey: “The church, as a whole, is the body of Christ encompassing every individual body as a believer. To reach out to the global church is to reach forth to all humanity for and in His kingdom.”

Post-survey: “The entire world and all of its individual churches encompassing mankind's growing understanding.”

Pre-survey: “The body of Christ all over the world.”

Post-survey: “The body of believers in different parts of the world who share the love of Christ.”

Pre-survey: “Believers around the world counted as one”

Post-survey: “The unity of the world of believers, of all tongues and nationalities, serving Jesus Christ and acknowledging Him in love and service.”

Paired Sample T-Test Results: All Participants

Question	Pre-Survey Mean	Post-Survey Mean	T	Sig
I understand the Biblical basis for why we do missions	3.6154	3.7077	-0.925	.359
I know how prayer impacts mission work	3.6061	3.8030	-2.137*	.036*
I regularly pray for the nations and missionaries that serve there	2.8281	3.0938	-2.792*	.007*
I understand the spiritual discipline of fasting	3.0923	3.1846	-0.925	.359
I know how to spiritually prepare for my missions experience	3.0000	3.5077	-5.295*	.000*
I am familiar with the term “unreached” when referring to specific people groups	3.5373	3.8955	-3.895*	.000*
I could clearly explain to someone why I am going on a Focus International team	3.4923	3.7692	-3.108*	.003*
I know how to support my in-country host	2.9672	3.5246	-4.815*	.000*
I have considered serving on a long-term mission (one year or more)	2.9688	3.3438	-3.402*	.001*
I understand the concept of the “global church”	3.1833	3.5667	-3.691*	.000*

*= the finding was significant

The participants showed significant growth in the area of living a missional lifestyle. Participants were significantly more likely to have considered serving on a long-term mission ($t=-3.402$, $p<.001$) at the completion of training than they were before training began.

There was no significant growth in the Biblical basis for missions learning outcome. This was supported by the qualitative data. On the pre-survey the most common answer for the open ended question “What is the Biblical basis for missions” had the common theme of the Great Commission (Matthew 28:18-20). The most common theme for the same question on the post-survey was also the Great Commission. Some examples of the pre/post-survey qualitative findings, with the Great Commission as the theme, are as follows:

Pre-survey: “One of our duties as a Christ-follower is to fulfill the Great Commission in order to spread the good news of the gospel”

Post-survey: “We are called, as God's disciples, to share the gospel to everyone around us.”

Pre-survey: “Go out, make disciples, baptize in the name of the Trinity”

Post-survey: “Matt 28:17-20”

Pre-survey: “Making disciples of all men, going to all the nations, by proclaiming the love of Christ, teaching from the Bible and serving.”

Post-survey: “Fulfill the great commission by sharing the good news.”

The one individual who indicated a deeper understanding of the Biblical basis for missions on the pre-survey was a team leader and the post-survey answer was almost identical to the pre-survey answer.

Pre-survey: “Acts 1:8, Matthew 25- Great Commission, go, make, baptize, teach”

Post-survey: “Mt 28: Go make, baptize, teach; Act 1:8 all the world”

One participant’s post-survey answer was almost word for word of what the training had been attempting to impart on the participants.

Pre-survey: "To aid the impoverished and spread the word and love of Christ"

Post-survey: "From Genesis to Revelation, God calls us to spread the gospel to the nations."

A paired t-test for Focus International team members (not leaders) revealed several significant areas of growth in three of the four learning outcomes. In regards to spiritual preparedness, by the end of training team members were significantly more likely to know how prayer impacts missions work ($t=-2.790$, $p<.05$), regularly pray for missionaries and the nations ($t=-2.457$, $p<.05$), know how to spiritually prepare for a missions experience ($t=-5.489$, $p<.001$), and be able to clearly explain to someone why they are participating in a Focus International trip ($t=-2.864$, $p<.05$).

In regards to understanding the concept of the Global Church, at the end of Focus International training team members were significantly more likely to be familiar with the term "unreached people group" ($t=-4.011$, $p<.001$), know how to support their in-country host ($t=-5.109$, $p<.001$), and understand the concept of the Global Church ($t=-3.921$, $p<.001$). In regards to living a missional lifestyle, team members were significantly more likely to have considered serving on a long-term mission ($t=-2.779$, $p<.05$) at the end of training than they were before training began.

A paired t-test for team leaders revealed no significant growth in any of the four learning outcomes. Though the following findings are not significant, it is interesting to note that team leaders' means decreased from the pre-survey to the post survey in the following areas: I understand the Biblical basis for missions (pre-mean=3.875, post-mean=3.75), I know how prayer impacts missions work (pre-mean=3.8235, post-mean=3.7059), and I understand the spiritual discipline of fasting (pre-mean=3.3529, post-mean=3.2941).

Paired Sample T-Test Results: Members and Leaders Split

Question	Title	Pre-Survey Mean	Post-Survey Mean	T	Sig.
I understand the Biblical basis for why we do missions	Member	3.5417	3.6875	-1.225	.227
	Leader	3.8750	3.7500	0.696	.497
I know how prayer impacts mission work	Member*	3.5208	3.8333	-2.790*	.008*
	Leader	3.8235	3.7059	0.808	.431
I regularly pray for the nations and missionaries that serve there	Member*	2.7872	3.0638	-2.457*	.018*
	Leader	2.9375	3.1250	-1.000	.333
I understand the spiritual discipline of fasting	Member	2.9787	3.1277	-1.359	.181
	Leader	3.3529	3.2941	0.251	.805
I know how to spiritually prepare for my missions experience	Member*	2.8333	3.4583	-5.489*	.000*
	Leader	3.4375	3.6875	-1.732	.104
I am familiar with the term “unreached” when referring to specific people groups	Member*	3.4286	3.8980	-4.011*	.000*
	Leader	3.8235	3.9412	-1.461	.163
I could clearly explain to someone why I am going on a Focus International team	Member*	3.3830	3.7234	-2.864*	.006*
	Leader	3.8235	3.9412	-1.461	.163
I know how to support my in-country host	Member*	2.7556	3.4889	-5.109*	.000*
	Leader	3.6000	3.6667	-0.564	.582
I have considered serving on a long-term mission (one year or more)	Member*	2.8478	3.1957	-2.779*	.008*
	Leader	3.2941	3.7059	-1.692	.110
I understand the concept of the “global church”	Member*	3.0000	3.5116	-3.921*	.000*
	Leader	3.6875	3.6875	0.000	1.000

* = the finding was significant

Discussion

In conjunction with the Office of World Missions, the Focus International program strives to develop young adults into spiritually prepared, global citizens that embody an understanding of the Biblical basis of missions. An assessment of these goals was rendered using quantitative and qualitative results from the current program evaluation. This data revealed several areas of success, growth, and further discovery.

Much of the programs success results from the thorough application process conducted prior to acceptance on a team. The application process weeds out individuals who do not meet the high standards and expectations the office has set out. The application highlights the rigorous schedule and time commitments and asks applicants to respond to various essay questions. Applicants are also required to provide three references that can provide feedback on their character and work ethic. As a result of this process, many of the individuals who are looking for a “summer of adventure” dissipate and those that have a heart for missions emerge. Overall, those who follow through on the application process have a better understanding of their upcoming missions experience and are, perhaps, more prepared for development in the areas covered in the learning outcomes.

The assessment of the pre-survey responses supports the hope that the application and selection process establishes the foundation for a successful program. On the four point Likert scale, very few of the participants strongly disagreed with the concepts addressed in the pre-survey. It seems as if the caliber of students Focus International attracts has a pre-established frame of reference for their development. The participants are already knowledgeable about the Biblical basis for missions (pre-survey mean=3.6154), the concept of the Global Church (pre-survey mean=3.1833), and how to spiritually prepare for a missions experience (pre-survey mean= 3.0000). Participants also appear to have already established characteristics of a missional lifestyle by having thought about serving on a long-term mission in the future (pre-survey mean=2.9688). The pre-survey qualitative responses support and confirm their general understanding of these concepts.

Of the four learning outcomes, increasing the participants understanding of the Biblical basis for missions needs further attention. Unlike the other outcomes, this topic was only addressed in one, one hour meeting that took place at the weekend training retreat. This afternoon session, which took place immediately after lunch, did not provide the most conducive learning environment. The learning outcome of the session was never directly expressed to the participants. During this session, a random member of a team would stand and read various scripture verses that called us to go out to the nations and share the gospel through love and actions. In the future, the learning objective should be explicitly stated. The teaching for this learning outcome should explicitly focus on dispelling the commonly held concept of the Biblical basis for missions only deriving from the Great Commission (found in Matthew 28:18-20) and should address and teach the concept of missions as a common thread woven throughout the entire Bible. Demonstrating this through scripture and then practicing it through memory could also be helpful.

When examining members and leaders separately, the Focus International program is more closely aligned with the needs of the team members. The members' significant area of growth in three of the four learning outcomes indicates the newly established outcomes are both challenging and attainable for this group. This is possibly due to team members having had less exposure to missions and are therefore in the beginning stages of formulating their understanding of concepts such as the Global Church.

One of the programs biggest successes is the strong correlation with the institutional mission. In 1899, Azusa Pacific University was founded as a school for

equipping Christian workers for service. Now in 2008, the university still strives to increase their internalization efforts. With both members and leaders, the Focus International program is helping students expand their worldview, increase their awareness of international issues, and develop a missional lifestyle. Through the various training methods, members are showing growth in their consideration of serving on a long-term mission of one-year or more.

In comparison with members, the results show that leaders did not grow significantly in any of the learning outcomes. There are several considerations that must be made upon assessing this information. First, out of the 67 usable surveys, only 17 were completed by team leaders. Therefore, one must carefully weigh the small sample size when interpreting the results. Secondly, one of the qualifications for acceptance as a leader is prior experience as a member of a missions' team. With this requirement, most leaders have a better understanding of what the Biblical basis for missions is prior to training. They are more likely to have interacted with an in-country host and therefore understand the dynamics involved in supporting them. Lastly, their experience and commitment to leading a team shows they have already begun developing a missional lifestyle.

The pre-survey results support the leaders' high confidence in their abilities prior to training. Yet, when comparing these same results with those taken in the post-survey, their results revealed no significant growth in any of the four learning outcomes. In fact, the results show there was a decrease in three areas; understanding the Biblical basis for missions work, knowing how prayer impacts missions' work, and understanding the spiritual discipline of fasting. So, why would the leaders decrease in their understanding

of these areas? There are several possible answers. One possible answer is that leaders are widening their lens to understand the complexity of the issue. It is often said the more someone knows, the more they realize what they do not know. This could be the case for the leaders. Another possibility could be that they had already attained the learning objectives set before them and therefore worked to foster understanding in their team rather than on a personal basis.

Regardless, the stagnant and declining results gathered from the Focus International leaders should be further assessed. The learning objectives set forth for all participants should be distinctly different for leaders. Although each leader should embody an understanding of members learning objectives they should also be challenged with additional objectives specific to leadership. These objectives could address such areas as being a servant leader, understanding the importance of being a missions mobilizer, and being a good steward of finances. These objectives can be explicitly discussed and modeled in the bi-weekly leader meetings.

References

- Black, J., & Mendenhall, M. (1990) Cross-cultural training effectiveness: A review and a theoretical framework for future research. *Academy of Management Review*, 15, 113-136.
- Blimling, G. S. (2001). Editorial: Diversity makes you smarter. *Journal of College Student Development*, 42(6), 517-519.
- Brislin, R.W. (1991) *Cross-cultural encounters*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Cheng, D. X., & Zhao, C. (2006). Cultivating multicultural competence through active participation: Extracurricular activities and multicultural learning. *NASPA Journal*, 43(4), 13-38.
- Clinton, W. J., 1993. Inaugural address. *New York Times*, 21 January, A15.
- Crossman, J. (2003). Secular spiritual development in education from international and global perspectives. *Oxford Review of Education*, 29(4), 503-520.
- Dearborn, T. (2003). *Short-term missions workbook: From mission tourists to global citizens*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Globalization. (n.d.). *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition*. Retrieved February 25, 2008, from Dictionary.com website: <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/Globalization>
- Holcomb, G. L., & Nonneman, A. J. (2004). Faithful change: Exploring and assessing faith development in Christian liberal arts undergraduates. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 122(summer), 93-103.
- Jaffarian, M. (2008). The Statistical State of the North American Protestant Missions Movement, from the Mission Handbook, 20th Edition. *International Bulletin of Missionary Research*, 32(1), 35-38. Retrieved February 18, 2008, from Humanities Module database. (Document ID: 1417046091)
- Lopez-Mulnix, E. E., & Mulnix, M. W. (2006). Models of excellence in multicultural colleges and universities. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 5, 4-21.
- Livermore, D. A. (2007). *Serving with eyes wide open: Doing short-term missions with cultural intelligence*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books.
- Mendenhall, M., & Oddou, G. (1986). Acculturation profiles of expatriate managers: Implications for cross-cultural training programs. *Colombia Journal of World Business*, 21(4), 73-79.

- N/A (1991). *The life application study Bible: New international version*. Wheaton, Illinois: Tyndale House Publishers, Inc.
- Peterson, R., Aeschliman, G., & Sneed, R. W. (2003). *Maximum impact, short-term mission: The God-commanded repetitive deployment of swift, temporary nonprofessional missionaries*. Minneapolis: STEM.
- Pope, R. L., & Reynolds, A. L. (1997). Student affairs core competencies: Integrating multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills. *Journal of College Student Development*, 38(3), 266-277.
- Priest, R. J., & Priest, J. P. (n.d.). *"They see everything, and understand nothing": Short-term mission and service learning*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Tuttle, K.A. (2000). The effects of short-term mission experiences on college students' spiritual growth and maturity. *Christian Education Journal*, 4, 123-140.
- Walling, S., Eriksson, C., Messe, K., Ciovica, A., Gorton, D., & Foy, D. W. (2006) Cultural Identity and Reentry in short-term student missionaries. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 34, 153-163.