

ABSTRACT

Title: STUDY ABROAD AS A PASSPORT TO STUDENT LEARNING: DOES THE DURATION OF THE STUDY ABROAD PROGRAM MATTER?

Jill M. Neppel, Master of Arts, 2005

Directed By: Assistant Professor Karen Kurotsuchi Inkelas,
Counseling and Personnel Services

This study examined the effect of the length of a study abroad program on the achievement of four learning outcomes: cognitive complexity, liberal learning, personal philosophy, and interpersonal self-confidence. Data was collected through a web-based survey instrument that was administered to a sample population of University of Maryland study abroad participants. The following study abroad programs were represented: Fall 2003, Winter 2004, Spring 2004, Summer 2004, Academic Year 2003-2004, Fall 2004, and Winter 2005. Analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was employed in the research design with gender and academic class standing as covariates.

The results found each of the research hypotheses to be statistically significant. The amount of growth in cognitive complexity, liberal learning, personal philosophy and interpersonal self-confidence was found to be significantly higher in the self-reported scores of those respondents who studied abroad on long-term programs in comparison to those individuals who studied abroad on short-term programs.

STUDY ABROAD AS A PASSPORT TO STUDENT LEARNING: DOES THE
DURATION OF THE STUDY ABROAD PROGRAM MATTER?

By

Jill M. Neppel

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park, in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
2005

Advisory Committee:
Assistant Professor Karen Kurotsuchi Inkelas, Chair
Associate Professor Susan R. Komives
Dr. Marsha Guenzler-Stevens

© Copyright by
Jill M. Neppel
2005

Table of Contents

List of Tables	iv
Chapter I: Introduction.....	1
Historical Legacy of Study Abroad	2
Current Status of Study Abroad.....	3
Profile of Study Abroad Participants	3
Study Abroad Destinations	6
Duration of Study Abroad Programs	8
Study Abroad Program Models	10
Common Definitions.....	10
Types of Programs	11
University of Maryland Programs	14
Goals of Study Abroad.....	17
A Comparison of Short-term and Long-term Study Abroad	18
Long-Term Study Abroad Programs	18
Short-Term Study Abroad Programs	18
Purpose of the Research Study	19
Significance of the Problem.....	21
Conclusion	23
Chapter II: Literature Review	25
Introduction.....	25
Research on College Student Learning.....	25
The Effect of Student Characteristics	27
Involving Colleges.....	28
The Role of Student Involvement.....	29
Research on Study Abroad.....	32
Limitations of Study Abroad Research.....	32
Study Abroad Research: Negative Results	35
Study Abroad Research: Inconclusive Results	36
Study Abroad Research: Positive Results.....	39
Intersection of Research on Student Learning and Study Abroad.....	47
Impact of Length of Time Abroad.....	48
Summary and Conclusion.....	54
Chapter III: Methodology	55
Review of Research Question and Hypotheses	55
Description of the Institution	55
Description of the Sample.....	56
Survey Instrument and Variables of Interest	58
Survey Questions	60
Validity and Reliability.....	63
Data Collection Procedure	64
The Subjects.....	64

Administering the Survey	65
Data Analysis	66
Scale Creation	66
Inferential Statistics	67
Descriptive Statistics	67
Summary	68
Chapter IV: Results	69
Introduction	69
Description of the Sample	69
Description of Respondents' Study Abroad Experiences	76
Data Analysis: Inferential Statistics	85
Data Clean-up and Modifications	85
Reliability	86
Testing of ANCOVA Assumptions	87
Analysis of Hypotheses	88
Ancillary Analyses	93
Summary	97
Chapter V: Discussion	98
Findings and Implications	98
Summary of Findings	98
Interpretation of Findings	99
Hypothesis One	99
Hypothesis Two	100
Hypothesis Three	102
Hypothesis Four	104
Additional Findings	104
Practical Implications	108
Limitations and Generalizability of the Study	109
Threats to Internal Validity	109
Threats to External Validity	111
Other Limitations	111
Suggestions for Future Research	114
Summary	117
Appendix A: NSLLP Survey	118
Appendix B: Study Abroad Survey	129
Appendix C: NSLLP Composite Scores	140
References	142

List of Tables

Table 1:	Estimated Number of Participants According to Program Type	57
Table 2:	Survey Questions	62
Table 3:	Composite Measures.....	66
Table 4:	Participation in Study Abroad Programs of Varying Lengths: Survey Respondents' Participation versus the Study Abroad Office's Estimation of Total Number of Participants	70
Table 5:	A Comparison of the Participants of this Research Study to the 2002-2003 Population of U.S. American Study Abroad Participants	71
Table 6:	Annual Income of Survey Respondents' Parents by Length of Program	72
Table 7:	Survey Respondents' Academic Colleges by Length of Study Abroad Program	73
Table 8:	Current Class Standing of Survey Respondents by Length of Study Abroad Program	74
Table 9:	Number of Times Survey Respondents Traveled Abroad Prior to this Study Abroad Experience by Length of Program	75
Table 10:	Longest Amount of Time (In Weeks) Spent in Another Country During a Single Visit Prior to this Study Abroad Experience	76
Table 11:	The Sponsoring Institutions and Organizations of Survey Respondents' Study Abroad Programs	77
Table 12:	The Extent to Which Survey Respondents' Study Abroad Programs Required Traveling to Multiple Locations by Length of Program	78
Table 13:	The Location of Survey Respondents' Study Abroad Programs by Length of Program	78
Table 14:	The Extent to which Survey Respondents' Study Abroad Experiences Involved the English Language by Length of Program	79
Table 15:	The Use of English as the Language of Instruction for the Majority of Survey Respondents' Classes by Length of Program.....	79
Table 16:	The Nationalities of Survey Respondents' Classmates While Abroad....	80

Table 17: The Nationalities of Survey Respondents’ Instructors While Abroad.....	81
Table 18: Survey Respondents’ Answer to Whether or Not Their Program Involved Staying With a Host Family by Length of Study Abroad Program.....	82
Table 19: Survey Respondents’ Answer to Whether or Not Their Program Involved Staying in University Housing by Length of Study Abroad Program.....	82
Table 20: Survey Respondents’ Answer to Whether or Not Their Program Involved Staying In a Private Dormitory by Length of Study Abroad Program.....	83
Table 21: Survey Respondents’ Answer to Whether or Not Their Program Involved Staying In a Private Apartment by Length of Study Abroad Program.....	83
Table 22: Survey Respondents’ Answer to Whether or Not Their Program Involved Staying In Hotels by Length of Study Abroad Program.....	83
Table 23: Habitation Patterns of Survey Respondents by Length of Study Abroad Program.....	84
Table 24: Reliability of Measured Constructs	87
Table 25: Descriptive Statistics for the NSLLP	89
Table 26: ANCOVA of Differences in Amount of Growth in Cognitive Complexity by Length of Study Abroad Program	90
Table 27: ANCOVA of Differences in Amount of Growth in Liberal Learning by Length of Study Abroad Program.....	91
Table 28: ANCOVA of Differences in Amount of Growth in Personal Philosophy by Length of Study Abroad Program.....	92
Table 29: ANCOVA of Differences in Amount of Growth in Interpersonal Self-Confidence	93
Table 30: Survey Respondents’ Feelings toward the Length of their Study Abroad Programs.....	94
Table 31: Participants’ Feelings toward their Study Abroad Experiences	95

Table 32: Future Plans to Study Abroad.....	96
Table 33: Barriers to Studying Abroad.....	97

Chapter I: Introduction

According to the Institute of International Education (IIE; 2004), a record 174,629 U.S. American college students received credit for studying abroad during the 2002/03 academic year. This marks an increase of 8.5% from the previous year and an astounding 145% increase from 1991/92 totals. These statistics are consistent with the general trend of increased student interest in study abroad, which has been apparent since the middle of the twentieth century, as shown by the increasing number of students studying abroad. According to the IIE, the number of students participating in study abroad programs has risen concurrent to the proliferation of study abroad opportunities, which have become more “plentiful, varied and more affordable” (¶ 2).

One of the ways in which study abroad opportunities have proliferated is the introduction of short-term programs. Within the last few decades, short-term study abroad programs have emerged as a popular alternative to the traditional study abroad programs that last for a semester or academic year. Although short-term study abroad has been credited with the rapidly ascending number of U.S. study abroad participants, research has not yet studied the effectiveness of short-term options in facilitating the learning outcomes often associated with their long-term study abroad counterparts. Accordingly, this study sought to examine potential differences in learning outcomes among undergraduates who participate in study abroad programs of differing lengths of time. Before discussing the research questions and hypotheses of this study in more detail, however, it is important to first provide a historical and contemporary portrayal of the field of study abroad.

Historical Legacy of Study Abroad

During the colonial period, international education was only an option for members of the elite class. According to Sell (1983), it was quite common for the adolescent male sons of affluent families to travel to Western Europe for the entirety of their post-secondary education. Even after colleges and universities were founded in the United States, a select number of students continued to travel abroad to receive advanced specialized training at foreign universities (Sell). Not until the time period between the first and second World Wars, when the “Junior Year Abroad” program was established for educational, economic, military and political reasons, did the number and demographics of students participating in international education begin to change (Sell). The major focus of junior year abroad programs was foreign language instruction. Most of these programs relocated students to Western European countries for the duration of an academic year. However, just as the field of higher education itself began to change after World War II, so too did the purpose and scope of international education.

In 1944, the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act (commonly referred to as the G. I. Bill) was passed, which provided returning war veterans with financial assistance and the incentive to enroll in colleges and universities as an alternative to looking for employment in the already saturated labor market. As a result of the G. I. Bill, diversity among male students increased dramatically on college campuses, as did the total number of students enrolled in post-secondary education (Thelin, 2003). Another historical influence on higher education that dates back to around this time was the momentous decision of the federal government to begin providing financial aid packages to students and higher education institutions in the 1960s. This succeeded in drastically increasing

access to higher education for women students, students of color, students of low socioeconomic backgrounds and nontraditionally aged students (Pearson, Shavlik, & Touchton, 1989; Thelin). At the same time, and perhaps due to the above factors, the nature of study abroad programs and demographics of participating students also began to change after World War II (Sell, 1983). As an alternative to the traditional academic year-long study abroad programs, semester, quarter and summer programs began to emerge. For the first time, students were given the choice of how long to remain abroad, as well as what to study while abroad (Sell). Increasingly, students were able to choose from a variety of academic disciplines, instead of being limited to the traditional option of foreign language and literature (Sell).

Current Status of Study Abroad

Profile of study abroad participants. A look at the rank and profile of students who take advantage of the opportunity to study abroad serves to give readers insight into just how much international education has changed throughout the history of the United States. At the same time, this depiction also serves to demonstrate how much work remains to be done in order to reach a level where all college and university students enroll in study abroad at the same rate, regardless of gender, socioeconomic class, race/ethnicity, age and/or ability.

As expected, the data provided by the Open Doors Report (IIE, 2004) reveal that the majority of study abroad participants are undergraduate students. Within the undergraduate population, juniors comprise the largest group of participants (38.0%), followed by seniors (20.2%), sophomores (11.8%) and freshmen (2.9%), respectively (IIE). Of the remaining 2002/03 study abroad participants, 15.3% are classified as

unspecified undergraduate students, 3.4% are classified as unspecified graduate students, 4.8% are Master's students, 2.1% of the students are pursuing their Associate degrees, 0.9% are Doctoral students and 0.7% are designated as unknown/other (IIE).

As stated earlier, study abroad is no longer restricted to foreign language majors. Before providing a detailed breakdown of study abroad participation by field of academic study, however, it is prudent to note that some students, though not foreign language majors, may still be attempting to enhance their foreign language proficiency through a study abroad experience. At any rate, the Institute for International Education (2004) reports that the largest proportion of study abroad participants (21.3%) major in the Social Sciences. The next most popular fields of study among study abroad participants (in descending order) are: Business and Management (17.7%), Humanities (13.3%), Fine or Applied Arts (9.0%), Foreign Language (7.9%), Physical Sciences (7.1%), other (6.4%), Education (4.1%), Undeclared (3.5%), Health Sciences (3.1%), Engineering (2.9%), Math and Computer Sciences (2.4%), and Agriculture (1.5%).

Perhaps not entirely unrelated to the academic majors of study abroad participants is the gender disparity among study abroad participants. In 2002/03, 64.7% of study abroad participants were female, and only 35.3% were male (IIE, 2004); this gender disparity among study abroad participants has persisted for at least the last decade. This phenomenon coincides with the trend of women enrolling in higher education in numbers that far exceed those of men. The 1980s saw the number of female college students overtake the number of male college students for the first time (Astin & Kent, 1983; The New York Times, 1998), a trend that has not reversed since and does not appear likely to do so anytime soon. In 2002, 57% of all awarded bachelor's degrees were conferred to

women (Hacker, 2003), and the United States Department of Education has forecasted that by the year 2007, there will only be 6.9 million men enrolled in institutions of higher education compared with 9.2 million women (The New York Times). Furthermore, female students tend to cluster in the social sciences and humanities, at the expense of science and math, which are academic subjects perceived to be less conducive to studying abroad. For these two interrelated reasons, then, it is not surprising that the ratio of female study abroad participants is nearly twice as high as male study abroad participants.

With regards to race/ethnicity, there is also a noticeable disparity among study abroad participants. In fact, in 2002/03, 83.2% of study abroad participants were White/Caucasian, while 6.0% were Asian-American, 5.1% were Hispanic/Latino, 3.4% were Black/African-American, 1.8% were Multiracial, and .5% were Native American/American Indian (IIE, 2004).

Although it has been demonstrated that the demographic composition of study abroad participants is skewed (i.e., more study abroad participants are female than male, and more White students study abroad than any other racial/ethnic group), these numbers do indicate significant progress since the colonial period and even since the middle of the last century. These two trends, however, must be interpreted in entirely different manners. The fact that women study abroad in higher numbers than men indicates substantial progress for women, since they were largely excluded from international education until the 1960s and 1970s when they were granted greater access to higher education in general. However, responsible educators must now face the difficult question of why men do not enroll in international education at the same rate as women.

As for the disparity along racial/ethnic lines, this incongruity is more straightforward to understand due to the widely acknowledged barriers to study abroad (i.e., economic, cultural, social, and academic), as well as the general sense of inequality that is to date still inherent in higher education, and which puts members of minority racial and ethnic groups at a disadvantage (hooks, 1994; Pinkus, 2000). However, the fact that study abroad participants have become increasingly diverse since the origination of international education (when only affluent White males could be counted among those fortunate enough to study abroad), can still be justifiably looked at as progress. As such, many (e.g., IIE, 2004; Spencer & Tuma, 2002) would attribute this progress, (i.e., greater numbers of students studying abroad and increased access for both minority and majority students) to the increase in type and focus of study abroad programs, which will be the focus of a subsequent section.

Study abroad destinations. Another trend in the field of international education concerns the destinations where students are choosing to study. Educators and institutions alike are actively promoting the benefits of studying abroad in nontraditional locations (Jenkins, 2002); accordingly, the locations where students are choosing to study are indeed becoming more diverse (IIE, 2004; Jenkins; Marklein, 2003). According to the Open Doors Report 2004 (IIE), the following twenty countries hosted the largest number of U.S. American college students in 2002/03: the United Kingdom (31,706 students), Italy (18,936 students), Spain (18,865 students), France (13,080 students), Australia (10,691 students), Mexico (8,775 students), Germany (5,587 students), Ireland (4,892 students), Costa Rica (4,296 students), Japan (3,457 students), Austria (2,798 students), China (2,493), Greece (2,011 students), the Czech Republic (1,997 students), Chile

(1,944 students), New Zealand (1,917 students), the Netherlands (1,792 students), South Africa (1,594 students), Ecuador (1,567 students), and Russia (1,521 students). This translates into 64% of study abroad participants studying in countries where English is not the native language (IIE). Of particular significance is the fact that each of the countries listed above, with the exception of China, witnessed substantial increases in the number of U.S. students they hosted since the preceding year, 2001/02 (IIE). Although Western and Eastern European countries saw a 9% rise in study abroad participants from the preceding year (bringing the total to 109,907 students), it is important to note that eleven of the most popular destinations are not located in Western Europe (IIE). Furthermore, seven of these eleven destinations experienced double-digit growth (in percentage points) since the preceding year (IIE). Latin America also experienced a 14% rise in the number of study abroad participants (bringing the total number of students to 26,643); similarly, Australia and New Zealand experienced significant increases as well (IIE). African nations also experienced a 4% rise in the number of U.S. American students they hosted, and for the first time ever, Antarctica was a study abroad destination, hosting 18 U.S. American students (IIE).

Despite the overall increase in the number of students studying abroad, two world regions, in fact, hosted fewer U.S. American students in 2002/03 than in years past. These world regions included Asia, which experienced an 11% decrease, and the Middle East, which experienced a decrease of 51% (IIE, 2004). The decrease in the number of students studying abroad in Asia can easily be explained by the outbreak of the SARS epidemic, which necessitated the cancellation of numerous spring and summer 2003 Asia study abroad programs (IIE). Furthermore, the precipitous decline in the number of U.S.

American students studying abroad in the Middle East could be attributed to the increasingly hostile relations between the United States and Middle Eastern countries, the war with Iraq, and the warnings by the U.S. State Department concerning the imminent threat of terrorist attacks against American citizens abroad (Dunbar, 2003; Farrelly, 2003; IIE; U.S. Department of State, 2004). Furthermore, the persistent hostilities between Israel and Palestine, often manifested in attacks and suicide bombings, may have also contributed to the diminished interest in this world area as a study abroad destination.

Duration of study abroad programs. Another major trend in the field of international education, and which will be given prominent attention in this particular research study, concerns the amount of time that students actually spend abroad. While the number of U.S. American students participating in study abroad programs has risen dramatically over the last few decades, the amount of time that students actually spend abroad has decreased just as drastically (Dwyer & Peters, 2004; IIE, 2004; Spencer & Tuma, 2002). The study abroad program lasting a full academic year, once held up as the ideal, is becoming increasingly less common. In fact, only 7% of study abroad participants chose academic year-long programs in 2002/03, compared to 18% in 1985/86 (IIE). The statistics propagated by Dwyer and Peters are perhaps even more illustrative of this trend. In reporting on the results of the International Education of Students (IES) 50-year Alumni Survey, the researchers found that among the individuals who had studied abroad during the 1950s and 1960s, 72% had studied abroad for a full year; in comparison, only 20% of the respondents had studied abroad for a full year during the 1990s.

As such, it is not surprising that the overwhelming majority of U.S. American students who studied abroad in 2002/03 (92%) were enrolled in programs that lasted for a semester or less (IIE, 2004). Results of the IES Alumni Survey revealed that the number of study abroad participants studying abroad for 10 weeks or less has increased threefold from the 1950s and 1960s to the 1990s (Dwyer & Peters, 2004). These statistics are buttressed by the analogous results of the Open Doors Report (IIE), which found that more than 50% of study abroad participants enrolled in summer, January term, or other programs that lasted eight weeks or less in 2002/03. It is held by many in the field of international education that the proliferation of short-term study abroad programs has permitted a greater number of students to participate in study abroad programs than would have otherwise been restricted from doing so, due to financial, familial or curricular impediments (IIE; Marklein, 2003; Rubin, 1995; Sowa, 2002; Spencer & Tuma, 2002).

Although the number of students who participate in study abroad continues to rise each year, the reality is that these students only account for a little more than 1% of the total college student population (IIE, 2004; Marklein, 2003). According to a report disseminated by NAFSA: Association of International Educators, institutions of higher education often unknowingly and unintentionally discourage students from studying abroad through such factors as faculty indifference, rigid curricula, and programs not conducive to the needs of nontraditional students (Marklein). The cost of international education, real or perceived, coupled with the temporary or permanent loss of a paying job, also acts as a significant factor dissuading students from studying abroad (Rubin, 1995; Sell, 1983). Many of the impediments to study abroad pertain to both long and

short-term programs; however, many are more applicable to semester and year-long programs because of the fact that short-term programs have been designed with many of these acknowledged barriers in mind. For example, in *Opening Doors: Alternative Pedagogies for Short-Term Programs Abroad*, Hovde (2002b), pointed to anecdotal and quantitative evidence demonstrating that most U.S. college students are unwilling and unable to spend a semester or academic year abroad. He proceeded to delineate the many reasons that institutions would be disinclined from sending large numbers of students abroad, including budgetary constraints, empty residence halls, lower student-faculty ratios, and logistical complications. Furthermore, individual students may have their own academic, personal, social or cultural justifications for not wanting to study abroad (Tuma, 2002a).

Study Abroad Program Models

Common definitions. The very reason that increasing numbers of students are able to choose to study abroad for varying amounts of time and from a plethora of destinations stems from the fact that there are currently numerous types of program models and program providers (IIE, 2004). Therefore, in light of the preceding historical and contemporary discussion of study abroad, it is important to review the common definitions of international education terms and to understand the diverse array of study abroad programs. At the most general level, international education may be defined as activities and programs that permit ideas and individuals to cross cultural and international borders (Arum & Van de Water, 1992; Harari, 1992). Study abroad is usually defined more narrowly within the U.S., to mean: “Any arrangement by which a student completes part of the college program studying in another country. Can [*sic*] be at

a campus abroad or through a cooperative agreement with some other U.S. college or an institution of another country” (Florida Atlantic University, Common Data Set Definitions). Harari defines student exchange programs as “the international movement of students and scholars” (p. 69). Moreover, the term “study tour” is frequently used to describe study abroad programs that are short-term and which often occur during the summer break or winter-term (Hopkins, 1999). For the purposes of this research study, the terms “international education,” “education abroad” and “study abroad” will be used interchangeably. It is important to note, however, that this study is only concerned with U.S. American students leaving the United States for a period of time to study at an institution of higher education located in another country, and not with foreign students who are enrolled at U.S. colleges and universities.

Types of programs. Kraft, Ballantine, and Garvey (as cited in Sowa, 2002) classify study abroad programs into three categories: total immersion, protective studies and tour models. These categories highlight the extent to which study abroad participants’ experiences may qualitatively differ in relation to the type of program in which individuals are enrolled. Through total immersion models, students are able to truly experience the language and culture of a foreign country and culture by studying at a foreign university for a period of time that lasts between a semester and a year. In comparison, protective study abroad models function as study abroad programs where students interact with and are instructed by resident advisors and instructors from their home countries while abroad. Finally, the third type of program, the study tour, usually occurs over a period of time spanning from two to eight weeks, and is meant to provide

students with an overview of the course topic and of the country (or countries, if more than one are visited during the study tour, which is often the case).

There are a myriad ways to further classify and categorize study abroad programs, including academic focus, provider, site, instruction method, and length of program. It is important to note that there are advantages and disadvantages associated with each type of program. Looking specifically at short-term study abroad program models, Hovde (2002b) identified three types of study abroad courses that could be labeled according to their predetermined academic focus: topical; language training and cultural learning; and interdisciplinary understanding. The possibilities for topical courses are virtually limitless, in that the context provided by the culture and political, social or economic environment of the host country enriches the topic of the course by providing a comparative perspective or the addition of materials which would most likely not have been utilized on the home campus (Hovde). Courses that focus on language training and cultural learning do exactly what they imply. Immersion in another culture, however brief, is a useful tool that aids students in increasing their foreign language proficiency and their understanding of the host culture (Hovde). Courses that focus on interdisciplinary understanding are global in scope and deal with such topics as ethnicity, diversity, anthropological world problems, international relations, and economic development and sustainability (Hovde).

Other pedagogical considerations concern the site and instruction of the program (Hovde, 2002b). Whereas residential programs are located at one particular site, travel programs take students to multiple locations throughout the study tour (Hovde). A related consideration centers on who should deliver the course material to the study abroad

participants. In the “transplanted” or “offshore” model, the U.S. American faculty member who has accompanied his/her students abroad is solely responsible for the instruction of the class as well as all aspects of grading. Conversely, it can be pre-arranged for one or more host nationals to teach the course material and conduct the evaluation of learning that has taken place (Hovde).

Program models may also be classified according to which individuals and/or entities coordinate, manage and direct the various aspects of the study abroad programs. Tuma (2002b) identified the following possibilities: programs that are faculty-directed, programs that result from institutional and program provider partnerships, exchange models, consortium programs, and embedded programs. Faculty directed programs are offered through the home institution and are led by an identified faculty member. They may result from the work of an individual faculty member, an academic department, the international/study abroad office, or a combination of these three entities (Tuma). Programs that result from partnerships between institutions and program providers are also quite common. In fact, the Institute of International Education estimates that 40% of short-term programs are sponsored by program providers, which include foreign universities, institutes, and adult education centers, as well as other U.S.-based and foreign organizations without U.S. accreditation (Tuma). Such programs enable students to study abroad, in spite of the fact that the actual home institutions in which they are enrolled may not have the finances or human resources to design and deliver study abroad programs on their own. Exchange models are essentially bilateral institutional agreements between U.S. American institutions of higher education and international institutions which involve the reciprocal exchange of students for agreed upon periods of

time (Tuma). Another program model is the consortium model, which involves two or more colleges and universities sharing program resources and allowing any of the institutional consortium members' students to participate in the consortium study abroad programs at an equal rate (Tuma). Finally, the structure of an embedded program requires that students participate in the short-term study abroad program as part of the academic requirement of the course, which usually lasts the entire academic term (Tuma).

Finally, study abroad programs can be classified by program duration. Study abroad programs deemed long-term usually last an academic year or semester. On the other hand, short-term programs, which usually take place in January, May, or the summer months, typically last between three and six weeks (but may range anywhere between one and eight weeks). Spencer and Tuma (2002) poignantly draw attention to the fact that the definition of short-term study abroad has changed substantially within the last fifty years. At one time, semester-long programs were thought of as short-term. Currently, however, short-term study abroad conjures up images of study tours that last significantly less than one term (i.e., one to eight weeks total). Short-term study abroad, as currently defined, has a large coterie of both supporters and detractors. Many supporters maintain that the original goals and outcomes of study abroad are maintained or changed only slightly with this shorter format. Critics, however, assert that short-term study abroad is not nearly as effective as long-term study abroad. The controversy remains, as relatively little empirical research has been conducted that attempts to isolate and assess the impact of the length of study abroad programs on learning outcomes.

University of Maryland programs. Although length of study abroad program was operationalized as the sole independent variable in this research study, it is important for

readers to know that there are general patterns of organization common to short-term and long-term study abroad programs. Given the myriad program offerings and study abroad opportunities available to students, however, it should be known that there are certainly many exceptions that exist. With this caveat noted, a brief description of the various program offerings of the University of Maryland, College Park (UM) will be provided in order to illustrate these general patterns. This section will also serve the purpose of orienting readers to the nature of study abroad at the University of Maryland, where this particular research study was conducted.

According to the University of Maryland's Office of Study Abroad (2004), potential study abroad participants are able to choose from 44 total programs offered by the University of Maryland or University of Maryland system. Students are also permitted to enroll in non-University of Maryland programs, if the programs are approved by a member of the UM study abroad staff. If students wish to remain abroad for an entire academic year, they can choose between enrolling in a pre-arranged exchange program or an academic year study abroad program. Through the reciprocal exchange opportunities, University of Maryland students are able to study in Argentina, Great Britain, Brazil, Germany/Austria, Japan, Korea, or Sweden; in exchange, international students from those countries are able to enroll at the University of Maryland. These exchange programs would be aptly classified as total immersion programs because U.S. students enroll directly in the receiving foreign institutions. In addition to focusing on language training and cultural understanding, exchange program participants enroll in regular academic courses offered by the college or university, much like they would at their home institution. As an alternative to exchange programs,

students also have the opportunity to enroll in various academic year programs, in which they receive more on-site support from the University of Maryland and resident faculty directors provided by the home institution (e.g., the University of Maryland or Towson University) or the program provider (e.g., Denmark International Studies [DIS]). There are four of these particular programs: Maryland-in-Nice, Study in Leiden, Netherlands, Study in Rome (offered by Towson University), and Denmark's International Study Program (offered by DIS). Students also have the option of studying abroad for only a semester, either through one of the four aforementioned programs or through three additional offerings: Maryland-in-London, Maryland-in-Spain, and Semester in Germany: Engineering and German. These programs would be aptly classified as protective studies models, because students have the opportunity to interact with resident directors and program staff, as well as host nationals.

In comparison to the number of long-term programs, the University of Maryland offers far more short-term programs. In fact, the Study Abroad Office's website (<http://www.inform.umd.edu/EdRes/Intl/studyabroad/idxprog.html>) advertises twelve summer programs and eighteen winter-term programs. The winter-term programs last a standard three weeks, but the summer programs range from ten days to six weeks. Furthermore, a perusal of the respective titles of both summer and winter-term programs illustrates that, to a large extent, the academic focus of these shorter-term programs is either topical or interdisciplinary in nature, as compared to many of the longer-term programs, which focus more on language and cultural learning. For example, the summer programs range from "Argentina: Politics of Globalization," to "Western Europe: HIV/AIDS in Western Europe." Likewise, a sampling of the winter-term programs

include: “Belize: Mayan Culture, Tropical Rainforests and Coral Reefs,” “China and Vietnam: Women, Culture, and Sustainable Development,” and “UK and France: London and Paris, A Tale of Two Cities: The Parallel Histories of London and Paris.” As opposed to the stationary semester and academic year programs, many of the shorter-term programs involve travel to multiple destinations. Additionally, short-term programs also differ from their longer-term counterparts in that they are developed, led, and instructed by University of Maryland faculty members with expertise in those academic areas. Once on location, many of these programs are supplemented by guest lectures given by host nationals who are considered experts in the areas of academia, government and/or industry. Finally, although many summer and winter-term programs involve homestays, they are much more likely to rely on hotel or pension accommodations than long-term programs.

Goals of Study Abroad

A cursory look into the research and literature that exists on the subject of study abroad reveals a cornucopia of valuable outcomes commonly associated with study abroad. The next chapter will present a more thorough examination of the literature and published results of research studies. At this time, however, it is prudent to mention some key outcomes that are associated with study abroad, as they are often the variables of interest in study abroad research. First, there are the general education or academic goals of study abroad, which include increased foreign language proficiency, increased topical knowledge, the development of a well-rounded, general education, or technical and specialty training. Another important outcome area could be labeled cross-cultural skills; such skills include the development of ethnorelativism, increased world-mindedness, a

heightened interest in world affairs, and cross-cultural communication and interpersonal skills. Finally, cognitive and personal development are also touted as valuable outcomes of study abroad. Cognitive development may consist of any of the following outcomes: increased cognitive complexity, critical thinking skills, value-reflective thinking skills, tolerance for ambiguity, increased interest in intellectual pursuits and enhanced motivation to learn. Likewise, personal development may entail increased self-confidence/self-efficacy, increased independence and autonomy, clarification of vocational goals, clarification of academic goals, and increased interest in travel.

A Comparison of Short-term and Long-term Study Abroad

Long-term study abroad programs. Many involved with international education often see long-term study abroad programs as the ideal (Hovde, 2002b). Indeed, there are many touted advantages to programs that last the duration of a semester or academic year. Certainly, the reality that study abroad participants are allotted a longer amount of time in which to immerse themselves in the culture, to make lasting cross-cultural personal relationships, and to increase their foreign language proficiency cannot be looked at as a disadvantage. Accordingly, Kinsella, Smith-Simonet and Tuma (2002) have asserted that most international educators hold the common belief that a study abroad experience which immerses students in a foreign culture for a semester or longer is unrivaled in terms of how students' worldviews and self-perceptions are affected.

Short-term study abroad programs. Critics of short-term study abroad programs speak disparagingly of the lack of academic rigor that they attach to study tours and of the inability of these programs, by their very design, to allow students the same depth of immersion as long-term programs provide. Despite these criticisms, however, it is clear,

based on the popularity and proliferation of short-term programs, that there are still many advantages attached to short-term study abroad. The mere inception of short-term programs has permitted numerous students to study abroad who would not have done so otherwise (Hovde, 2002b). Beneficiaries of short-term study abroad programs have been those participants for whom cost is a major deterrent, as well as those students who either need to complete their degrees in as efficient a manner as possible, or those students with inflexible majors (e.g., science, engineering and math) that are notorious for rigid and highly sequenced course requirements (Spencer & Tuma, 2002). Furthermore, many students lack the confidence, preparedness, or drive to spend a semester or year abroad (Hovde). For these students, the allure of short-term study abroad programs may tempt them to participate, when they never would have thought to study abroad before. Such students may find short-term study abroad to suffice as a once-in-a-lifetime experience, or it may whet their appetites for future longer-term study abroad experiences or home campus-based courses, activities, and experiences that are more global or cultural in nature.

Purpose of the Research Study

This study sought to investigate the effects of a study abroad program's duration on the following learning outcomes: cognitive complexity, liberal learning, personal philosophy, and interpersonal self-confidence. The basic definitions of these constructs were borrowed from Inkelas' extensive research conducted on the outcomes of living-learning programs (Vogt, Longerbeam, Inkelas, & Owen Casper, in review). This research involved a psychometrically proven survey instrument (see Appendix A), which was modified for this study to measure the learning outcomes associated with study

abroad (see Appendix B). Because of the similar foundations of these research studies, it was deemed appropriate to use common definitions for the shared outcome measures. As such, growth in cognitive complexity was defined as “intellectual change and growth while in college” (Vogt et al., p. 12). Moreover, growth in liberal learning focused on “openness to new ideas and concepts. The concept of liberalism includes an appreciation of a broad education, openness to differing views, ability to discuss issues, and enjoyment of art, music, and cultural diversity” (Vogt et al., p. 12). Next, growth in personal philosophy measured “growth in self-understanding, development of values, and awareness of differing philosophies and cultures. It also includes an item that measures growth in the ability to get along with different kinds of people” (Vogt et al., p. 12). Finally, interpersonal self-confidence investigated “confidence in working with others, including leadership ability, expressing ideas orally, team efficacy, and time management” (Vogt et al., p. 12).

These particular learning outcomes were chosen because, first, it was necessary to limit the number of learning outcomes for this particular study from the more exhaustive list of learning outcomes researched by Vogt et al. (in review). Second, unlike foreign language acquisition, it seemed reasonable to believe that the potential existed for each learning outcome (i.e., cognitive complexity, liberal learning, personal philosophy, and interpersonal self-confidence) to be significantly affected by the study abroad experience, regardless of the length of the program. Lastly, these learning outcomes were specifically chosen because of their previous association with study abroad (Carsello & Creaser, 1976; Dwyer & Peters, 2004; Gmelch, 1977; Hensley & Sell, 1979; McMillan & Opem, 2004).

Significance of the Problem

National study abroad trends indicate that while the total number of students going abroad is rising substantially, the average amount of time sojourners are actually spending abroad is declining (IIE, 2004). Whereas, at one time it was the norm for students to spend an entire academic year abroad, the majority now spend eight weeks or less living and studying in their host countries (IIE). This inverse relationship between number of participants and length of sojourn makes one wonder about the potential repercussions to the American society, the global society, individual study abroad participants, and institutions of higher education. This research study, which was designed to compare potential differences in learning outcomes among participants in study abroad programs of varying lengths, attempted to add insight and quantifiable information to this topic. Following are a few of the most obvious justifications for the study.

First, this topic is of considerable societal significance. In an era of increased interdependence and globalization, the United States requires globally educated citizens now more than ever (Bikson & Law, 1994; IIE, 2004; U.S. Department of Education, n.d.). Accordingly, institutions of higher education are increasingly being called on by employers, the government, students and their parents to produce internationally savvy graduates (Bikson & Law; Carlson & Widaman, 1988). Study abroad is touted as a highly effective way to accomplish this lofty goal, both because of the immediate effects on study abroad participants and because of the indirect effects on students at the home institutions (Kauffmann, Martin & Weaver, 1992). According to Tuma (2002b), “Increasing the international experience of your students and your faculty leads to an

enhanced internationalization of your campus and curriculum” (p. 66). As a result of teaching overseas, faculty members are able to infuse the courses they teach on the home-campus with cross-cultural experiences and activities, global perspectives, and innovative ideas and knowledge (Amel & Uhrskov, 2002). One might wonder then about the extent to which students who have studied abroad are able to have a similar effect on the campus culture of their respective home institutions, and whether the effect varies according to the amount of time the student spends abroad.

Furthermore, in a period that places a high value on institutional accountability (Pulley, 2002; Woodard & Komives, 2003), it is very likely that students and their parents, as well as university administrators and governmental agencies, will soon require study abroad professionals to prove that international education successfully produces the learning outcomes in student participants that it claims to generate. Moreover, since short-term study abroad is still relatively new, to a large extent it has not been empirically tested against long-term study abroad, nor has it been subjected to a rigorous outcomes assessment (Spencer & Tuma, 2002). Therefore, this study was conceived as a way to add to the research on this topic, since, regardless of length of program, the current literature on study abroad is fraught with contradictory and inconclusive results (Sell, 1983).

Another objective of this study was to help institutions that are attempting to justify whether or not to continue devoting finite time, energy, human and financial resources to the development, promotion and maintenance of short-term study abroad programs. If study abroad purports to result in learning and development for all participants, it needs to first be established whether or not programs of varying lengths

accomplish this goal equally well. Additionally, it needs to be further determined whether or not nontraditional students are benefiting directly from the proliferation of short-term programs, as is commonly suggested. As stated earlier, the common perception is that short-term study abroad is more conducive to the needs of nontraditional students (Spencer & Tuma, 2002). With this in mind, it is important to assess the outcomes of short-term study abroad so that institutions may determine whether or not nontraditional students are both taking advantage of, and benefiting from, the increasing number of short-term study abroad options. This factor will continue to increase in importance, due to the fact that the expanding higher education enrollments are comprised of nontraditional students, increasing diversity in terms of race/ethnicity, culture, religion, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, age, and level of physical ability (El-Khawas, 2003). In order to provide more insight into this topic, sub-analyses were conducted on the various demographic factors represented by those study abroad participants who responded to the survey, the results of which are reported in chapter four.

The final point of significance concerns the fact that this study was conducted at the University of Maryland, College Park, where an increasing number of short-term programs are being developed to keep up with high student and faculty demand. This phenomenon makes it important to compare the effects of long-term (i.e., semester and academic year) and short-term (i.e., summer and winter-term) programs for purposes of assessment, evaluation and strategic planning.

Conclusion

This chapter has sought to provide readers with the appropriate context and knowledge in which to place the scope and purpose of this research study. The next

chapter will provide a review of the literature and the results of past research studies, in order to establish what is currently known or thought about this topic, and to provide a rationale for the chosen research design and methodology, as well as the hypotheses of this study.

Chapter II: Literature Review

Introduction

This chapter will begin with scholarly literature on college student learning outcomes and then proceed to the available research on study abroad outcomes. The focus will shift to the intersection of the research on these two topics. Finally, the research regarding length of time abroad will be discussed, as it was the critical focus of this research study. Ultimately, the purpose of this chapter is to review what is currently known and understood about learning outcomes associated with study abroad, in order to place the study into a broader context. The chapter will serve to illuminate both the gaps in our current knowledge surrounding this topic, as well as the inconsistencies apparent in the research. A review of the literature will provide a basis for the methodology employed in the study as well as the hypotheses that were empirically tested. After reviewing the literature, the reader should have the foundational knowledge to better understand the scope and purpose of the study.

Research on College Student Learning

The impact of college on learning and development has been the focus of substantial research efforts. Researchers such as Astin and Kuh have studied student learning outcomes, as well as the roles that institutions and students themselves play in the learning that occurs. Recently, the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) and the American College Personnel Association (ACPA) collaborated to produce a document entitled, *Learning Reconsidered: A Campus-Wide Focus on the Student Experience*, in which they proposed “*new ways of understanding and supporting learning and development as intertwined, inseparable elements of the*

student experience” (2004, p. 1). This approach of viewing learning and development as interconnected processes that occur both during and because of college, regardless of institutional type, academic major and/or student demographic background, reveals the complex nature of this field of research. Multiple research studies have been conducted which have endeavored to isolate and examine an array of individual factors, but, as asserted by NASPA and ACPA, all facets of the college experience have the potential to generate student learning and development. This includes the impact of the academic curriculum, co- and extracurricular activities, friends, roommates, staff and faculty.

In an effort to synthesize the extensive college impact research, Pascarella and Terenzini (1996) reviewed 2,600 available research studies surrounding this topic. They too found that the changes that occur during college tended to happen in an integrated manner, meaning that cognitive and affective changes were found to be interconnected and mutually reinforcing. In the learning and cognitive change domain, Pascarella and Terenzini found that students made great strides during college. Students advanced in terms of their verbal, quantitative, and writing skills, as well as their topical knowledge. As a result of higher education, students were also found to improve in their problem-solving and reasoning ability, critical thinking ability, reflective judgment ability, and intellectual and conceptual complexity. Overall, students were found to become better and more adaptive learners.

Pascarella and Terenzini (1996) also focused on attitude and value outcomes and found that college attendance resulted in the increased ability to appreciate art, culture and ideas. Between matriculating and graduating, students were found to adopt progressively more liberal attitudes toward issues of diversity, politics, social values,

gender norms, and religious beliefs. Finally, during college, students were found to shift their value orientations corresponding to their educational and professional aspirations, from a preoccupation with extrinsic rewards to a greater concern for intrinsic rewards.

Students were found to undergo psychosocial changes during college as well (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1996), which the authors partially attributed to gains in cognitive skills and ability. College students were found to grow in their understanding of self, their self-definition, and personal commitment, as well as their healthy functioning of ego. Students were found to improve in their academic and social images, as well as in their independence, personal adjustment, psychological well-being, personal development and maturity. Finally, students were found to have improved in their interpersonal skills and ability to relate to others who differed from them in terms of race/ethnicity, social class and/or culture.

The effect of student characteristics. Research has shown that various student characteristics (e.g., academic major and place of residence) and demographic factors (e.g., sex, race, socioeconomic class, and ability) have the potential to differentially affect the attainment of learning outcomes. For example, the benefits to students of living on campus versus commuting are quite substantial. Residents are more likely to get involved with co- and extracurricular activities, and to interact with faculty (Astin 1989; 1999). Furthermore, they are more likely to succeed academically, to persist to graduation, and to develop in leadership ability, interpersonal and academic self-esteem, and liberalism (Astin, 1989). With regards to gender, it has been demonstrated that male students are substantially more confident in their interpersonal and academic abilities than female students, both at the time they enter college and when they leave (Astin, 1989).

Moreover, research has shown that the difference in ability between high and low-achieving college students, as measured by college admissions tests at time of entry, actually becomes more pronounced during the college years (Astin, 1989). However, with regards to self-esteem, academic ability has been found to produce divergent effects. This means that throughout college, highly able students develop more academic self-confidence in relation to their lower-achieving peers, but, in terms of interpersonal self-confidence, the two groups tend to converge (Astin, 1989).

Involving colleges. The role of the college or university in a student's ability to learn and develop is not to be understated. In considering the potential for student learning, NASPA and ACPA (2004) attached a high value to the academic context, social context and institutional context, as well as to the student and the way in which he or she integrates the outcomes within the college context with its various interrelated components. In focusing on the academic context, NASPA and ACPA postulated that campuses which provide experiential learning opportunities, interdisciplinary courses, and opportunities for students to interact with faculty members are rife with learning potential. Similarly, they looked for evidence of personal relationships, group memberships and inter-group connections within the social domain. With regards to institutional context, they looked for campus cultures with established ethical codes and judicial processes, as well as abundant opportunities for students to procure and benefit from work-study positions, leadership roles, and assistantships. According to NASPA and ACPA, all of these domains interact to provide students with myriad sites where learning may occur.

Additionally, Kuh (1991), delineated five characteristics of “involving colleges,” a term that he used to describe institutions which encourage student involvement in co- and extracurricular learning opportunities. An involving college possesses a mission and philosophy that is lucid, demonstrates institutional commitment to multiculturalism, and places a high priority on student achievement. It also takes full advantage of its location and campus environment to promote living and learning among its students. Furthermore, involving colleges actively encourage student involvement through the campus culture, manifested by history, traditions, language and symbols. The policies and practices of involving colleges are consistent with the institution’s mission and the needs and realities of the student population. Finally, administrators, faculty and staff of involving colleges actively support students in their learning and development in and out of the classroom.

The role of student involvement. Alexander Astin (1989; 1996; 1999) has published extensively on the correlation between student involvement and the achievement of student learning outcomes. He developed his own student involvement theory after conducting a longitudinal study regarding the environmental factors that are present or lacking when students drop out of college. He found conclusive evidence to support his theory that the more involved students are, the more likely they are to persist, learn and develop at the institution. He defined involvement as “the quantity and quality of the physical and psychological energy that students invest in the college experience” (1999, p. 528).

Accordingly, a large portion of the research on learning outcomes looks specifically at the learning and development that results from co-curricular and extracurricular activities and experiences. For example, Kuh (1996) focused on the

impact of out-of-class experiences in his article *What Students Learn Outside the Classroom*. His qualitative study involved interviews with 149 seniors at 12 different colleges and universities. Through an analysis of the interviews, five outcome domains emerged: personal competence (i.e., self-awareness, autonomy, confidence, social confidence, and sense of purpose), cognitive complexity (i.e., reflective judgment and application of knowledge), knowledge and academic skills, practical competence (i.e., practical competence and vocational competence), and altruism and estheticism (i.e., altruism, and estheticism, characterized as gaining experience with individuals from different racial, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds). The study successfully linked out-of-classroom involvement with learning outcomes.

Research by Light (1992) corroborated Astin and Kuh's findings that co-curricular and extracurricular activities and experiences are fraught with learning and development potential. In fact, Light's study, which involved interviews of more than 1,600 undergraduate students, found that when students were asked to describe a crucial moment or incident that had changed them profoundly during college, 80% of the participants chose an experience that occurred outside of the classroom. Helen Astin and Laura Kent (1983), moreover, found that increased self-confidence and self-efficacy ranked among the numerous benefits emanating from out-of-classroom experiences.

The results of the 2004 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) add further information and insight on this topic. Data were obtained from 160,000 first-year and senior students, randomly chosen from more than 470 national colleges and universities, in order to examine the intersection of student engagement and the attainment of learning outcomes. The NSSE concluded that students were capable of

learning and development that far exceeded the growth caused by traditional pedagogical methods. In fact, the NSSE found that students learned more from being involved in activities that required them to be active learners and participants, as opposed to passive learners. This ‘deep’ learning is thought to result from activities that challenge students to think on deeper levels, by requiring them to synthesize, integrate and apply their learning. In reporting on selected results of student engagement, the NSSE (2004) found that “Students who engage more frequently in ‘deep’ learning activities report greater educational and personal gains from college, participate in more enriching educational experiences, perceive their campus to be more supportive, and are more satisfied overall with college” (p. 12).

NSSE findings supported the tenets of Astin’s Student Involvement Theory. Specifically, the NSSE found that the amount of time students were engaged with on-campus jobs, curricular obligations (e.g., writing a research paper, asking questions in class, or contributing to class discussions), and co-curricular activities (e.g., studying abroad, interning, or participating in a living learning community) was positively correlated to students’ self-reported measures of educational and personal growth (e.g., critical thinking ability, the ability to understand one’s self, and the development of a personal code of ethics). The following findings are especially notable. First-year students (81%) and seniors (87%) indicated that they had increased their critical thinking and analytical ability in college “very much” or “quite a bit” as a result of their involvement in college. Furthermore, 81% of first-years and 85% of seniors responded emphatically that they had acquired a broad general education as a result of college. Sixty percent of first-years and sixty-six percent of seniors indicated that they understood

themselves well as a result of college. As for developing a personal code of values and ethics, 54% of first-years and 59% of seniors attributed this gain to college “very much” or “quite a bit.”

Research on Study Abroad

As briefly suggested in the last chapter, the study abroad research that is currently available is inconclusive and inconsistent. There are also large gaps in the literature corresponding to lengthy periods of time when there was a dearth of research conducted on study abroad. As will be shown in the subsequent sections, there are numerous reports available which assert that study abroad results in positive effects for study abroad participants. However, abundant research also exists to refute these positive results; these research studies have either associated study abroad with negative effects or no effects at all. In addition to the contradictory research results, there is also a lack of research comparing study abroad experiences based on such factors as length of time abroad, type of program model, and location of study abroad program. In an effort to demonstrate the range of research that exists, the limitations of the study abroad literature will first be delineated, followed by examples of research yielding negative results, inconclusive results and positive results.

Limitations of study abroad research. A scan of the study abroad literature reveals that much of the research is outdated. Furthermore, the collection of research studies attempting to measure the impact of study abroad have yielded contradictory and inconclusive results. For example, Sell (1983) reviewed multiple research studies, including five studies whose participants were questioned only once after their study abroad experiences and 15 studies that administered pre- and post-sojourn questionnaires,

in order to assess the effects of study abroad on attitude change. Despite the fact that study abroad participants and program directors emphatically attest to the personal growth that results from cross-cultural experiences (Lee, 2002; Quade, 2002), Sell found that studies attempting to measure attitudinal change were seldom able to empirically verify the outcomes they were designed to test. Not surprisingly, multiple educators and researchers have opined on the array of plausible reasons for the wide-ranging results of study abroad research studies. According to Philip G. Altbach, the director of Boston College's Center for International Education, one problem concerns the fact that research on study abroad has been sporadic (Rubin, 1995). Limburg-Weber (1999/2000), on the other hand, stated that it is not the research that is the problem, but the widely divergent opinions among researchers about the so-called "truths" of study abroad, as well as what outcomes should be studied. Additional critiques of the study abroad research concern the widespread use of small sample groups and one-group pretest-posttest designs lacking control groups (Carlson & Widaman, 1988). Furthermore, Sell's reproach of the available study abroad research focused on "the loosely structured experimental designs, infrequent use of follow-up studies, and the lack of a theoretical base upon which further research can be assessed" (p. 141). Her final estimation is effectively summarized by the following illustrative quote:

The impact of foreign experiences on participants is complex and multifaceted. It involves attitudes, preconceptions, motivations, country visited, and length of stay. No longer will pre and post measurement of a particular attitude or opinion scale suffice in analyzing this impact. Past research highlights the deficiencies inherent in such a methodology. Only when researchers include the entire range

of contributing factors will attitudinal and behavioral changes be more readily detected. (p. 144)

As suggested by Limburg-Weber (1999/2000), a major limitation of the study abroad research is the lack of consensus in the field regarding the outcomes that should be studied as well as what international education is ultimately meant to achieve. For example, many place a high value on foreign language acquisition; however, research studies which have attempted to measure changes in foreign language proficiency have been impeded by the limitations of the testing instruments used (Limburg-Weber). Furthermore, a plethora of studies have attempted to study the impact of study abroad on personal development and growth in cultural understanding. Coehlo (1962) noted that researchers, educators and participants are often biased toward believing that growth in international understanding, multicultural competence and personal development automatically result from study abroad, despite the lack of empirical research to substantiate these august claims. Furthermore, those studies which have attempted to objectively measure the effects of study abroad on such variables as multicultural competence and personal development have been hindered by faulty and inappropriate research methodologies (Coehlo; Limburg-Weber; Sell, 1983).

Another poignant critique of the study abroad research comes from Sampson and Smith (1957) who ascribed researchers' inability to assess changes in students' levels of cross-cultural understanding to the ambiguity of such constructs as "international understanding" and "world-mindedness." To this end, they created a new scale to measure world-minded attitudes, the Worldmindedness Scale, to replace the abundant scales that were being used at the time proclaiming to measure world-mindedness, but

actually measuring international-mindedness. The two concepts differ qualitatively in that international-mindedness refers to a proclivity to be versed in international affairs and global issues, while using a specific nation and/or culture as one's point of reference. The concept of world-mindedness refers to a value orientation, wherein one is concerned with the issues and problems of all humanity, and thus sees all nations and peoples as being interconnected and interdependent, as opposed to self-standing, disjointed entities.

A final limitation of the study abroad research concerns the prevalent data collection methods, which emphasize self-report assessment measures (Raphael & Lloyd, 2004) and the failure to use psychometrically tested assessment measures, as demonstrated by the frequent omission of reported reliability and validity scores. Furthermore, much of the available study abroad research used descriptive statistics exclusively, most often manifested in frequencies. The use of more advanced statistical analysis procedures could lend more credibility to the study abroad research and produce more sophisticated results.

Study abroad research: Negative results. In spite of the obvious limitations of study abroad research, numerous studies have still been carried out by researchers, the results of which have yielded an array of outcomes - positive, negative, and inconclusive. First, attention will be given to those studies whose results have been less than positive. Juhasz and Walker (1987/88), for example, conducted a study wherein study abroad participants were compared with a control group comprised of students who remained at the home institution. Results of the post-test actually found members of the study abroad group to be less confident than members of the control group after the study abroad experience. The researchers actually interpreted this to mean that the students who had

studied abroad had experienced increased levels of self-awareness thereby facilitating more objective self-assessments; however, many readers would perhaps question the validity of this interpretation, and instead take the negative findings at face value.

An additional study worthy of mention is a 1959 study conducted by McGuigan. This study compared a sample of study abroad participants at Hollins College with a control group of students who remained on campus. Using the Social and Personal Distance Scale, Adorno's Authoritarian Scale, Pelmutter's Scale of Hostile Feelings toward Americans, Pelmutter's Xenophile Scale, Finley's Social Opinion Inventory and the Navorani Dependency Scale, McGuigan found study abroad participants to be more hostile toward other Americans upon return, demonstrated by a proclivity to attribute more negative traits to Americans in relation to Europeans. Study abroad participants were also found to be more xenophobic and dependent than members of the comparison group. McGuigan hypothesized, "It would thus seem that the 'abroad' experience hampers the development of independence relative to that which occurs 'at home' (p. 248). To the discredit of the article, the study's results are not interpreted.

Study abroad research: Inconclusive results. Many studies have also been conducted only to find that there are either no empirically significant results – positive or negative, giving the illusion that study abroad participants do not experience any changes as a result of their international experiences – or the results are contradictory, thus making it difficult to generalize. For example, Nash (1976) conducted a study with the purpose of examining the effect of international education on the self-realization of 41 University of Connecticut students who spent their junior year studying in France. The subjects were compared with a control group comprised of 32 students who remained at

the University of Connecticut during this same time period. Pre-tests and post-tests were administered to all participants before and after their junior years. Results of the study were contradictory. First, on the variables, increased autonomy and expansion or differentiation of self, study abroad participants were found to have significantly higher scores than members of the control group. No statistical differences, however, were found to exist between groups on increased tolerance and flexibility, or increased self-assurance and confidence. In fact, to the contrary, the self-confidence scores of study abroad participants were found to have decreased significantly between the administration of the pre- and post-tests. Furthermore, two additional findings of interest were that students who had studied abroad increased significantly in their interest in international affairs, but concurrently held significantly less favorable attitudes toward France, their host country.

Inconclusive findings were also the result of a 1980 study by Marion, who used locally defined antecedents and transactional questionnaires along with scales measuring dogmatism, internationalism, radicalism-conservatism, perception of host country, and perception of the U.S. both before going abroad (i.e., the pre-test) and after returning from abroad (i.e., the post-test). The study attempted to investigate attitude change among 90 undergraduate students from the University of Colorado as a result of study abroad. The sample was comprised of students who either studied abroad in England, France or Germany for an academic year, and who took regular classes at a foreign university, or who studied in Italy for a semester, and who took classes apart from the foreign university due to a lack of language proficiency. Admittedly, the study was designed to explore a diverse array of variables, and not to focus intensively on a few select variables

(Marion). However, the following quote essentially summarizes the effectiveness of the study to find definitive results:

In general, certain kinds of people became more conservative, more nationalistic, less positive toward the host country, and more positive toward the U.S., and other kinds became more radical, more international, more positive toward the host country, and less positive toward the U.S. (Marion, p. 62)

In an attempt to explain the phenomenon whereby change in study abroad participants' attitudes toward other nations and cultures is a result of the type of international contact, Salter and Teger (1975) postulated a theory of generalization of affect. They identified two primary variables that they believed to be involved in attitudinal change, namely types of personal contacts experienced by study abroad participants (i.e., genuine and superficial) and the overall satisfaction participants felt toward their experiences. Both variables were assumed to be independently important; however, the theory of generalization of affect contends that the degree and direction of attitude change is likely to correlate with the overall positive or negative evaluation of the experience. Therefore, all aspects of attitude change, such as feelings toward one's home country and culture, feelings toward the host country and culture, as well as feelings toward host nationals, will depend on the general experience and reaction to the international experience. According to Sell (1983), this finding could help to explain why study abroad research is often unable to detect any significant results. Due to the fact that individual study abroad participants are likely to vary in terms of the degree and direction of the attitude change that they experience, this theory would rationalize that opposing positive and negative results would cancel each other out. In essence, this suggests that it

would be unlikely that any research attempting to study attitudinal changes in the aggregate would be successful in finding net results.

Study abroad research: Positive results. Despite the limitations and varied findings of study abroad research, there is a powerful contingent of students, educators and researchers that believe strongly in the benefits of study abroad, and they have research at their disposal to support their claims. As was alluded to in the introduction, study abroad outcomes most often fall into the following domains: academic, vocational, cross-cultural, personal and social. Therefore, this section will be devoted to those studies that have found international education to positively affect student participants in any of these domain areas.

Recently, the Institute for the International Education of Students (IES) released the results of their 50-Year Alumni Survey, which according to Courtney Peters, the Communications and Media Relations Coordinator of IES, (personal communication, May 6, 2004), is the largest ever quantitative survey of study abroad alumni. Results of this study were reported in the following two articles: McMillan and Opem's (2004) *Study Abroad: A Lifetime of Benefits* and Dwyer and Peters' (2004) *The Benefits of Study Abroad*. This comprehensive study included more than 3,700 participants, representing all IES study abroad programs and more than 500 colleges and universities. Each of the participants in the study had studied abroad at some point between 1950 and 2000. The results of the survey were reported as frequencies. The following findings are some of the most impressive.

Looking first at academic and professional outcomes, it is striking that 80% of respondents indicated that study abroad had enhanced their interest in academic study

(McMillan & Opem, 2004); 63% reported that study abroad had prompted them to expand or change their academic majors (Dwyer & Peters, 2004; McMillan & Opem); 64% responded that they had enrolled in graduate school as a result of studying abroad (Dwyer & Peters); and more than 50% of participants confirmed that they received their post-graduate degrees after studying abroad (McMillan & Opem). Approximately 35% of study abroad alumni whose programs had necessitated that they communicate in a foreign language while abroad declared that they were still speaking a foreign language more than twice monthly (McMillan & Opem). Results of the survey also showed that, in addition to academic decisions, study abroad affected professional pursuits. In fact, 62% of respondents indicated that new professional interests were engendered and acted upon as a result of studying abroad (Dwyer & Peters), and more than half of the respondents had worked or volunteered abroad since returning from their IES study abroad programs (Dwyer & Peters).

The cultural values and cross-cultural skills of IES study abroad alumni were also found to have been positively impacted through study abroad, as the following findings clearly indicate: 98% of respondents attributed a better understanding of their own cultural values and biases to their study abroad experiences (Dwyer & Peters, 2004); 94% of individuals responded that their cross-cultural interactions continued to be influenced as a result of the study abroad experience (Dwyer & Peters); 90% concluded that the study abroad experience influenced them to seek out a more diverse group of friends (Dwyer & Peters); and 64% had been prompted to explore additional cultures because of studying abroad (Dwyer & Peters).

Personal growth and development was also found to be a significant result of study abroad. In fact, 97% of respondents felt that they had experienced self-revelations and had increased in maturity due to study abroad (McMillan & Opem, 2004); 96% felt that their levels of self-confidence had risen as a direct result of study abroad (Dwyer & Peters, 2004; McMillan & Opem); and 95% felt that their study abroad experiences have had a lasting effect on their views of the world, as well as their individual values and choices (Dwyer & Peters; McMillan & Opem). Finally, 89% felt that their tolerance for ambiguity had increased (Dwyer & Peters) and 73% indicated that the experience of studying abroad continued to affect the decisions they made with their families (Dwyer & Peters).

These findings were the result of a study which involved study abroad alumni; however, similar results have been replicated with participants while they are enrolled at a college or university, thereby limiting the amount of time between study abroad experience and participation in the research study, as well as the related factors which could potentially confound the variables of interest. For example, the study conducted by Carlson and Widaman (1988) compared two groups of students: those students who spent their junior year abroad in Sweden, Spain, France, Germany, Italy, or the United Kingdom as part of the University of California's (UC) Education Abroad Program (EAP), versus a control group comprised of students with junior standing who remained at their respective UC campuses (i.e., Berkeley, Davis, Irvine, Los Angeles, Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz, and Riverside). The study used retrospective analysis (i.e., students were actually surveyed in their senior years) and a survey instrument that involved three parts. The first part of the survey instrument asked for background information,

specifically the respondent's academic major, gender, and whether the respondent or the respondent's family had lived abroad for three or more consecutive months at any time prior to the student's junior year. The second part of the survey asked students to retrospectively indicate the positions they had held on a number of items prior to their junior year. Examples of these items include: awareness of problems common to many countries, desire for international peace, and respect for historical and cultural traditions and achievements of nations other than a student's own. The third and final part of the survey asked students to evaluate the extent to which they had changed their perspectives since their junior year on items such as the following: negative feelings about foreigners, critical views of one's own country, and belief that conflicts among particular nations do not affect the rest of the world. Factor analysis and analysis of variance were used to compare the study abroad and comparison group students on their before and after attitudes. The limitations that were noted by the researchers centered on the use of retrospective analysis. First, the researchers admitted that respondents may have "misremembered" the attitudes they had once held (Carlson & Widaman, p. 5). Furthermore, those students who had studied abroad may have felt compelled to respond to the survey in a socially desirable way, by virtue of the fact that the survey was obviously designed to measure changes resulting from the study abroad experience. This, of course, is a limitation that is inherent in most social science research.

Carlson and Widaman's (1988) research study involved a large number of respondents. The study abroad group consisted of 308 total respondents (405 were surveyed, for a response rate of 67%) and the control group consisted of 519 total students (800 were surveyed, for an equally high response rate of 65%). The results of the

study were in line with the researcher's expectations, namely that study abroad was found to result in increased levels of interest in international politics, in cross-cultural matters and in cultural cosmopolitanism. Study abroad participants were also found to concurrently report significantly more positive as well as more critical attitudes toward the United States than members of the control group.

Another study, conducted by Carsello and Creaser (1976), asked students to assess whether their interests, attitudes or skills had changed across 30 different categories, and to indicate whether the change was in a positive or negative direction. The study surveyed 209 U.S. American students while they were studying in Italy, France, Spain or Switzerland for a semester or academic year. The majority of the respondents were traditionally-aged juniors (the average age of respondents was 21.5). The respondents represented a variety of U.S. home institutions and majors. Forty-eight student respondents had financial assistance in the form of loans, and sixty-two students had scholarships. Finally, 145 of the respondents were female and 64 were male. The following are a few of the study's significant findings: more than 75% of study abroad participants felt that they their interest in travel, art, foreign language, and/or history had increased as a result of study abroad; interpersonal skills were also found to be positively affected, as demonstrated by the fact that 71.3% felt that their ability to relate to strangers had improved, and 46.9% felt better able to relate to fellow students. Finally, more than half (55.5%) attributed a heightened interest in a career to the international experience.

Hensley and Sell (1979) compared their sample of 52 students, who participated in the Kent State University Geneva Semester Program, to a control group of 17 students who stayed at the home institution of Kent State. The research study used multiple

regression analysis to assess attitude change associated with four total outcomes. Two of these outcomes concerned internationalist attitudes – worldmindedness and support for the United Nations (U.N.). The remaining two variables to be tested were psychological variables, and included self-esteem and tolerance for ambiguity. The study used multiple instruments, all of which used Likert scales. To measure worldmindedness, the researchers used Sampson and Smith's (1957) Worldmindedness Scale. They used a test developed by Rosenberg to measure self-esteem, and a test designed by Budner to measure tolerance of ambiguity. To measure support for the U.N., the researchers developed a locally defined survey instrument, which included questions borrowed from a variety of sources, such as Lutzker's 1960 internationalism scale, a 1970 Gallop poll, a 1963 Roper poll, and items that they had previously developed for other related projects (Hensley & Sell). Results of the study revealed that study abroad participants were not found to differ significantly from those of the control group on three of the outcome variables: worldmindedness, support for the U.N., or tolerance of ambiguity. However, the researchers did find the study abroad participants' self-esteem levels to have increased relative to the self-esteem levels of members of the control group. The increase in self-esteem was found to be based on the extent of contact students had with non-Americans, and not on the overall level of enjoyment of the experience, as posited by Salter and Teger's (1975) generalization of affect theory.

Pyle (1981) used interviews and the Student Development Task Inventory (SDTI), which is based on Chickering's theory of psychosocial development (Chickering, 1969), in comparing 22 experimental group participants to a control group of 14 students. Students in the experimental group participated in a three-week cross-cultural service-

learning project in Woburn Lawn, Jamaica, where they assisted community members with construction projects. The cross-cultural service-learning experience also included social and educational programs and events. For instance, members of the Jamaican government and faculty members of the University of the West Indies gave presentations on developing countries, and the government, culture and current state of Jamaica. The program included a component in which students lived and worked side-by-side with the host nationals, so that they would encounter rich cross-cultural experiences.

One limitation of Pyle's (1981) study, in addition to the small sample sizes, is that neither group was randomly selected. Service-learning participants self-selected, and the members of the comparison group were purposefully chosen from those students who had an interest in the program, but for whatever reason were unable to participate.

Furthermore, this study was conducted with students who participated in a cross-cultural service-learning project, which differs from a traditional study abroad program. However, despite these limitations, a positive attribute of the study is the high reported measures of reliability and validity for the SDTI. According to Pyle, reliability was established through test-retest correlations and internal consistency which utilized the coefficient-Alpha procedure; test-retest correlations ranged between .85 and .93, and the total coefficient for the inventory was .90. Validity was determined by the "concurrent validity of the congruent type and of the differential type" (Pyle, p. 511). Validity was found to be strong on the first two tasks (i.e., autonomy and purpose) and their subtasks; however, caution was recommended when interpreting the results of the interpersonal relations task and its subtasks. An analysis of the results indicated that, in comparison to members of the control group, study abroad participants experienced significant increases on gain

scores for the total SDTI, for the autonomy task, and for the interdependence and mature life-style plans subtasks.

Unlike the majority of researchers, Gmelch (1977) did not conduct a strict quantitative research study. Instead, his approach could be aptly described as mixed methods, since his observations and findings were drawn from the following sources: entries from 51 journals collected from students in three different anthropology classes at various times during the study abroad program, travel logs required of students in one class detailing their travel experiences, a twenty-item survey instrument administered to all three classes at the end of the 6-week academic term, and informal conversations with students while acting as an instructor of a summer-term study abroad program in Innsbruck, Austria. Gmelch's observations led him to a slightly different conclusion than most researchers, but is entirely in line with the results of Carlson et al.'s 1990 study of 400 students participating in an academic year-long study abroad program in Western Europe. Accordingly, Gmelch concluded that the personal development students undergo while abroad results from their independent travels, and not from the academic components of their program or even their residential living experiences. Gmelch found that the students he observed became more independent, mature, adaptable, self-confident and self-reliant. He concluded that these positive outcomes resulted from students' independent travels, and the consequent need to constantly exercise critical thinking and organizational skills, as well as the need to successfully adapt to the cultures and environments of the places visited.

Intersection of Research on Student Learning and Study Abroad

In calculating institutional benchmark scores, the NSSE (2004) relied on five indicators of effective educational practice: level of academic challenge, opportunity for active and collaborative learning, quality and quantity of student-faculty interaction, opportunity to participate in enriching educational experiences, and the supportive nature of the campus environment. Along with internships and practicum experiences, community service and volunteer work, participation in living-learning communities, research with faculty members, culminating senior experiences, and foreign language coursework, participation in study abroad was included in the list of enriching educational experiences. Students were asked about these specific activities and experiences because of their known tendency for providing students with ample opportunity to “synthesize, integrate, and apply their knowledge. Such experiences make learning more meaningful and, ultimately, more useful because what students know becomes a part of who they are” (p. 42). Active learning and educationally enriching experiences, such as study abroad, facilitate “higher-order learning,” “integrative learning” and “reflective learning.” NSSE describes higher-order learning activities as those that demand students “to utilize higher levels of mental activity than those required for rote memorization” (p. 21). Furthermore, integrative learning activities are “activities that require integrating acquired knowledge, skills, and competencies into a meaningful whole” (p. 21), and reflective learning activities require students to “explore their experiences of learning to better understand how they learn” (p. 21).

The potential of study abroad to result in significant personal development and higher-order, integrative and reflective learning necessitated that it be included in the

NSSE's (2004) evaluation of enriching educational activities. The impact of study abroad is most likely related to its structural components. As a co-curricular activity, study abroad has an academic component, and an added component that challenges students to apply their knowledge, skills and abilities in a foreign context that transcends the classroom. Study abroad participants find themselves grappling with another culture, perhaps another language, a foreign system of higher education, unfamiliar food and accommodations, and individuals previously unknown to them (both members of the host culture and fellow sojourners) while abroad. They also live in environments with social, political and value systems very different from ones to which they are accustomed, requiring them to reflect upon and think critically about their own convictions. Study abroad participants must successfully adapt to these myriad challenges for at least the duration of the study abroad program. Kinsella, Smith-Simonet and Tuma (2002) asserted that "for learning to occur, the emotional and cognitive growth must be internalized personally and integrated intellectually" (p.213). Furthermore, the leadership of the study abroad program and the design, including the pre-departure and re-entry orientations, must intentionally and successfully integrate goal-setting, personal reflection and meaning-making into the experience.

Impact of Length of Time Abroad

In the introduction to their edited book, *The Guide to Successful Short-Term Programs Abroad*," Spencer and Tuma (2002) emphasized that abundant literature exists on the traditional study abroad issues and results, yet scant research has been disseminated on short-term study abroad. These authors speak to a major deficiency of the currently accessible research and information on short-term study abroad. Indeed, few

researchers have specifically studied the effects of short-term study abroad, and even fewer have included the length of the sojourn as a variable in their research designs. Research conducted by Koester (1985) is one prominent exception. Using the statistical method of multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA), Koester's research study of 3,200 respondents looked at the effects of both length and type of international experience (e.g., participation in a U.S. sponsored study abroad program, direct enrollment in a foreign institution, independent international study, educational travel, paid international work, volunteer work, etc.) on nine outcomes. The statistical test of MANOVA did not reveal a significant interaction effect between the two independent variables, but significant multivariate main effects were found for both length and type of program. Therefore, these significant main effects were further analyzed through univariate analyses of variances. Koester's study found the length of time abroad to have significant effects on the following dependent variables: increased interest in international events, increased interest in academic performance, improved self-confidence, increased political awareness, impact on career plans, and establishment of cross-cultural relationships. The Student-Newman-Keuls Post Hoc Comparison Test of Means was employed to further analyze the significant findings, which enabled Koester to declare that the shorter international sojourns resulted in less significant changes than longer stays abroad. Specifically, experiences that lasted between one and three months resulted in less impact on students than the sojourns that lasted between three and twelve months. Koester's study also examined the effects produced by experiences lasting more than twelve months. In discussing the time period of three to twelve months, the researcher stated, "This time frame appears to represent the optimum length, less time

produces less effect and more time rarely produces even the same level of effect...[T]he choice of a three to twelve month stay produced the most changes” (p. 60). In critiquing her research, Koester lamented that the study did not further break down the three to twelve month period into two separate categories (i.e., three to six months and six to twelve months), and that a sojourn of less than one month was not offered as an option. This could have potentially allowed for a more exact assessment of impact as it relates to the amount of time that an individual spends abroad.

Kinsella et al. (2002) conceded that some research has been published which refutes Koester’s (1985) claims, yet, in writing about the merits of short-term study abroad, they themselves stated that there is no equal substitute for the potential of long-term study abroad programs to impact students’ self-perceptions and worldviews. In fact, Kinsella et al. claim that short-term study abroad programs should not have the same objectives as long-term programs, since long-term programs are most often designed to increase cross-cultural skills and global awareness. According to Kinsella et al., short-term programs are better suited as learning experiences that focus on the exploration of topics within the host country and culture:

This is not to suggest that general cross-cultural skills of adaptation, and/or culture-specific skills (e.g., language learning, personal flexibility, appreciation for differences, etc.) are not learnable in a short-term program abroad format. To be academically honest with our students, however, educators involved with short-term programs must acknowledge that the same *depth* and *kind* of learning possible in a semester- or year-long program is *less* possible through a short visit to another society (Kinsella et al., p. 206).

Hansel's (1986) report, titled *The AFS Impact Study: Final Report*, is an example of a study that purposely included the duration of the study abroad program in the research design. This report was the culmination of an assessment project begun in 1977. The study compared three groups of students: those who had participated in AFS year-long study abroad programs, those who had studied abroad on AFS short-term programs, and those students who did not participate in study abroad at all. The study relied on pre- and post-tests and on a behaviorally anchored rating scale. Students were compared in the following domain areas: intercultural knowledge and sensitivity, global issues awareness, interpersonal relationship-building, and personal values and skills. In reviewing the results of the study, both those results that specifically pertain to length of time abroad, and the results that pertain to the general study abroad experience (regardless of length of time abroad), will be reported here.

Five variables were measured under the intercultural knowledge and sensitivity domain; i.e., understanding other cultures, open-mindedness, foreign language appreciation and ability, awareness and appreciation of the home country and culture, and awareness and appreciation of the host country and culture (Hansel, 1986). In general, AFS students showed larger average increases on all of these variables relative to members of the control group. However, statistically significant differences were only found on the following variables: understanding other cultures, awareness and appreciation of host country and culture, and foreign language appreciation and ability. Furthermore, statistically significant differences were also found to exist between long-term study abroad program participants (those who had no previous international experience) and short-term study abroad program participants in awareness and

appreciation of host country and culture and foreign language appreciation and ability, with the long-term program participants scoring higher on both of these variables. The reverse is true for the variable understanding other cultures, where short-term study abroad participants were found to have significantly higher scores than the participants of long-term programs.

The only variable thought to exclusively relate to the goal of global issues awareness was international awareness (Hansel, 1986). AFS study abroad participants evidenced statistically significant differences over their control group counterparts in this domain; however, no significant differences were found to specifically exist between long-term and short-term program participants.

The variables of interest under interpersonal relationship-building included adaptability, communication with others, high standards for personal relationships, and appreciation of own family (Hansel, 1986). AFS study abroad participants were associated with average increases in all four of these variables, but not all differences were statistically significant. On the communication with others variable, significant differences were found to exist between AFS study abroad participants and members of the control group, but Hansel qualified this finding by saying that the differences were probably due almost solely to the large statistical differences found between AFS study abroad participants with prior international travel experience and members of the control group. Of further interest is the fact that adaptability scores between AFS study abroad participants and control group participants were found to be statistically significantly different. AFS short-term study abroad participants were found to have significantly higher scores than any of the respondents who had studied abroad for a year, or who had

remained at home. Hansel asserted that this finding may be explained by the fact that self-rating scales were used in the research study; thus, the disparity could be a manifestation of the higher levels of conviction felt among short-term study abroad participants who experienced less difficulty adjusting than students who remained abroad for an entire academic year. Another interesting finding was that AFS year-long study abroad participants were found to have scores that differed significantly from both short-term program participants and members of the control group on the variable appreciation of own family.

The variables associated with personal values and skills included: awareness of opportunities, non-materialism, critical thinking, exchange of ideas, independence (responsibility for self), personal growth and maturity, and self-confidence (Hansel, 1986). According to the report, AFS study abroad participants experienced growth in every area relative to the control group. The amount of growth was found to be significant on the following variables: awareness of opportunities, non-materialism, critical thinking, and independence (responsibility for self).

Hansel (1986) conceded that few studies attempting to examine the differences in learning outcomes by length of time abroad have revealed significant differences, yet the few that have been able to do so are notable. The results of her study, along with her knowledge of the study abroad literature, prompted her to suggest a relationship between length of sojourn and intercultural learning. An alternative explanation, however, could be that students who self-select to participate in a study abroad experience already harbor such a predisposition. At any rate, she explained the surprising finding that short-term study abroad participants rated higher on the two variables, adaptability and

understanding of other cultures, as the result of self-rating scales, where short-term sojourners felt more confident in their growth on these variables due to the nature of their experiences and the structure of these programs. Beyond these findings, she concluded: “it seems that the two-month and the year-long homestays offer roughly the same opportunities for learning” (p. 32).

Summary and Conclusion

In conclusion, a review of the literature shows that, in general, the desired outcomes of study abroad largely mirror those outcomes associated with higher education. Objectives such as foreign language proficiency and cross-cultural skills may be more keenly pronounced in the field of international education relative to higher education; however, there appears to be an equal focus on many of the educational, academic, career, and personal development values and objectives listed above, such as increased self-confidence/self-efficacy, critical thinking skills, cognitive complexity, value-reflective thinking skills, interest in intellectual pursuits, motivation to learn, tolerance for ambiguity, independence and autonomy, and clarification of academic and vocational goals.

The next chapter will explain the research methodology employed in this study, including the learning outcomes ultimately chosen as dependent variables. For this study, the length of the study abroad program was operationalized as the independent variable. The two levels of the independent variable included short (i.e., summer and winter programs) and long-term (i.e., semester and academic year programs). The study investigated the impact of length of time abroad as it related to the measured amounts of the four learning outcomes.

Chapter III: Methodology

Review of Research Question and Hypotheses

To review, the purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of a study abroad program's duration on the following learning outcomes that are commonly associated with study abroad: perceptions of growth in 1) cognitive complexity, 2) liberal learning, 3) personal philosophy, and 4) interpersonal self-confidence. Ancillary studies were conducted to determine if there were differences in growth in learning outcomes among study abroad participants of varying background characteristics. A delineation of the null hypotheses that guided this study are as follows:

1. There will be no differences in the amount of growth in cognitive complexity depending on the length of the study abroad program.
2. There will be no differences in the amount of growth in liberal learning depending on the length of the study abroad program.
3. There will be no differences in the amount of growth in personal philosophy depending on the length of the study abroad program.
4. There will be no differences in the amount of growth of interpersonal self-confidence depending on the length of the study abroad program.

Description of the Institution

This study was conducted at the University of Maryland, College Park. This institution is a large public university and the flagship of the state's higher education system. It is classified as a Carnegie Class I Research University and is located in the mid-Atlantic region of the country. According to the University of Maryland, College Park's Office of Institutional Research and Planning (2004), approximately 35,000

students attend the University of Maryland; about 25,000 of these students are undergraduates and the remaining 10,000 are graduate students. A specific look at the undergraduate student population reveals that 91.2% of students attend college on a full-time basis, whereas 8.8% attend part-time. Furthermore, the undergraduate student population is essentially divided equally between male (51.1%) and female students (48.9%). A look at the racial/ethnic breakdown of the undergraduate population reveals that the institution is predominately composed of White students (58.2%). The remaining undergraduate population can be further classified as follows: 12.1% Black/African-American, 13.7% Asian-American, 5.5% U.S. Hispanic/Latino, 0.3% Native American/American Indian, and 2.4% foreign. The race/ethnicity of the remaining 7.8% of students is unknown. Approximately 24.5% of students are classified as out-of-state residents.

Description of the Sample

In order to enhance the university experience, the University of Maryland offers students the opportunity to study abroad through short and long-term programs administered by the University of Maryland, as well as programs administered by other institutions and/or private organizations, provided that they have been reviewed and approved by the University of Maryland Study Abroad staff. Close to 1,000 University of Maryland students take advantage of the opportunity to study abroad each year. This research study collected data through a web-based survey that was administered to all University of Maryland students who participated in at least one study abroad program during the previous academic year (2003-2004), summer 2004, fall 2004, or winter-term 2005. Table 1 is a depiction of the approximate number of students who studied abroad

during this stated time period by program type according to Dr. Michael Ulrich, Study Abroad Director at the University of Maryland, College Park (personal communication, October 4, 2004):

Table 1: Estimated Number of Participants According to Program Type

Program type	Participants
Short-term	
Winter 2004	180
Summer 2004	200
Winter 2005	200
Long-term	
Fall 2003	100
Spring 2004	350
Academic Year 2003-2004	60
Fall 2004	125

Because the sampling frame was large enough to yield potentially significant results, yet small enough to be manageable, the entire population of study abroad participants from fall 2003 through winter 2005 was sampled. Specific demographic

information was collected from participants to ascertain whether or not the survey population was representative of the national population of study abroad participants.

Survey Instrument and Variables of Interest

Data was collected through the use of a locally defined survey (see Appendix B), modified from the Residence Environment Survey of the National Study of Living-Learning Programs (Inkelas, 2004; see Appendix A), which was originally designed to research the outcomes associated with student participation in living-learning programs. The NSLLP Residence Environment Survey was chosen as the model for this study because of its high ratings of reliability and validity for the measured learning outcomes, which were also of interest for this study. The original NSLLP survey contains forty-one total questions. The first and second sections of the survey focus on perceptions before entering college and college experiences, respectively. The next sections ask about the residence hall environment, perceptions of diversity, citizenship perceptions, experiences with alcohol, future activities, and overall satisfaction with college. The final section asks respondents for demographic information, which is further divided into questions about background information, high school information, and college information.

As noted above, the NSLLP Residence Environment Survey has been tested extensively for reliability and validity. Validity of the survey instrument was confirmed both via content and construct validity. The NSLLP researchers consulted the directors of 15 living-learning programs and surveyed 5,437 undergraduate students from four different campuses (the Universities of Illinois, Maryland, Michigan and Wisconsin) to assess the reliability of the item-sets as composite scales. Two survey methodology research experts were also asked to determine the appropriateness of the item sets

comprising the construct scales. Feedback from these different sources was used to modify and improve the instrument. The instrument was further tested for construct validity via the following four statistical analyses: factor analysis, intercorrelation between subscales, sensitivity to group differences, and correlation to demographic variables (Vogt et al., in review).

Reliability of the constructs in the NSLLP Residence Environment Survey was established by testing for internal consistency of the composite scales. First, for the purpose of determining the consistency of the scales across the different campuses involved in the pilot study, a Cronbach alpha coefficient was found for the entire sample. Additionally, separate reliability analyses were conducted with samples from the individual institutions. Cronbach alpha coefficients were also used to test for internal consistency across individual construct scales. Eight scales were omitted because of low alpha values; of the scales which were retained, the Cronbach alpha values ranged from .64 to .90. The Cronbach alpha reliability scores of the constructs of the 2004 NSLLP Residence Environment Survey applicable to the current research study are listed below.

Growth in cognitive complexity:	.817
Growth in liberal learning:	.803
Growth in personal philosophy:	.799
Interpersonal self-confidence:	.744

(For a more complete list of the Residence Environment Survey reliability scores, including factor loading values and the Cronbach alphas for both the 2003 pilot test and the 2004 NSLLP study, please see Appendix C.)

Survey questions. For the purposes of this research study, questions 10 and 11 of the Residence Environment Survey were retained (see Table 2), as well as many of the demographic questions. The remaining questions from the original NSLLP survey were omitted.

Question 10 of the 2004 NSLLP Residence Environment Survey exists for the purpose of measuring intellectual growth, which includes growth in cognitive complexity, growth in liberal learning and growth in personal philosophy. The original wording of the question was: “In thinking about how you have changed during college, to what extent do you feel you have grown in the following areas?” Students were asked to respond to multiple statements using the following choices: 1) not grown at all, 2) grown somewhat, 3) grown, or 4) grown very much. For the purposes of my study, the wording of the question was changed to: “To what extent do you think that your study abroad experience contributed to your growth in the following areas?” This question appeared in the Study Abroad Survey as question 12. A sample of the individual statements to which students were asked to respond include the following (for the complete list of questions, please see Appendix B):

- Developing your own values and ethical standards
- Understanding yourself and your abilities, interests, and personality
- Ability to put ideas together and to see relationships between ideas
- Appreciation of racial/ethnic differences
- Ability to critically analyze ideas and information
- Appreciation of art, music, and drama
- Openness to views that you oppose

The other substantive question that was retained (question 11) measured self-confidence (i.e., academic self-confidence and interpersonal self-confidence). For the purposes of my study, only the items that inquired about interpersonal self-confidence were used. The question appeared as question 13 in the Study Abroad Survey. The original wording, “Now that you have been in college for a while, how confident do you feel in the following areas?,” was changed to “As a result of your study abroad experience, how confident do you feel in the following areas?” The response choices included: 1) not at all confident, 2) somewhat confident, 3) confident, and 4) very confident. The statements to which students were asked to respond included: (listed again in Appendix B):

- Expressing ideas orally
- Working as part of a team
- Leadership ability

Table 2: Survey Questions

Residence Environment Survey Question Number	Study Abroad Survey Question Number	Selected Portions of Survey Questions for Study Abroad Survey	Study Abroad Survey Question Response Choices
Question 10	Question 12	<p>To what extent do you think that your study abroad experience contributed to your growth in the following areas?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing your own values and ethical standards • Understanding yourself and your abilities, interests and personality • Ability to put ideas together and to see relationships between ideas • Appreciation of racial/ethnic differences • Ability to critically analyze ideas and information • Appreciation of art, music and drama • Openness to views that you oppose 	<p>1) Not grown at all 2) Grown somewhat 3) Grown 4) Very much grown</p>
Question 11	Question 13	<p>As a result of your study abroad experience, how confident do you feel in the following areas?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expressing ideas orally • Working as part of a team • Leadership ability 	<p>1) Not at all confident 2) Somewhat confident 3) Confident 4) Very confident</p>

Additional questions were created specifically for this study so that ancillary analyses could be conducted. Respondents were asked to indicate their gender, race/ethnicity, academic college, and current class level. To get an estimate of a respondent’s socioeconomic status and cultural capital, a question was asked about parents’ incomes. Additionally, questions also asked respondents to indicate where and when they studied abroad, the length of time they were abroad, the number of previous

trips they had taken abroad before participating in their study abroad program, their satisfaction with their time abroad, and their interest or plans to travel, work, live and/or study abroad in the future. These background questions were included in the study so that it would be possible to illustrate the types of Maryland students who study abroad and the corresponding programs they choose, by duration and location.

This research study employed the statistical method of analysis of covariance (ANCOVA), which allowed two of the variables, gender and academic class standing, to be built into the research design as covariates. These variables were chosen as covariates because of their potential to confound the results of the study, in terms of the effect of program length on cognitive complexity, liberal learning, personal philosophy and interpersonal self-confidence. As suggested by the previous chapter, the research on learning outcomes asserts that male students evidence greater interpersonal self-esteem throughout college than their female counterparts (Astin, 1989), making it necessary to mitigate this phenomenon. Additionally, the research reviewed for this study infers that the effects of class level should be statistically controlled for, since seniors manifest greater levels of cognitive complexity than younger students (Astin; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1996). It is generally assumed that upper-level students are more experienced, mature and educated than lower-level students. Therefore, because all class levels were represented in this research study (in addition to recent graduates), a deliberate attempt was made to statistically control for the many potentially confounding effects of class standing.

Validity and reliability. Due to the fact that the survey instrument was altered a great deal from its original state, it was necessary to re-establish validity and reliability.

Dr. Michael Ulrich, the Director of the University of Maryland's Study Abroad Office was asked to examine the survey instrument, in order to establish face validity.

Furthermore, the survey was pilot tested with a group of six University of Maryland students, all of whom had previously studied abroad. Their feedback was solicited and subsequently used to revise and improve the survey. In addition, to test for internal consistency, Cronbach alpha coefficients were generated using the final obtained sample for each of the four individual construct scales (i.e., cognitive complexity, liberal learning, personal philosophy, and interpersonal self-confidence). These values will be reported in the next chapter.

Data Collection Procedure

The subjects. The survey was administered to all subjects of the sampling frame: all University of Maryland students who participated in at least one of the following study abroad programs: fall 2003, winter 2004, spring 2004, academic year 2003-2004, summer 2004, fall 2004, and winter 2005. It was possible to make a fair number of assumptions about this sampling frame, because of the fact that students must meet a number of established requirements specific to their chosen study abroad programs in order to participate in an education abroad experience. In general, most programs require a minimum grade point average, which usually ranges from a 2.5 to a 3.2 minimum. Furthermore, many programs require students to write personal statements describing their motivations and goals for studying abroad. At the University of Maryland, class level (first year students are only allowed to participate in winter-term programs), the quality of students' letters of recommendation, and involvement in extracurricular

activities are all additional factors that have the potential to affect an individual student's candidacy.

Administering the survey. The study abroad survey was created with Survey Monkey, a privately held survey software program. The survey was hosted on the world wide web. Email addresses of members of the sampling frame were procured from the Study Abroad Office's database of past participants, so that a link to the survey could be sent out via email. In total, three email messages were sent to members of the sampling frame. These messages explained the purpose of the study and asked individuals for their participation. They were also used to advertise the research incentives being offered, in order to encourage greater participation in the study. Four randomly chosen participants were selected to receive \$50 Target gift cards.

The initial message was sent on March 7, 2005. Immediately upon accessing the web survey, participants were notified of their rights and then asked whether they were eighteen years of age and wished to participate in the study. If they elected not to continue, they were thanked for their time. Participants who responded in the affirmative, thus providing their informed consent, were then linked to the first page of the survey. A total of 232 individuals responded to this first message. On March 11, 2005, a second message was sent to all members of the sample population who did not participate in the study as a result of the first message. An additional 137 individuals responded at this time. A final attempt to obtain more responses was made on March 16, 2005, nine days after the initial message was sent out. This resulted in 102 extra responses. When the data collection period ended on March 22, 2005, a total of 471 individuals had completed the survey.

Data Analysis

Scale creation. The composite scales for the four learning outcomes were borrowed directly from the National Study of Living Learning Programs. As stated earlier, the scales were re-tested for reliability, in order to ensure that the Cronbach alpha values were sufficiently high using the data collected for this study. The scores for individual items (e.g., leadership ability, expressing ideas orally, and working as part of a team) were summed to form composite scales (e.g., interpersonal self-confidence). (See Table 3 for a full list of the composite scales used in this study.)

Table 3: Composite Measures

	Variable
Growth in cognitive complexity	
Ability to critically analyze ideas and information	Question 12h
Ability to learn on own, pursue ideas, and find information needed	Question 12f
Learning more about things that are new to you	Question 12I
Ability to put ideas together, see relationships between ideas	Question 12e
Growth in liberal learning	
Openness to views that you oppose	Question 12l
Ability to discuss controversial issues	Question 12m
Motivation to further explore ideas presented in class	Question 12n
Gaining a broad general education about different fields of knowledge	Question 12k
Appreciation of art, music, and drama	Question 12j
Increased appreciation of racial/ethnic differences	Question 12g
Growth in personal philosophy	
Developing own values and ethical standards	Question 12b
Understanding self and own abilities, interests, personality	Question 12c
Becoming more aware of different philosophies, lifestyles, cultures	Question 12a
Improving ability to get along with different kinds of people	Question 12d
Interpersonal self-confidence	
Leadership ability	Question 13k
Expressing ideas orally	Question 13h
Working as part of a team	Question 13I

Inferential statistics. Inferential statistics were used to analyze the survey results pertaining to the research hypotheses. Specifically, the statistical procedure of ANCOVA allowed the comparison of groups (long-term vs. short-term) on the following outcomes: cognitive complexity, liberal learning, personal philosophy, and interpersonal self-confidence, all of which were operationalized as dependent variables. The independent variable in this study was duration of study abroad program. It was hoped that enough responses would be obtained to permit winter-term programs, summer programs, semester programs and academic year-long programs to be treated as four distinct levels of the independent variable. However, because the number of responses for each category was so unbalanced, (in addition to the fact that only twenty-three respondents had studied abroad for an entire academic year), it was necessary to collapse the data into two levels: short-term programs (i.e., winter-term and summer programs) and long-term programs (i.e., semester and academic year-long programs). As mentioned earlier, gender and academic class standing served as covariates in the ANCOVA analysis. Because the data was collapsed into two levels of the independent variable, it was not necessary to conduct any post hoc tests to further investigate the nature of any significant differences.

Descriptive statistics. The main focus of this study was to answer the research question, which necessitated that inferential statistics be used. However, ancillary descriptive analyses were also used to describe the demographic and background characteristics (gender, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, class level, and previous international travel experience) of survey respondents. This information provides insight

into the types of students who choose to participate in both short and long-term study abroad programs at the University of Maryland.

Summary

This chapter has described the research methods that were implemented in this quantitative research study of study abroad outcomes. The next chapter will report the results of the data collection and analysis efforts. The final chapter will discuss implications of the research study.

Chapter IV: Results

Introduction

This chapter utilizes descriptive statistics to define the participants involved in the research study, as well as the types of study abroad experiences represented by the respondents. Results of analyses pertaining to the research hypotheses are then reported in the form of inferential statistics. An interpretation of the results of the data analysis is discussed in the subsequent chapter.

Description of the Sample

As indicated in the previous chapter, the Director of the Study Abroad Office at the University of Maryland originally estimated that 1,215 students had studied abroad during the time period relevant for this study. In reality, the actual sample size of the study was 1,408 individuals. Forty-five of the email addresses procured from the Study Abroad Office were invalid, making the revised sample size 1,363 participants. A total of 471 participants responded to the survey, equating to a response rate of 34.6%. In addition to the questions at the heart of this study, participants were also asked to respond to a number of demographic questions, the results of which will be presented here.

Table 4 shows the number of respondents who studied abroad on programs of varying lengths. These numbers are compared to the original sample suggested by the Study Abroad Office. Slightly less than half of the survey respondents (44.1%) participated in programs that have been defined by this study as long-term (i.e., programs lasting for an academic year or semester); 52.8% of the total respondents participated in short-term programs (summer or winter programs). The remaining 3.1% of respondents chose the option of “other” to describe the length of their study abroad program. As

suggested by Table 4, all program types were represented in this study. Winter-term participants responded at a higher rate (44.7%) than the other program types, however. Semester participants were slightly under-represented in comparison to the other program types (31.1%).

Table 4: Participation in Study Abroad Programs of Varying Lengths: Survey Respondents' Participation versus the Study Abroad Office's Estimation of Total Number of Participants

Program type	Estimated number of total participants	Number of actual respondents	Percentage of respondents by type of program
Short-term	n=580	n=242	
Winter Term 2004 and 2005	380	170	44.7%
Summer 2004	200	72	36.0%
Long-term	n=635	n=202	
Academic year 2003-2004	60	23	38.3%
Semester: Fall 2003 and 2004; Spring 2004	575	179	31.1%

Of the total respondents, 444 individuals indicated their gender, while 27 chose not to respond to this question. Of those who responded, 329 respondents were female (74.1%), while 115 respondents were male (25.9%). In terms of race/ethnicity, 445 participants responded to the question and 26 skipped the question. Among the respondents, 318 (71.5%) identified as White/Caucasian, 54 (12.1%) identified as Asian

or Pacific Islander, 28 (6.3%) identified as African-American/Black, 23 (5.2%) identified as Multi-racial/Multi-ethnic, 12 (2.7%) identified as Hispanic/Latino, and 8 (1.8%) identified as Other. Two respondents (0.4%) indicated that their race/ethnicity was not included in the given response choices, and none of the respondents identified as American Indian or Alaskan Native. Table 5 compares the population of survey respondents (in terms of race/ethnicity and gender) to the profile of the 2002/2003 U.S. American study abroad participant population using data presented in the Open Doors Report (IIE, 2004). This comparison shows there to be greater racial/ethnic diversity among the sample of UM survey respondents. At the same time, however, the table also shows there to be a larger gender disparity among the sample of UM survey respondents as compared to the national population of study abroad participants.

Table 5: A Comparison of the Participants of this Research Study to the 2002-2003 Population of U.S. American Study Abroad Participants

	UM Study Abroad Participants (who responded to this survey)	2002-2003 U.S. American Study Participants
Gender		
Female	74.1%	64.7%
Male	25.9%	35.3%
Race/Ethnicity		
African-American/Black	6.3%	1.8%
Asian or Pacific Islander	12.1%	6.0%
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0.0%	.5%

Hispanic/Latino	2.7%	5.1%
White/Caucasian	71.5%	83.2%
Multi-racial/Multi-ethnic	5.2%	1.8%

In order to get a sense of both short-term and long-term study abroad participants' socioeconomic backgrounds, a question was included in the survey that asked respondents to estimate their parents' total, pre-taxed income from the previous year (from all sources). As indicated by Table 6, chi-square statistics did not find a significant difference between respondents' socioeconomic backgrounds by length of study abroad program. Both long-term and short-term participants tended to come from a variety of socioeconomic backgrounds, with a large proportion of both coming from relatively high socioeconomic class backgrounds.

Table 6: Annual Income of Survey Respondents' Parents by Length of Program

Estimate of parents' income from all sources before taxes	Long-term		Short-term	
	#	%	#	%
Less than \$74,999	45	24.2	63	29.4
\$74,999-\$99,999	39	21.0	39	18.2
\$100,000-\$149,999	51	27.4	57	26.6
\$150,000-\$199,999	25	13.4	30	14.0
More than \$200,000	26	14.0	25	11.7
Chi-square: $\chi^2=1.857$; $df=4$; $p=.762$				

A total of 446 individuals responded to the question that asked them to indicate what college housed their academic major. Results corroborate the literature that states

that study abroad is no longer restricted to foreign language majors exclusively. Some disparities were found to exist, however, between the individual academic colleges and their propensity to send students on either short-term or long-term study abroad programs. The most notable differences are manifested in the academic colleges of Arts and Humanities, Robert H. Smith School of Business, Education, and Life Sciences, with the former two colleges sending relatively more students on long-term programs and the latter two colleges sending relatively more students on short-term programs. (See Table 7)

Table 7: Survey Respondents' Academic Colleges by Length of Study Abroad

Program

Academic college	Long-term		Short-term	
	#	%	#	%
Letters and Sciences	1	0.5	5	2.1
Agriculture and Natural Resources	5	2.5	8	3.4
Architecture, Planning and Preservation	0	0.0	7	3.0
Arts and Humanities	59	29.9	41	17.4
Behavioral and Social Sciences	46	23.4	54	23.0
Robert H. Smith School of Business	44	22.3	36	15.3
Computer, Mathematical and Physical Sciences	6	3.0	5	2.1
Education	4	2.0	16	6.8
James Clark School of Engineering	8	4.1	13	5.5
Health and Human Performance	5	2.5	4	1.7
Information Studies	0	0.0	0	0.0

Phillip Merrill College of Journalism	6	3.0	9	3.8
Life Sciences	12	6.1	32	13.6
Public Policy	0	0.0	1	0.4
Individualized Major	1	0.5	0	0.0
Other	0	0.0	4	1.7
Chi-square: $\chi^2=36.260$; $df=14$; $p=.001$				

Respondents were also asked to indicate their current class standing. As indicated by Table 8, respondents who are currently in their freshman or sophomore year participated in short-term study abroad programs at a higher rate than in long-term programs. The majority of respondents who are currently seniors, however, participated in long-term study abroad programs at a higher rate than in short-term study abroad programs. Finally, among individuals who have already graduated, more short-term participants than long-term participants responded.

Table 8: Current Class Standing of Survey Respondents by Length of Study Abroad Program

Current academic standing of survey respondents	Long-term		Short-term	
	#	%	#	%
First year	0	0.0	6	2.6
Sophomore	3	1.5	33	14.0
Junior	35	17.6	52	22.1
Senior	143	71.9	101	43.0

Already graduated	18	9.0	43	18.3
Chi-square: $\chi^2=49.149$; $df=4$; $p=.000$				

The survey further queried respondents about their previous international experiences. Table 9 depicts survey participants' responses regarding the number of times they had traveled beyond the borders of the United States prior to the study abroad experience in question. A total of 88.3% of respondents had traveled abroad at least once. Cross-tabulations between the number of times respondents traveled abroad before their respective study abroad experiences and the length of the study abroad program did not reveal significant differences.

Table 9: Number of Times Survey Respondents Traveled Abroad Prior to this Study Abroad Experience by Length of Program

Previous times abroad	Long-term		Short-term	
	#	%	#	%
None	22	11.1	27	11.5
Once	24	12.1	30	12.8
Twice	29	14.6	42	17.9
Three times	31	15.6	29	12.4
Four times	32	16.1	18	7.7
Five times	13	6.5	18	7.7
Six times or more	48	24.1	70	29.9
Chi-square: $\chi^2=9.686$; $df=6$; $p=.139$				

A related question asked respondents to indicate the longest amount of time they had spent in another country in a single visit before studying abroad. The two most common response choices for both short-term and long-term study abroad participants was two weeks and three to four weeks, respectively. A greater proportion of long-term participants than short-term participants indicated that they had spent five to seven weeks in another country during a single visit prior to the study abroad experience in question. On the other hand, a larger proportion of short-term participants than long-term participants indicated that they had previously spent twelve or more weeks abroad in a single visit before this particular study abroad experience. (See Table 10)

Table 10: Longest Amount of Time (in Weeks) Spent in Another Country During a Single Visit Prior to this Study Abroad Experience

Period of time	Long-term		Short-term	
	#	%	#	%
Less than 1 week	34	18.0	39	17.6
2 weeks	48	25.4	58	26.2
3-4 weeks	45	23.8	55	24.9
5-7 weeks	27	14.3	12	5.4
8-11 weeks	12	6.3	16	7.2
12 or more weeks	23	12.2	41	18.6
Chi-square: $\chi^2=11.260$; $df=5$; $p=.046$				

Description of Respondents' Study Abroad Experiences

Descriptive questions were also asked about respondents' study abroad experiences in regards to such programmatic factors as the sponsoring institution, type,

duration, and location of the program. According to the results of the survey, the vast majority of short-term respondents studied abroad on a University of Maryland program. In contrast, a greater proportion of long-term respondents studied abroad on a non-UM program than on a UM program. (See Table 11)

Table 11: The Sponsoring Institutions and Organizations of Survey Respondents’ Study Abroad Programs

Sponsoring institution/organization	Long-term		Short-term	
	#	%	#	%
University of Maryland	96	47.5	231	95.5
Non-UM program provider	106	52.5	11	4.5
Chi-square: $\chi^2=130.325$; $df=1$; $p=.000$				

As demonstrated by Tables 12 and 13, there was some diversity among short-term and long-term respondents in terms of study abroad destinations and the extent to which travel was mandated by the individual study abroad programs. Whereas the vast majority of long-term participants were stationed in one location, the opposite is true for short-term participants, who tended to travel to multiple locations as part of the planned study abroad experience. (See Table 12) As for location, the majority of both short-term and long-term respondents studied abroad in Europe. However, in order of popularity, the next most common destinations for short-term respondents included South America, Asia, North America, Africa, and Australia/New Zealand. In comparison, the world regions that hosted the most long-term respondents were Australia/New Zealand, Asia, South America, and Africa, respectively. None of the long-term respondents studied abroad in North America. (See Table 13)

**Table 12: The Extent to which Survey Respondents' Study Abroad Programs
Required Traveling to Multiple Locations by Length of Program**

Travel requirement	Long-term		Short-term	
	#	%	#	%
Stationed in one location	193	95.5	94	39.0
Traveled to multiple sites	9	4.5	147	61.0
Chi-square: $\chi^2=153.987$; $df=1$; $p=.000$				

**Table 13: The Location of Survey Respondents' Study Abroad Programs by Length
of Program**

Study abroad location	Long-term		Short-term	
	#	%	#	%
Africa	4	2.0	8	3.3
Asia	17	8.5	35	14.5
Australia/New Zealand	26	13.0	5	2.1
Europe	144	72.0	131	54.1
North America	0	0.0	17	7.0
South America	9	4.5	46	19.0
Chi-square: $\chi^2=60.854$; $df=5$; $p=.000$				

Several additional programmatic questions were included in the survey in order to gain further insight into the nature of participants' study abroad experiences. For example, respondents were asked whether or not their study abroad programs were stationed in one or more locations where English was the native language. Cross-tabulations revealed that the majority of both long-term and short-term participants

studied abroad in countries where English was not the native language (short-term respondents at a higher rate). (See Table 14) Additionally, the majority of both long-term and short-term respondents indicated that the majority of their classes were instructed in English. (See Table 15)

Table 14: The Extent to which Survey Respondents' Study Abroad Experiences Involved the English Language by Length of Program

English as the official language of the study abroad location(s) visited	Long-term		Short-term	
	#	%	#	%
Yes	69	34.3	48	19.9
No	132	65.7	193	80.1
Chi-square: $\chi^2=11.694$; $df=1$; $p=.001$				

Table 15: The Use of English as the Language of Instruction for the Majority of Survey Respondents' Classes by Length of Program

English as the language of instruction for the majority of respondents' classes	Long-term		Short-term	
	#	%	#	%
Yes	154	76.2	193	80.1
No	48	23.8	48	19.9
Chi-square: $\chi^2=0.957$; $df=1$; $p=.328$				

Respondents were also asked to give further information about the nationalities of their classmates and instructors. The overwhelming majority of short-term respondents indicated that most of their classmates were other students from the U.S. In comparison, there was a more equal distribution of responses in regards to the nationality of

classmates among long-term respondents, although the largest proportion of long-term respondents still indicated that the majority of their classmates were from the U.S. (See Table 16)

Table 16: The Nationalities of Survey Respondents' Classmates While Abroad

The nationalities of study abroad participants' classmates	Long-term		Short-term	
	#	%	#	%
The majority were natives of the host country	37	18.4	4	1.7
The majority were other international students (but not host nationals)	29	14.4	9	3.8
The majority were from the United States	72	35.8	218	91.6
Took classes with a combination of host nationals, international students, and other U.S. American students	63	31.3	7	2.9
Chi-square: $\chi^2= 153.362$; $df=3$; $p=.000$				

As for the nationalities of their instructors, the largest percentage of long-term respondents indicated that the majority of their instructors were natives of the host country; the statement “Took classes from a combination of host national instructors, international instructors and U.S. American instructors” was the second most oft cited response choice among long-term respondents. In contrast, the largest percentage of short-term respondents indicated that the majority of their instructors were American. (See Table 17)

Table 17: The Nationalities of Survey Respondents' Instructors While Abroad

The nationalities of study abroad participants' instructors	Long-term		Short-term	
	#	%	#	%
The majority were natives of the host country	135	66.8	73	30.4
The majority were foreign (but not host nationals)	16	7.9	10	4.2
The majority were from the United States	5	2.5	105	43.8
Took classes from a combination of host national instructors, international instructors, and U.S. American instructors	46	22.8	52	21.7
Chi-square: $\chi^2=108.678$; $df=3$; $p=.000$				

Moving beyond the educational context, the researcher thought it was important to gain insight into the residential environments to which study abroad participants had been exposed while abroad. Tables 18 through 23 provide a detailed look at the variety of housing and roommate options that study abroad participants experienced as a part of their international programs. Chi-square analyses were conducted so that readers could compare the experiences of long-term and short-term respondents. Results show that approximately the same proportion of long-term and short-term respondents stayed with a host family. (See Table 18) Long-term respondents were more likely than short-term respondents to reside in university housing while abroad. (See Table 19) However, relative to long-term respondents, short-term respondents stayed in private dormitories at a higher rate. (See Table 20) A high proportion of long-term respondents resided in private apartments during their education abroad experience; this was only true for a small proportion of short-term respondents, however. (See Table 21) The inverse is true for hotels, meaning that the vast majority of short-term respondents stayed in hotels as a

part of their study abroad experiences. This statement did not hold true for the majority of long-term respondents. (See Table 22)

Table 18: Survey Respondents' Answer to Whether or Not Their Program Involved Staying With a Host Family by Length of Study Abroad Program

Home stay with a host family	Long-term		Short-term	
	#	%	#	%
Yes	39	19.3	52	21.6
No	163	80.7	189	78.4
Chi-square: $\chi^2=.347$; $df=1$; $p=.556$				

Table 19: Survey Respondents' Answer to Whether or Not Their Program Involved Staying in University Housing by Length of Study Abroad Program

University housing	Long-term		Short-term	
	#	%	#	%
Yes	62	30.7	33	13.7
No	140	69.3	208	86.3
Chi-square: $\chi^2=18.853$; $df=1$; $p=.000$				

Table 20: Survey Respondents' Answer to Whether or Not Their Program Involved Staying In a Private Dormitory by Length of Study Abroad Program

Private dormitory	Long-term		Short-term	
	#	%	#	%
Yes	11	5.4	28	11.6
No	191	94.6	213	88.4
Chi-square: $\chi^2=5.215$; $df=1$; $p=.022$				

Table 21: Survey Respondents' Answer to Whether or Not Their Program Involved Staying In a Private Apartment by Length of Study Abroad Program

Private apartment	Long-term		Short-term	
	#	%	#	%
Yes	88	43.6	13	5.4
No	114	56.4	228	94.6
Chi-square: $\chi^2=90.965$; $df=1$; $p=.000$				

Table 22: Survey Respondents' Answer to Whether or Not Their Program Involved Staying In Hotels by Length of Study Abroad Program

Hotel(s)	Long-term		Short-term	
	#	%	#	%
Yes	7	3.5	147	61.0
No	195	96.5	94	39.0
Chi-square: $\chi^2=160.380$; $df=1$; $p=.000$				

Among short-term study abroad participants, the majority lived with one or more U.S. American roommates (but not with a host family). The next most common responses among short-term participants included: lived with a host family (did have other U.S. American roommates), lived alone, and lived with a host family (no other U.S. American roommates). The majority of long-term study abroad participants also indicated that they resided with one or more U.S. American roommates (but not a host family) while abroad. The next most common response choices among long-term participants included: lived with one or more international students (but not a host family), lived with a host family (did have other U.S. American roommates), and lived with a combination of host national, international and/or U.S. American students (but not a host family). The following response options: lived alone and lived with a host family (no U.S. American roommates), were both chosen by 7.7% of long-term respondents. (See Table 23)

Table 23: Habitation Patterns of Survey Respondents by Length of Study Abroad

Program

Roommate options	Long-term		Short-term	
	#	%	#	%
Lived alone	15	7.7	21	9.1
Lived with a host family (no U.S. American roommates)	15	7.7	17	7.4
Lived with a host family (did have other U.S. American roommates)	21	10.7	28	12.2
Lived with one or more U.S. American roommates (but not a host family)	91	46.4	155	67.4
Lived with one or more host national students (but not a host family)	14	7.1	1	0.4

Lived with one or more international students (but not with a host family)	24	12.2	0	0.0
Lived with a combination of host national, international, and/or U.S. American students (but not with a host family)	16	8.2	8	3.5
Chi-square: $\chi^2=54.341$; $df=5$; $p=.000$				

Data Analysis: Inferential Statistics

This next section will describe the data analysis measures that were used in analyzing the four null hypotheses of this research study. To review, the inferential statistical method, analysis of covariance (ANCOVA), was selected prior to the act of data collection. Gender and class standing were chosen as covariates. The independent variable operationalized for this study was length of study abroad program, and the dependent variables to be tested according to the research hypotheses included: cognitive complexity, liberal learning, personal philosophy, and interpersonal self-confidence. In accordance with proper data analysis methods, statistical tests were run for the reliability of constructs and assumptions of ANCOVA.

Data clean-up and modifications. The first step taken once data had been exported from the survey software to SPSS was to run frequencies on all of the variables to ensure that variables had been coded accurately and data had been transferred successfully. Next, the data obtained from survey questions three and twenty-one were recoded. Survey question three asked respondents to identify the length of their study abroad program. It was originally hoped that enough responses would be obtained to analyze the independent variable (i.e., length of study abroad program) on four levels (i.e., academic year, semester, winter-term and summer); however, because of the unequal

samples sizes associated with each category, it was necessary to collapse the data into two categories (i.e., long-term programs and short-term programs) instead of four. The response choices of academic year and semester were recoded and labeled as long-term. Similarly, the response choices of winter-term, summer (4 weeks or more), and summer (less than 4 weeks) were recoded and labeled as short-term. It was also necessary to recode question 21, which asked respondents to indicate their academic class standing, into quasi-continuous coding. The original order (i.e., already graduated, first year, sophomore, junior, senior, and graduate student) was reordered and re-labeled as first year, sophomore, junior, senior, and already graduated (which included the response choices “graduate student” and “already graduated”). Frequencies were run again on both of the variables that had been recoded (length of program and academic class standing) to ensure consistency and accuracy.

Reliability. Next, the learning outcome constructs were tested for internal consistency using Cronbach alpha coefficients. In keeping with the 2004 NSLLP Residence Environment Survey, the original learning outcome constructs were retained (See Appendix C). As indicated by Table 24, reliability was demonstrated for each construct; Cronbach alpha values for the constructs used in this study ranged from .744 to .827.

Table 24: Reliability of Measured Constructs

Composite Scales	Study Abroad Survey Cronbach Alphas	2004 NSLLP Cronbach Alphas
Growth in cognitive complexity	.773	.817
Growth in liberal learning	.792	.803
Growth in personal philosophy	.744	.799
Interpersonal self-confidence	.827	.744

Once reliability was demonstrated, it was possible to create the learning outcome scales for cognitive complexity, liberal learning, personal philosophy and interpersonal self-confidence. Frequencies were then run for each of the scales to ensure consistency and accuracy.

Testing of ANCOVA assumptions. A number of assumptions associated with the statistical procedure of ANCOVA were tested for each hypothesis, including the appropriate measurement of covariates, reliability of covariates, correlations among covariates, and homogeneity of regression slopes (Pallant, 2001).

The first assumption (measurement of covariates) required that the covariates be measured as a part of the research design. In accordance with this assumption, data was collected about respondents' gender and academic class standing. These values were not manipulated as a result of treatment or statistical analysis. The second assumption (reliability of the covariates) presumes that respondents answered questions about their gender and academic class standing accurately.

Another assumption that had to be tested (correlation among the covariates) required the researcher to verify that the covariates were not too strongly correlated with

one another. Using SPSS, a test was conducted to determine the amount of correlation between the variables of gender and academic class standing. The resulting Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was .095, which is a small/negligible correlation, and well below the cut-off value of .8 (Pallant, 2001). Therefore, this assumption was met.

The final assumption that had to be tested concerned homogeneity of regression slopes. This required multiple tests to be conducted for the purpose of determining whether or not there was evidence of statistically significant interactions between the various dependent variables and the individual covariates. Individual analyses revealed that this assumption was not violated. The relationship between the gender covariate and the dependent variables, cognitive complexity, liberal learning, personal philosophy, and interpersonal self-confidence, did not differ significantly as a function of the independent variable, length of program. Similarly, the relationship between the academic class standing covariate and the four dependent variables did not differ significantly as a function of the independent variable.

Analysis of hypotheses. A one-way analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was conducted for each of the hypotheses associated with this study. The independent variable (length of study abroad program) included two levels (long-term and short-term). The dependent variables included: growth in cognitive complexity, liberal learning, personal philosophy, and interpersonal self-confidence. Gender and academic class standing of respondents were used as covariates. A separate ANCOVA was conducted to test each of the four hypotheses. A Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances was run as a part of each ANCOVA to confirm the null hypothesis that the

error variance of the dependent variable was equal across groups. The ANCOVA associated with each hypothesis was statistically significant. The results are even further encouraging, because the mean values for both short-term and long-term respondents are higher than the norm values provided by the NSLLP (Inkelas, 2004). Furthermore, the standard deviation scores are much lower for this research study than for the NSLLP, which suggests greater consistency in response choice. Table 25 provides comparative data for the NSLLP.

Table 25: Descriptive Statistics for the NSLLP

Dependent Variable	N	Min. Value	Max. Value	Mean	Std. Dev.
Cognitive Complexity	19,321	4.000	16.000	11.244	2.326
Liberal Learning	19,285	6.000	24.000	15.344	3.513
Personal Philosophy	19,568	4.000	16.000	11.407	2.449
Interpersonal Self-Confidence	19,302	3.000	12.000	8.539	2.000

*Inkelas, 2005 [Raw Data]

Results of the first ANCOVA allowed the following null hypothesis to be rejected: *There will be no differences in the amount of growth in cognitive complexity depending on the length of the study abroad program.* The ANCOVA revealed significance, $F = 8.073$, $p = .005$, $\eta^2 = .019$ (small effect size). Long-term study abroad participants evidenced a larger amount of growth in cognitive complexity than short-term study abroad participants, as demonstrated by the respective means of 12.037 (long-term) and 11.323 (short-term). Possible composite score values ranged from 4.000 to 16.000, with

a score of 4.000 representing “Not grown at all,” a score of 8.000 representing “Grown somewhat,” a score of 12.000 representing “Grown,” and a score of 16.000 representing “Grown very much.” The low standard deviation scores for both short-term and long-term respondents indicates that there was not much variation in how respondents chose to answer this question. (See Table 26)

Table 26: ANCOVA of Differences in Amount of Growth in Cognitive Complexity by Length of Study Abroad Program

	<u>Short-Term</u>		<u>Long-Term</u>			
Dependent Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Significance	Partial η^2
Growth in Cognitive Complexity	11.323	.168	12.037	.184	F=8.073; df=1; p=.005	.019
Covariates						
Gender					F=7.276; df=1; p=.007	.017
Class Standing					F=.006; df=1; p=.937	.000

*Composite score values ranged from 4.000 to 16.000.

The second hypothesis was also rejected: *There will be no differences in the amount of growth in liberal learning depending on the length of the study abroad program.* Again, the ANCOVA revealed significance, $F = 8.318$, $p = .004$, $\eta^2 = .020$ (small effect size). Respondents who had participated in long-term study abroad programs manifested a significantly larger amount of growth in liberal learning (mean = 17.886) compared to their short-term study abroad counterparts (mean = 16.790). For this particular composite scale, the minimum value was 6.000 and the maximum value

was 24.000. A mean score of 6.000 corresponds to “Not grown at all.” A score of 12.000 corresponds to the response choice “Grown somewhat;” a score of 18.000 corresponds to “Grown” and a score of 24.000 corresponds to “Grown very much.” Again, the low standard deviation scores show the relative lack of variation in response choices among both short-term and long-term respondents. (See Table 27)

Table 27: ANCOVA of Differences in Amount of Growth in Liberal Learning by Length of Study Abroad Program

	<u>Short-Term</u>		<u>Long-Term</u>			
Dependent Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Significance	Partial η^2
Growth in Liberal Learning	16.790	.251	17.886	.281	F=8.318; df=1; p=.004	.020
Covariates						
Gender					F=5.155; df=1; p=.024	.012
Class Standing					F=.020; df=1; p=.888	.000

*Composite score values ranged from 6.000 to 24.000.

The third hypothesis: *There will be no differences in the amount of growth in personal philosophy depending on the length of the study abroad program*, was also rejected. Accordingly, the results of the ANCOVA revealed significance: $F = 24.155$, $p = .000$, $\eta^2 = .054$ (moderate effect size). Table 28 shows that the growth in personal philosophy experienced by long-term study abroad participants was significantly higher than the growth experienced by short-term study abroad participants, as illustrated by the respective mean values of 13.309 (long-term) versus 12.249 (short-term). Potential

values for this composite scale ranged from 4.000 to 16.000. As with growth in cognitive complexity, mean scores of 4.000, 8.000, 12.000, and 16.000 corresponded to the following response choices respectively: “Not grown at all,” “Grown somewhat,” “Grown,” and “Grown very much.” The standard deviation scores of .145 (short-term respondents) and .158 (long-term respondents) shows that there was even less variation in terms of how this question was answered than with the previous two questions.

Table 28: ANCOVA of Differences in Amount of Growth in Personal Philosophy by Length of Study Abroad Program

	<u>Short-Term</u>		<u>Long-Term</u>			
Dependent Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Significance	Partial η^2
Growth in Personal Philosophy	12.249	.145	13.309	.158	F=24.1555; df=1; p=.000	.054
Covariates						
Gender					F=9.288; df=1; p=.002	.021
Class Standing					F=.010; df=1; p=.921	.000

*Composite score values ranged from 4.000 to 16.000.

The final hypothesis to be tested: *There will be no differences in the amount of growth in interpersonal self-confidence depending on the length of the study abroad program*, was also rejected. The mean amount of growth reported by long-term participants was 9.668; in comparison the mean amount of growth reported by short-term participants was 9.242. The range of possible composite scale values started at 3.0 (“Not at all confident”) and ended at 12.0 (“Very confident”), meaning that both short-

term and long-term respondents rated themselves as slightly higher than “Confident” as a result of their study abroad experiences. Results of the ANCOVA revealed significance: $F = 5.331$, $p = .013$, $\eta^2 = .013$ (small effect size). (See Table 29)

Table 29: ANCOVA of Differences in Amount of Growth in Interpersonal Self-Confidence by Length of Study Abroad Program

	<u>Short-Term</u>		<u>Long-Term</u>			
Dependent Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Significance	Partial η^2
Growth in Interpersonal Self-Confidence	9.242	.123	9.668	.135	F=5.331; df=1; p=.021	.013
Covariates						
Gender					F=.287; df=1; p=.593	.001
Class Standing					F=.1.247; df=1; p=.265	.003

*Composite score values ranged from 3.000 to 9.000.

Ancillary Analyses

Additional information was collected in order to assist the Study Abroad Office to understand participants’ feelings and attitudes toward international education, perceived barriers to studying abroad, and future interest in study abroad. As shown in Table 30, participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed with two statements, both of which were designed to elicit respondents’ attitudes toward the respective lengths of their study abroad programs. A chi-square analysis revealed that short-term and long-term participants tended to choose each response choice at nearly the same frequency.

Overall, 92% of all respondents disagreed with the notion that they would have liked to have participated in a shorter study abroad program, and 69% directly affirmed that they wished for a longer study abroad program.

Table 30: Survey Respondents' Feelings toward the Length of their Study Abroad Programs

	Long-term		Short-term	
	#	%	#	%
I wish my study abroad program would have been shorter				
Strongly disagree	127	63.8	135	58.2
Disagree	53	26.6	78	33.6
Neither agree or disagree	14	7.0	18	7.8
Agree	3	1.5	1	0.4
Strongly agree	2	1.0	0	0.0
Chi-square: $\chi^2=6.024$; $df=4$; $p=.197$				
I wish my study abroad program would have been longer				
Strongly disagree	6	3.0	6	2.6
Disagree	23	11.6	22	9.5
Neither agree or disagree	42	21.2	35	15.2
Agree	56	28.3	77	33.3
Strongly agree	71	35.9	91	39.4
Chi-square: $\chi^2=3.928$; $df=4$; $p=.416$				

Overall satisfaction with the study abroad experience is buttressed by the following survey results: 98% asserted that they were happy with their choice of study abroad location and 99% agreed that studying abroad was a great experience. Furthermore, it is likely that many survey respondents will become advocates for studying abroad. Ninety-seven percent agreed with the notion that more students should study abroad, and ninety-four percent indicated that they would actively encourage more students to do so. Finally, 77% indicated that they would like to study abroad again, and 99% indicated that they hoped to engage in more international travel in the future. (See Table 31) Table 32 provides more insight into respondents' future study abroad and international travel aspirations.

Table 31: Participants' Feelings toward their Study Abroad Experiences

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
I am happy that I chose to study abroad where I did	0%	1%	1%	26%	72%
I wish I would have studied abroad in a different country	40%	35%	16%	7%	1%
I believe that studying abroad was a waste of my time	87%	11%	1%	1%	0%
I believe that studying abroad was a great experience	0%	0%	1%	16%	83%

I believe that more students should study abroad	0%	0%	4%	24%	73%
In the future, I will encourage more students to study abroad	0%	0%	5%	26%	68%
I would like to study abroad again	1%	3%	19%	24%	53%
I would like to do more international traveling in the future	0%	1%	0%	10%	89%

Table 32: Future Plans to Study Abroad

Study abroad plans	Number of respondents	Frequency
Academic year program	17	3.8%
Semester program	35	7.9%
Winter program	59	13.3%
Summer program (4 weeks or more)	48	10.8%
Summer program (less than 4 weeks)	38	8.5%
None, I have already graduated	28	6.3%
None, I will graduate soon	246	55.3%
None, I do not plan to study abroad again	26	5.8%
Other	32	7.2%

Finally, respondents were also asked to indicate which factors they personally considered to be barriers to studying abroad. As shown in Table 33, money was the most oft cited concern, followed by academic major, leaving friends, and leaving family.

Respondents were allowed to choose as many barriers as they thought pertained. They could also choose the option of “other” and specify the barrier they had in mind. These written-in responses ranged from “none” or “no fear,” to academic restrictions (i.e., the 30-credit rule), fear of not being able to graduate on time, leaving a job, and leaving a significant other.

Table 33: Barriers to Studying Abroad

Perceived barriers	Number of respondents	Frequency
Money	299	71.9%
Leaving family	101	24.3%
Leaving friends	108	26%
Academic major	123	29.6%
Co-curricular or extra-curricular commitments	60	14.4%
Fear of living in another country	26	6.2%
Fear of not being able to communicate	55	13.2%
Other	48	11.5%

Summary

This chapter has reviewed the results of the data analysis procedures as they relate to the original research hypotheses and ancillary analyses. The next chapter will provide further interpretation of the results, including implications for the field and suggestions for future research. Limitations of the study will also be discussed.

Chapter V: Discussion

Findings and Implications

This final chapter provides a summary and interpretation of the results of the research study. Limitations of the study and its generalizability are discussed, in addition to suggestions for future research. The study's results are also discussed as they relate to practical implications for the field.

Summary of Findings

To review, the purpose of this study was to compare a group of short-term study abroad participants to a group of long-term study abroad participants in terms of the amount of growth each group perceived on four purposefully chosen learning outcomes. The study hypothesized that there would be differences in students' perceived amount of growth in cognitive complexity, liberal learning, personal philosophy and interpersonal self-confidence in relation to the length of the study abroad program. A locally modified survey instrument, which was re-tested for reliability and validity, was distributed to a sample population of 1,363 individuals. Four hundred seventy-one individuals participated in the study, for a response rate of 34.6%. Data analysis, which included four separate ANCOVA tests, revealed that all hypotheses were significant, with the long-term study abroad group evidencing larger perceived amounts of growth on all variables of interest (i.e., cognitive complexity, liberal learning, personal philosophy, and interpersonal self-confidence). Although significant, the effect size was small for three of the four variables; however, the effect size associated with growth in personal philosophy was moderate ($\eta^2=.054$). The effects of the chosen covariates, gender and academic class standing, were controlled for statistically. Ancillary analyses yielded further information

about the participants involved in the study, including demographic and programmatic information.

Interpretation of Findings

The ANCOVA results of this study suggest that there are differences in the perceived amount of growth in cognitive complexity, liberal learning, personal philosophy, and interpersonal self-confidence in relation to the length of the study abroad program. As such, this study builds on the small body of research that examines the impact of the length of time abroad on the attainment of learning outcomes. The results of the cross-tabulations and ancillary analyses also provide further insight into short-term and long-term study abroad participants and their respective experiences.

Hypothesis one. ANCOVA results found the first hypothesis to be statistically significant. Significant differences were found to exist between the long-term and short-term study abroad groups in terms of the perceived amount of growth in cognitive complexity each group experienced as a result of their respective study abroad experiences. The long-term group was found to attribute greater growth in cognitive complexity to the study abroad experience in comparison to the short-term group. For the purposes of this study, cognitive complexity was defined as intellectual change and growth, and measured as the ability to critically analyze ideas and information, learn on one's own, and pursue ideas and needed information. The ability to learn more about new ideas and concepts, as well as the ability to see relationships and patterns, and to put ideas together, also formed part of the cognitive complexity construct.

Given this definition, along with prior research on learning outcomes, it is logical that long-term study abroad programs would be more conducive to nurturing participants'

growth in cognitive complexity, as compared with short-term programs. The National Survey of Student Engagement (2004) asserted that involvement in activities and experiences, which necessitate active learning and participation (referred to as ‘deep learning’) over passive learning, challenges students to think more complexly, due to the need to synthesize, integrate and apply learning. Results of this study imply that long-term programs are structured in such a way as to be more likely than short-term programs to encourage, empower and require participants to become more immersed in the local culture. This requires individuals to be more active and self-sufficient in terms of navigating the culture and pursuing the information necessary for understanding the new environment and deciphering cultural contextual clues. In contrast, short-term programs are limited by their design and time constraints. They seem more likely to introduce participants to the culture and the systems of the host country in a more packaged way (e.g., staying in hotels with other American students), which allows more passivity on the part of participants.

Hypothesis two. ANCOVA test results found the second hypothesis to be statistically significant as well. Significant differences were found to exist among the long-term and short-term study abroad groups in terms of the perceived amount of growth in liberal learning each group ascribed to their respective study abroad experiences. The long-term group was found to connect higher levels of growth in liberal learning to the study abroad experience in comparison to the short-term group. For the purposes of this study, liberal learning referred to tolerance and open-mindedness about new ideas and concepts. The notion of liberalism pertained to an appreciation for a broad,

liberal arts education, enjoyment of art, music and cultural diversity, as well as a proclivity to discuss issues with an open mind.

The statistical significance of this finding may imply that individuals are more likely to become more open-minded, tolerant, and ethnorelative the longer they are abroad. Research on college student learning outcomes declares that students become progressively more liberal throughout the time of their college attendance, in terms of their ability to appreciate art, culture and ideas, as well as in their attitudes toward such issues as politics, religion, diversity, and social and gender norms (Astin, 1989; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1996). It may possibly be inferred that the major catalyst for this increase in liberalism is the heightened exposure to new ideas, concepts, values, cultures and diversity of people within the college setting. In comparison, study abroad has the potential to take this exposure to difference to an even higher level. Study abroad participants find themselves in the midst of a new political, social and cultural terrain. The extent of this exposure to difference is likely to vary, however, according to the length of the study abroad experience, and the related structural components of the program.

Prolonged exposure to a new culture and way of life is a facet of long-term study abroad programs that is lacking from short-term programs. Long-term study abroad participants are more likely to live among and take classes with a greater diversity of individuals than short-term study abroad participants. In addition, the greater likelihood that long-term study abroad participants will take classes with host national instructors, as opposed to American instructors, suggests that they will also be exposed to different ideas and ways of teaching and interacting in the classroom setting. For these reasons, it

is not surprising that the long-term group evidenced higher levels of perceived growth in liberal learning over the short-term group.

Hypothesis three. Similar to the other three hypotheses, the third hypothesis was also found to be statistically significant. Unique to this hypothesis, however, ANCOVA tests revealed the length of time abroad to actually have a moderate effect size ($\eta^2=.054$) on the perceived growth in personal philosophy for long-term participants in comparison to short-term participants. For the purposes of this study, growth in personal philosophy included growth in self-understanding, the development and refinement of values, and growth in awareness of the diverse array of philosophies and cultures. Additionally, this construct also included participants' growth in ability to interact with people different than them.

The fact that this study found the long-term study abroad group to perceive that they had achieved a significantly larger amount of growth in personal philosophy over their short-term comparison group is deserving of considerable attention and suggests that study abroad, in particular long-term study abroad, should be a priority of colleges and universities. Indeed, results of this study indicate that participants in long-term study abroad programs are significantly more likely to increase their self-awareness, to develop ethics and values, and to grow in appreciation of diversity and multiculturalism. Extrapolating from the research on learning outcomes (Astin, 1989; 1996; 1999; Kuh, 1996; & NSSE, 2004) allows us to infer that this growth in personal philosophy may be attributable to the myriad challenges presented to study abroad participants to step out of their comfort zones. These challenges depend in part on the nature of the study abroad experience, as well the length of the program. To varying extents, participants are

challenged to adapt to a foreign country and to operate within the parameters of unfamiliar cultural, social, political, economic and educational systems. These experiences invite participants to question previous assumptions about global issues, their home and host countries, culturally different others, and themselves. This continual process of learning, questioning and reflecting over the course of the study abroad experience has the potential to result in significant learning and development, especially in the areas that characterize the personal philosophy construct (i.e., self-understanding, the development and refinement of values, awareness in the diversity of cultures and philosophies, and the ability to interact and form relationships with others who are culturally different). The findings of this study suggest that long-term participants are more likely than short-term participants to face these challenges in greater frequency, intensity and duration.

Given the fact that a large number of students are unable or unwilling to participate in study abroad for a variety of reasons, however, institutions of higher education should look to create comparable types of experiences that could likewise result in growth in personal philosophy for those students who remain at the home campus throughout their collegiate careers. For example, institutions could intentionally work to bring together individuals from different cultural or national backgrounds in the context of the classroom and beyond. Institutions could also do a better job of capitalizing on the rich and varied experiences and knowledge bases that are brought to campus by American students and faculty who have taught or studied beyond the borders of the United States, as well as by international students, by encouraging them to teach

and share what they have learned and experienced to other students, staff and faculty on the home-based campus.

Hypothesis four. ANCOVA test results also found the fourth hypothesis to be statistically significant. Significant differences were found to exist among the long-term and short-term study abroad groups with regards to the perceived amount of growth in interpersonal self-confidence imputed to the study abroad experience. The long-term group was found to attribute higher levels of interpersonal self-confidence to the study abroad experience in comparison to the short-term group. The construct of interpersonal self-confidence was measured as leadership ability, ability to work as an effective member of a team, and confidence in expressing ideas orally.

It is highly likely that many facets of studying abroad contribute to this perceived growth in self-confidence, especially in relation to the long-term study abroad experience. For instance, studying abroad requires one to learn to navigate a new culture, a new political system, and perhaps even a new language. Individuals may achieve greater self-confidence through independent or group travel, as suggested by Gmelch (1977), as well as through meeting new people or eating new foods. The longer one is abroad, the more opportunities one will have for making new discoveries and for becoming more self-confident. Because the research states that female college students tend to harbor lower feelings of self-confidence than their male peers (Astin, 1989), advisors should be especially vocal about stating the implications of long-term study abroad opportunities when working with female advisees.

Additional findings. Using cross-tabulations to compare short-term and long-term respondents illuminated many noteworthy findings. To begin with long-term study

abroad participants, it is important to note that almost 72% were seniors, which was a much higher proportion than that evidenced among short-term respondents (43%). Additionally, chi-square statistics revealed that long-term respondents were much more likely than short-term respondents to have been stationed in a single, permanent location during the study abroad experience (95.5% vs. 39%). Almost a third of long-term respondents (31.3%) indicated that they had taken courses with host national students, international students and other American students as a part of their coursework; in comparison, only 2.9% of short-term respondents identified this to be an accurate portrayal of their own study abroad experiences. Long-term respondents were also much more likely than short-term respondents to have been instructed by natives of the host country (66.8% vs. 30.4%), and to have lived in either private apartments or university housing while abroad.

A closer look at short-term respondents reveals that they were much more likely than long-term respondents to have participated in study abroad programs coordinated by the University of Maryland (95.5% vs. 47.5%). Moreover, short-term respondents indicated at a much higher rate than long-term respondents that they stayed at hotels during their study abroad programs (61% vs. 3.5% respectively). Although a greater proportion of short-term respondents than long-term respondents indicated that their education abroad experiences occurred in foreign environments where English was not the official language (80.1% vs. 65.7%), short-term respondents were also much more likely than long-term participants to have responded that the majority of their classmates while abroad were other American students (91.6% vs. 35.8%).

There are also areas deserving of note where there was seemingly no difference between the long-term and short-term study abroad groups. First, the two groups did not differ significantly in terms of the number of previous international experiences each had had before participating in the education abroad experience in question. Furthermore, despite popular sentiment that students from lower socioeconomic statuses are more likely to choose short-term study abroad options than long-term study abroad programs (Hovde, 2002b), this study did not find this to be the case. In fact, short-term and long-term respondents were surprisingly equal in terms of their respective socioeconomic backgrounds, which was measured by this study as annual family income.

Examining the above differences in light of the research that is available on learning outcomes, allows the researcher to draw some valuable inferences in terms of the possible reasons why long-term study abroad participants manifested significantly higher perceived learning outcome scores than their short-term counterparts. Most relevant is Astin's (1999) theory of involvement, which was founded on the notion that the more involved students are, the more likely they are to persist, learn, and develop. The following definition of involvement: "the quantity and quality of physical and psychological energy that is invested in the experience" (Astin, p. 528), is instrumental for comparing the different qualitative experiences of long-term and short-term study abroad participants. The above discussion of the results of the cross-tabulations suggest that the nature of the long-term study abroad experience requires a much higher level of physical and psychological energy to be invested, in comparison to the short-term experience. The majority of long-term respondents indicated that they were immersed in one location for a relatively long period of time, as opposed to traveling to multiple

locations in the span of a few weeks, like short-term respondents. Furthermore, long-term respondents were more likely to expend a greater amount of psychological energy in terms of the quantity and quality of cross-cultural interactions required by the experience. This relates to the available research on the impact of diversity on learning and development, which is a critical factor in the study abroad experience.

As stated above, the majority of long-term respondents indicated that they lived in more permanent locations and multicultural environments than short-term respondents, who tended to stay in hotels with other American students. For long-term respondents, this exposure to diversity extended into the academic context as well, since they tended to take courses taught by host national instructors, and with students from a variety of cultural and national backgrounds. In contrast, an overwhelming preponderance of short-term respondents indicated that the majority of their classmates were other Americans. The research that is available on the impact of diversity on learning outcomes is helpful in understanding why long-term respondents reported greater perceived growth than short-term respondents in all outcome areas included in this study. Blimling (2001) provides this useful summary:

Students who attend institutions with a diverse population of students, faculty, and staff report greater learning, increases in various measure of interpersonal competencies, develop greater self-confidence, are less likely to hold irrational prejudices, make greater gains in critical thinking, and have greater involvement in civic and community service behaviors (Beckham, 2000; Gudeman, 2000; Gurin, 1999; Pascarella, Palmer, Moye,

& Pierson, 2001; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2000; Milem, 1999; Smith, Gerbick, Figueroa, Watkins, Levitan, et al., 1997; Sedlacek, 1987) (p. 518).

Practical Implications

This growing trend of students spending shorter amounts of time abroad is partially a result of institutions and study abroad program providers offering a greater number of short-term programs to either fulfill or drive student and faculty demand (it has not yet been determined which is the cause and which the effect). This is happening largely without practical assessments of needs and outcomes occurring, which suggests that more intentional research and assessment needs to be conducted by practitioners in the field. Study abroad professionals should attempt to stay current on relevant literature and research as it becomes available. Practitioners should also constantly re-evaluate and reassess the goals and mission of the field of study abroad to see who is and is not being served, and to determine how well the field is fulfilling its charge.

This particular study was more concerned with advancing practice than advancing theory. It was conducted for the purpose of assessing the outcomes of short-term study abroad in relation to the outcomes of long-term study abroad. Neither the results of this study, nor the available research on study abroad, indicate conclusively the extent to which short-term study abroad participants may or may not achieve growth in learning outcomes over comparable students who do not participate in a study abroad experience. It is likely that studying abroad, even for a short amount of time, produces more growth in learning outcomes than not studying abroad at all; however, that cannot be stated with certainty. This study maintains that both short-term and long-term study abroad programs are of value, and does not intend to imply that short-term study abroad programs should

be diminished or eliminated. The results of this comparison study do suggest, however, that long-term study abroad appears to be more likely to produce growth in learning outcomes than short-term study abroad. Therefore, practitioners in the field, as well as at the University of Maryland, should weigh the advantages and disadvantages of developing a large number of short-term study abroad programs at the expense of long-term programs, in light of this study's findings, and the overall purpose and mission of study abroad. It should be determined who the consumers of short-term study abroad programs are, and the expectations that they have for short-term programs. Program providers and study abroad advisors should be prepared to thoughtfully discuss the distinct nature of short-term and long-term programs with potential study abroad participants, so that they may make informed decisions that fit their personal and academic needs and expectations.

Alternatively, institutions and independent program providers could endeavor to re-structure short-term programs to more closely resemble their long-term counterparts. Perhaps by including more activities and experiences found to be empirically linked to enhanced learning outcomes, these short-term programs could have a greater effect on those for whom these offerings are more conducive.

Limitations and Generalizability of the Study

Threats to internal validity. Because this study involved a non-experimental research design, there are, accordingly, a few threats to internal validity that need to be noted. These identified threats include history, selection, subject attrition and maturation. First, the historical threat to internal validity concerns the fact that respondents studied abroad in different locales and at different times. As has been noted

throughout this document, there are also a myriad programmatic features that no doubt contribute to the uniqueness of individuals' study abroad experiences. Therefore, the situations, events and occurrences that may have happened during and since participants' study abroad programs could have had varying effects on their respective experiences and thus may have affected the way that subjects chose to respond.

The selection threat to internal validity suggests that it is possible that long-term respondents may have indicated greater growth in learning outcomes than short-term respondents due to initial differences in values, motivations and expectations for their study abroad experiences. The extent to which these factors ultimately contributed to the choice of a long-term program or short-term program is unknown, and thus must be noted as a limitation. For example, it is possible that, from the beginning, individuals who chose long-term programs were more open to growth, change and long-term exposure than their short-term counterparts, who perhaps approached study abroad with their own distinct expectations. Another example of a threat to internal validity caused by the selection effect concerns the portion of the sample who chose to respond to the survey. These self-selected respondents may have had the most positive reactions to study abroad, which could have been the catalyst prompting them to participate in the research study. This could have caused the results to be skewed.

The subject attrition threat to internal validity concerns the fact that some subjects considered to be part of the sampling frame may have withdrawn from the university or have graduated during the 2003-2004 academic year, or in December 2004. This means that those students who were considered to be part of the study could have

essentially dropped out of the study, if they left the university and did not change or update their email addresses with the Study Abroad Office.

Finally, maturation is another identified threat to internal validity. A sincere attempt was made to mitigate this threat as much as possible by including class standing as a covariate in the research design, since short-term and long-term respondents tended to differ in terms of their current class standings. Maturation occurs from more than just advancing in age and class standing, however. Depending on the length of time that has lapsed between being abroad and participating in this study, respondents are likely to have matured to varying degrees from events and occurrences unrelated to the study abroad experience; although they may still have attributed their growth to the study abroad experience. The fact that the effects of maturity could have affected the manner in which respondents answered the survey questions is therefore a noteworthy limitation.

Threats to external validity. Also inherent in the research design is an identified threat to external validity, namely the Hawthorne Effect. This particular threat is based on the fact that subjects' responses may have been biased simply because subjects had knowledge that they were part of a research study on the effects of study abroad. Most students who choose to study abroad are well aware of the touted benefits of study abroad before they even depart for their international destinations. Therefore, in completing the survey, subjects may have chosen the most socially desirable responses, instead of answering truthfully and upon examination of their own feelings and experiences.

Other limitations. Other potential limitations of this research design concern the size and scope of the study. First, due to financial and time constraints, the study was

limited to one institution, the University of Maryland, College Park. In addition, it was not possible to determine the extent to which the survey respondents represented the total population of study abroad participants at the University of Maryland, because demographic information was unavailable for the original sample. Furthermore, the sampling frame was not composed of equal numbers of students who participated in the different types of study abroad programs (i.e., winter-term, summer, semester and academic year). In fact, there were only 55 actual subjects in the sampling frame who studied abroad for an entire academic year, as compared to the other types of programs that had hundreds of participants. In order to lessen the subject attrition and maturation threats to internal validity, the decision was made to only include participants in the research design who studied abroad during the current (2004-2005) or preceding (2003-2004) academic year. Because only twenty-three individuals from the academic year program subcategory responded, it was necessary to collapse the data. This means that, as a result, the independent variable (i.e., length of study abroad program) was only analyzed on two levels instead of four. This factor needs to be noted as a limitation, because, for instance, studying abroad for a semester could be qualitatively very different from studying abroad for an entire academic year, just as summer and winter-term programs may be divergent in terms of their respective lengths and effects as well.

A related limitation concerns the use of the chi-square statistic for ancillary analyses. Cross-tabulations allowed for the comparison of long-term and short-term respondents on many background and programmatic factors. However, despite the utility of this statistical procedure for illuminating differences between and among the distribution of response choices of short-term and long-term respondents, a major

limitation concerns the fact that the chi-square statistic is unable to reveal where exactly the significant differences lie between the two groups.

Although the dependent variables in this research study were learning outcomes, the research design was set up in such a way as to compare students who studied abroad on short-term programs (i.e., summer and winter-term) vis-à-vis students who studied abroad on long-term programs (i.e., semester and academic year). This means that there was no control group; study abroad participants were not studied vis-à-vis those students who never participated in a study abroad program. Since this was a comparative study, it is not possible to claim causality. Therefore, this study cannot be used to infer that study abroad programs of a semester or longer cause growth in cognitive complexity, liberal learning, personal philosophy and interpersonal self-confidence directly, only that individuals who study abroad for longer periods of time report greater increases in these learning outcome areas over individuals who study abroad for shorter periods of time. Another limitation of this study centers on the finite number of outcomes that were ultimately included in the research design, since it would have been unwieldy to study every single outcome that has ever been associated with study abroad.

Further consideration should also be given toward the varying attitudes and personal characteristics of individual study abroad participants before, during and after their individual study abroad experiences, since this research study relied on a self-report survey instrument. Attitudinal differences in survey respondents may have been manifested in such divergent areas as satisfaction with the study abroad experience in general, developmental readiness for the study abroad experience, foreign language proficiency (where applicable), and pre-existing levels of ethnorelativism/ethnocentrism,

patriotism, and international-/worldmindedness. Such factors could have affected the way that participants chose to respond to survey questions.

Suggestions for Future Research

As noted in the literature review of this study, there are many deficiencies associated with the body of study abroad research. The available research could be aptly described as inconclusive, inconsistent, and largely outdated. There was a span of time when there seems that very little if any research was done on the effects of study abroad. Given that even the older literature, which was largely published in the mid-twentieth century, was not conclusive about the nature of the effects of study abroad, it is not clear why there was such a dearth of research in the latter half of the twentieth century. However, with the current emphasis on accountability (Pulley, 2002; Woodard & Komives, 2003), it is advisable that those in the field conduct more regular and periodic research and assessment. As will be suggested here, the potential topics that could be investigated within the field of study abroad are numerous. Many of the topics that will be suggested below are related to the current study, and would add considerable insight to the topic at hand, and to the field of study abroad in general.

First, this study was a non-experimental, comparison study and not a study of causality. A follow-up study could add a control group to the research design, comprised of a comparable sample of students who remain at the home institution, to determine the extent to which they assign growth in the measured learning outcomes to experiences and activities associated with the collegiate experience other than study abroad. The control group could then be compared to the long-term and short-term study abroad groups to see which group manifests the greatest amount of perceived growth. Alternatively, the

current study could be replicated using a pre-test, post-test design in order to procure a better estimate of the perceived growth in learning outcomes. This more precise measurement could then be used in the comparison of the short-term and long-term study abroad groups.

As was noted in the literature review section, there has been limited research conducted that has looked specifically at length of time abroad as a variable of interest. Data analysis conducted as a part of this research study revealed this factor to be statistically significant. As such, more research should be conducted in general which focuses on the duration of study abroad programs for the purpose of replicating and further supporting the advances made by this study. Moreover, because it was necessary to collapse the data for this study, statistical analyses could only be conducted on two distinct levels of the independent variable (i.e., short-term programs vs. long-term programs), instead of the four levels that were originally hoped for (academic year, semester, winter-term and summer). Therefore, it would be useful if further studies were conducted which looked in greater detail at the variety of study abroad program lengths and their corresponding effects.

It has been noted as a limitation of this study that only duration of the study abroad program was analyzed as an independent variable, despite the fact that there are a multitude of programmatic factors that distinguish study abroad programs from one another. This focuses attention on the need for further studies to investigate each of these individual programmatic factors, both in isolation and in relation to one another.

This study used cross-tabulations to gain some insight into the demographic and background characteristics of individuals who chose to study abroad on both short-term

and long-term study abroad programs. However, further attempts should also be made to determine the extent to which certain factors (e.g., gender, race/ethnicity, SES, academic major, institutional culture, parental involvement, advisors' input, etc.) contribute to students' decisions to participate in study abroad programs of varying lengths. Such studies could utilize the statistical procedure of multiple regression to determine the respective weights of such factors.

Along these lines, more attention should be devoted in the research to the motivations and expectations that students have for short-term study abroad, as well as the resulting outcomes. It has been conjectured that one potential benefit of the proliferation of short-term study abroad opportunities is that an increasing number of students, who for various reasons would not have considered studying abroad before they were presented with short-term options, are enrolling in short-term study abroad programs in increasing numbers (Hovde, 2002b). It is further hypothesized that this initial international experience may entice these same students to subsequently become more open to longer-term study abroad, international travel, and/or international issues and global awareness. A viable research study would be to follow those first-time, short-term study abroad participants after they have returned from their education abroad programs, to determine the extent to which their experiences cause them to actively pursue subsequent international travel and study abroad experiences, especially in comparison to those students who are unable to participate in short-term study abroad programs during college.

The current perception in the study abroad field is that short-term study abroad is more conducive to the needs of non-traditional students and those students for whom cost

is a major deterrent (Hovde, 2002b). This sentiment must be further explored, however, because the results of this study actually found short-term and long-term study abroad participants to be of similar socioeconomic backgrounds; a sizeable proportion of both short-term and long-term participants actually came from relatively high socioeconomic backgrounds. In spite of this, respondents overwhelmingly identified cost as a major impediment to studying abroad. For this reason, more attention needs to be focused on the issue of whether short-term study abroad opportunities are meeting the needs of those less privileged, in order to substantiate this sentiment as fact or repudiate it as myth.

Finally, it would be interesting to further investigate the proposition of Tuma (2002b), who wrote, “Increasing the international experience of your students and your faculty leads to an enhanced internationalization of your campus and your curriculum” (p. 66). It would be a viable research study to examine the extent to which a campus becomes increasingly internationalized based on the number and proportion of students who study abroad for varying amounts of time.

Summary

This chapter has discussed the findings of this study, as well as its limitations and generalizability. Suggestions for future research were provided, in addition to implications for practice. The research study, which was designed to compare perceived differences in growth in learning outcomes among participants of study abroad programs of varying lengths, attempted to add insight and quantifiable information to this topic. The findings of the study should be used to inform practice and to prompt professionals to pay closer attention to the trends in the field and their potential repercussions.

Appendix A

(p. 118-128)

National Study of Living-Learning Programs

2003–04 Residence Environment Survey

NSLLP-RES

Please note:

Because this survey will be fielded on the world wide web, the questions on this paper-and-pencil version of the questionnaire will be altered in format to conform to the lay-out parameters of a web survey. However, the content and order of the questions will not change from this version. Indeed, the first official page of the survey will be the consent form you see on the following page.

Please feel free to use this version of the instrument for your Human Subjects/IRB applications, but be sure to note that the actual survey will be collected on the web.

National Study of Living-Learning Programs

Informed Consent Form

The primary purpose of this study is to understand college students' perceptions of their residence environments and the impact of residence environments on students' academic and social development. This research will not help you personally. The researchers on this project believe that there are no short- or long-term effects associated with participation in this study.

Your participation in this study is voluntary, and you may skip any questions on the attached survey that you feel uncomfortable answering.

Please be assured that, to the extent permitted by law, personal information obtained for this project will remain confidential, and will not be shared with anyone not associated with this project. However, confidentiality is not absolute or perfect. There are some circumstances where the research staff might be required by law to share information that has been provided. For example, if the researchers have reason to believe that criminal or serious harm may have been done to an individual or individuals, the researchers are required by law to file a report with appropriate agencies.

For the purpose of understanding your collegiate experiences as a whole, some of your demographic records will be obtained from your registrar and merged with your responses to this survey. Any publications of the study will be based on grouped data and will not reveal your identity or your individual records.

We know how busy, and sometimes stressful, college life can be. In fact, some of the questions on the survey may trigger some personal and social emotions that you may like to discuss with someone who can assist you. In these circumstances, please call the Counseling Center at 301-314-7651, where you can schedule an appointment to visit with a counselor. For concerns about alcohol use or the effects of alcohol use on others, please call either the Counseling Center (301-314-7651) or the University Health Center Substance Abuse Program at 301-314-8128, or consult the following website: <http://www.inform.umd.edu/UHC/Library/subsabuse.html>.

If you have any questions about this study, please feel free to contact:

Karen Kurotsuchi Inkelas, PhD
3214 Benjamin Building
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742

Phone: 301-405-0682
Email: info@livelearnstudy.net

I state that I am 18 years of age or older and wish to participate in this study:

Yes No

2003-04 Residence Environment Study

YOUR PERCEPTIONS BEFORE ENROLLING IN COLLEGE

1. Thinking back to *before you started college*, what activities did you *think* were going to be very important to you during college? (Circle one response for each.)

1 = Not at all important 3 = Important
2 = Somewhat important 4 = Very important

Participating in extra-curricular activities.....	1	2	3	4
Participating in volunteer or community service activities.....	1	2	3	4
Getting to know people from backgrounds different than your own.....	1	2	3	4
Learning about cultures different from your own.....	1	2	3	4
Discussing ideas and intellectual topics with other students.....	1	2	3	4
Getting to know your professors outside of class.....	1	2	3	4
Learning more about yourself.....	1	2	3	4
Finding your residence hall to be academically supportive.....	1	2	3	4
Finding your residence hall to be socially supportive.....	1	2	3	4
Drinking alcohol during social occasions.....	1	2	3	4

2. Looking back to *before you started college*, how confident were you that you would be successful at the following? (Circle one response for each.)

1 = Not at all confident 3 = Confident
2 = Somewhat confident 4 = Very confident

Handling the challenge of college-level work....	1	2	3	4
Feeling as though you belong on campus.....	1	2	3	4
Analyzing new ideas and concepts.....	1	2	3	4
Applying something learned in class to the "real world".....	1	2	3	4
Enjoying the challenge of learning new material.....	1	2	3	4
Appreciating new and different ideas, beliefs....	1	2	3	4
Developing your own values and beliefs.....	1	2	3	4
Gaining skills in working with others.....	1	2	3	4
Growing and developing academically.....	1	2	3	4
Making a difference in the community in which you live.....	1	2	3	4
Being satisfied with your college experience....	1	2	3	4

YOUR EXPERIENCES IN COLLEGE

3. Using a continuum of 1 = Very Difficult to 6 = Very Easy, please indicate how you felt the following activities to be during your first year in college: (Circle one response for each.)

	Very Difficult	1	2	3	4	5	6	Very Easy
Amount or difficulty of coursework.....	1	2	3	4	5	6		
Using computers for coursework.....	1	2	3	4	5	6		
Seeking academic or personal help when you needed it.....	1	2	3	4	5	6		
Becoming familiar with the campus.....	1	2	3	4	5	6		
Learning to use e-mail.....	1	2	3	4	5	6		
Making new friends.....	1	2	3	4	5	6		
Managing your time effectively.....	1	2	3	4	5	6		
Managing money effectively.....	1	2	3	4	5	6		
Communicating with instructors outside of class.....	1	2	3	4	5	6		
Being separated from your family....	1	2	3	4	5	6		
Forming study groups.....	1	2	3	4	5	6		
Getting along with your roommate(s).....	1	2	3	4	5	6		
Getting to know other people in your residence hall.....	1	2	3	4	5	6		

4. During the past year, how much time did you spend during a typical week doing the following activities? (Circle one response for each.)

	None	1 to 5 hrs	6 to 10 hrs	11 to 15 hrs	16 to 20 hrs	21+ hrs
Attending classes.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
Studying/doing homework.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
Socializing with friends.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
Exercising/sports.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
Partying.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
Working (for pay).....	1	2	3	4	5	6
Volunteer work.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
Student clubs/groups.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
Watching TV alone.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
E-mail or instant messaging.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
Playing video/computer games.....	1	2	3	4	5	6

2003-04 Residence Environment Study

5. During the past year, how involved are/were you in any of the following activities? (Circle one response for each.)

1 = Not at all involved 3 = Involved
2 = Somewhat involved 4 = Very involved

- Fraternity/sorority1 2 3 4
- Service fraternity/sorority.....1 2 3 4
- Marching band.....1 2 3 4
- Arts/music performances & activities1 2 3 4
- Intramural or club sports.....1 2 3 4
- Varsity sports1 2 3 4
- Student government1 2 3 4
- Political or social activism1 2 3 4
- Religious clubs and activities.....1 2 3 4
- Ethnic/cross-cultural activities, clubs.....1 2 3 4
- Media activities (e.g., newspaper, radio).....1 2 3 4
- Work-study or work on-campus1 2 3 4
- Work off-campus1 2 3 4
- Armed Services ROTC.....1 2 3 4
- One-time community service activity.....1 2 3 4
- Ongoing community service activity.....1 2 3 4
- Other (specify: _____).....1 2 3 4

6. Who did you primarily socialize with during the current school year? (Circle all that apply.)

- 1. People you work with
- 2. People in social clubs/activities
- 3. People you attend class with
- 4. People in your major or intended major
- 5. People in a living-learning (L/L) program
- 6. People in your residence hall (not in L/L program)
- 7. Friends from home
- 8. Other: _____

7. During interactions with other students outside of class, how often have you done each of the following during the current school year? (Circle one response for each.)

1 = Never 3 = A few times a month
2 = A few times a semester 4 = Once or more a week

- Discussed something learned in class1 2 3 4
- Talked about current news events.....1 2 3 4

Talked about different lifestyles/customs1 2 3 4

Shared your concerns about classes and assignments.....1 2 3 4

Held discussions with students whose personal values were very different from your own1 2 3 4

Discussed major social issues such as peace, human rights, and justice.....1 2 3 4

Talked about your future plans and career ambitions1 2 3 4

Held discussions with students whose religious beliefs were very different from your own1 2 3 4

Discussed your views about multiculturalism and diversity.....1 2 3 4

Studied in groups1 2 3 4

Held discussions with students whose political opinions were very different from your own1 2 3 4

8. About how often have you done each of the following during the current school year? (Circle one response for each.)

1 = Never 3 = A few times a month
2 = A few times a semester 4 = Once or more a week

Asked your instructor for information related to a course you were taking1 2 3 4

Visited informally with an instructor before or after class1 2 3 4

Made an appointment to meet with an instructor in his/her office1 2 3 4

Communicated with your instructor using e-mail.....1 2 3 4

Visited informally with an instructor during a social occasion (e.g., over coffee or lunch)...1 2 3 4

Discussed your career plans and ambitions with an instructor.....1 2 3 4

Discussed personal problems or concerns with an instructor.....1 2 3 4

Went to a cultural event (e.g., concert or play) with an instructor or class1 2 3 4

Worked with an instructor on an independent project.....1 2 3 4

Worked with an instructor involving his/her research.....1 2 3 4

2003-04 Residence Environment Study

9. Please indicate the level to which you agree with the following statements: (Circle one response for each.)

1 = Strongly disagree 3 = Agree
2 = Disagree 4 = Strongly agree

- I frequently question or challenge professors' statements and ideas before I accept them as "right"1 2 3 4
- I prefer courses in which the material helps me understand something about myself1 2 3 4
- I prefer courses requiring me to organize and interpret ideas over courses that ask me only to remember facts or information1 2 3 4
- There have been times when I have disagreed with the author of a book or article that I was reading1 2 3 4
- I consider the best teachers to be those who can tie things learned in class to things that are important to me in my personal life1 2 3 4
- I enjoy discussing issues with people who don't agree with me1 2 3 4
- I try to explore the meaning and interpretations of the facts when I am introduced to a new idea1 2 3 4
- A good way to develop my own opinions is to critically analyze the strengths and limitations of different points of view1 2 3 4
- I have become excited about a specific field or academic major as a result of taking a course in that field1 2 3 4
- When I discover new ways of understanding things, I feel even more motivated to learn1 2 3 4
- When I don't understand something in a course, I work at it until I do1 2 3 4
- Something I learned in one class helped me understand something from another class1 2 3 4
- I try to look at everybody's side of a disagreement before I make a decision1 2 3 4
- I enjoy the challenge of learning complicated new material1 2 3 4
- I prefer reading things that are relevant to my personal experiences1 2 3 4
- I often have discussions with other students about ideas or concepts presented in classes1 2 3 4
- Learning is important to me because it will give me greater control over my life1 2 3 4
- For me, one of the most important benefits of a college education is a better understanding of myself and my values1 2 3 4
- I enjoy courses that are intellectually challenging1 2 3 4
- I have applied material learned in a class to other areas in my life, such as in my job, internship, interactions with others1 2 3 4

10. In thinking about how you have changed during college, to what extent do you feel you have grown in the following areas? (Circle one response for each.)

1 = Not grown at all 3 = Grown
2 = Grown somewhat 4 = Very much grown

- Becoming more aware of different philosophies, lifestyles, and cultures1 2 3 4
- Developing your own values and ethical standards1 2 3 4
- Understanding yourself and your abilities, interests, and personality1 2 3 4
- Improving your ability to get along with people different than yourself1 2 3 4
- Ability to put ideas together and to see relationships between ideas1 2 3 4
- Ability to learn on your own, pursue ideas, and find information you need1 2 3 4
- Appreciation of racial/ethnic differences1 2 3 4
- Ability to critically analyze ideas and information1 2 3 4
- Learning more about things that are new to you1 2 3 4
- Appreciation of art, music, and drama1 2 3 4
- Gaining a broad general education about different fields of knowledge1 2 3 4
- Openness to views that you oppose1 2 3 4
- Ability to discuss controversial issues1 2 3 4
- Motivation to further explore ideas presented in class1 2 3 4

11. Now that you have been in college for a while, how confident do you feel in the following areas? (Circle one response for each.)

1 = Not at all confident 3 = Confident
2 = Somewhat confident 4 = Very confident

- Writing ability1 2 3 4
- Math ability1 2 3 4
- Working independently1 2 3 4
- Research ability1 2 3 4
- Computer ability1 2 3 4
- Problem-solving ability1 2 3 4
- Library skills1 2 3 4
- Expressing ideas orally1 2 3 4
- Working as part of a team1 2 3 4
- Time management skills1 2 3 4
- Leadership ability1 2 3 4

2003-04 Residence Environment Study

16. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements: (Circle one response for each.)

- 1 = Strongly disagree 3 = Agree
 2 = Disagree 4 = Strongly agree
 9 = Don't know/Never thought about this

- Since coming to college, I have learned a great deal about other racial/ethnic groups 1 2 3 4 9
- I have gained a greater commitment to my racial/ethnic identity since coming to college..... 1 2 3 4 9
- My campus's commitment to diversity fosters more division among racial/ethnic groups than inter-group understanding 1 2 3 4 9
- Since coming to college, I have become aware of the complexities of inter-group understanding..... 1 2 3 4 9
- My relationships with students from different racial/ethnic backgrounds during college have been positive..... 1 2 3 4 9
- I think this campus's focus on diversity puts too much emphasis on the differences between racial/ethnic groups 1 2 3 4 9
- My social interactions on this campus are largely confined to students of my race/ethnicity 1 2 3 4 9
- At times, it is important to be with people of my own racial/ethnic group for the chance to be myself..... 1 2 3 4 9

CITIZEN PERCEPTIONS

17. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following items: (Circle one response for each.)

- 1 = Strongly disagree 4 = Agree
 2 = Disagree 5 = Strongly agree
 3 = Neutral

For the items that refer to a "community," please refer to the community to which you feel the most affiliated, whatever that may be.

- I understand the extent to which the groups I participate in contribute to the larger community..... 1 2 3 4 5
- It is important to me that I play an active role in my communities..... 1 2 3 4 5
- I volunteer my time to the community 1 2 3 4 5
- I believe my work has a greater purpose for the larger community..... 1 2 3 4 5
- There is little I can do that makes a difference for others..... 1 2 3 4 5
- I believe I have responsibilities to my community..... 1 2 3 4 5

- I give time to making a difference for someone else..... 1 2 3 4 5
- Ordinary people can make a difference in their community..... 1 2 3 4 5
- I work with others to make my communities better places..... 1 2 3 4 5
- I have the power to make a difference in my community..... 1 2 3 4 5
- I am willing to act for the rights of others 1 2 3 4 5
- I participate in activities that contribute to the common good 1 2 3 4 5
- I believe I have a civic responsibility to the greater public 1 2 3 4 5
- I value opportunities that allow me to contribute to my community 1 2 3 4 5

EXPERIENCE WITH ALCOHOL

18. How did your drinking habits change from high school to college? (Circle one response.)

1. I don't drink alcohol and I never have (*skip to question 22*)
2. I started drinking in college
3. I am drinking less in college
4. I am drinking more in college
5. I stopped drinking in college
6. No change

19. Think back over last semester. During a typical two week period, how many times did you have 5 or more drinks(men) or 4 or more drinks (women) in a row? (Circle one response.)

- | | |
|----------|---------------------|
| 0. None | 3. 3-5 times |
| 1. Once | 4. 6-9 times |
| 2. Twice | 5. 10 or more times |

20. What factors influence how much you drink on a given occasion? (Circle all that apply.)

1. As a reward for working hard
2. To fit in
3. To feel more comfortable in social situations
4. If everyone else is drinking
5. If it is free or cheap
6. If it is a special occasion
7. If I'm having a bad day or got a bad grade
8. To lower my inhibitions about having sex
9. To get away from my problems and troubles
10. To get drunk
11. None of the above

2003-04 Residence Environment Study

21. Since the beginning of the school year, how many times have any of the following happened to you as a result of your own alcohol use? (Circle one response for each.)

- 1 = Not at all 2 = Once 3 = Twice or more
- I have missed or performed poorly in class..... 1 2 3
 - I have been confronted by a residence hall staff member..... 1 2 3
 - I have had a hangover..... 1 2 3
 - I have become sick or vomited 1 2 3
 - I have passed out..... 1 2 3
 - I have had memory loss or blackouts..... 1 2 3
 - I have physically harmed myself or another person..... 1 2 3
 - I have caused a disturbance (i.e., been noisy)..... 1 2 3
 - I have damaged property..... 1 2 3
 - I have had unprotected sex 1 2 3
 - I have received a citation or been arrested 1 2 3
 - I have regretted getting sexually involved with someone 1 2 3
 - I have coerced another person into being sexual with me..... 1 2 3
 - I have been ashamed by my behavior 1 2 3
 - I have had a conflict with my roommate or another person 1 2 3
 - I have fallen behind in my studies..... 1 2 3
 - I have regretted losing control of my senses..... 1 2 3

22. Since the beginning of the school year, how often have you experienced any of the following because of others' drinking? (Circle one response for each.)

- 1 = Not at all 2 = Once 3 = Twice or more
- I have been harassed, insulted, or humiliated..... 1 2 3
 - I have had a serious argument or quarrel 1 2 3
 - I have been pushed, hit, or assaulted 1 2 3
 - I have had my property damaged 1 2 3
 - I have had to "baby sit" or take care of another student 1 2 3
 - I have had my studying or sleep interrupted 1 2 3
 - I have experienced an unwanted sexual advance.. 1 2 3
 - I have been the victim of sexual assault or date rape..... 1 2 3
 - I have been inconvenienced from vomit in the hallway or bathroom 1 2 3
 - I have been affected by the behavior of guests who are drinking..... 1 2 3

FUTURE ACTIVITIES

23. Which of the following activities do you plan to participate in while in college that you have not participated in yet? (Circle all that apply.)

1. Practicum, internship, field experience, co-op experience, or clinical assignment
2. Community service, volunteer work, or service learning
3. Research with a professor
4. Taking a leadership position
5. Study abroad
6. Independent research
7. Self-designed major
8. Culminating senior experience (e.g., capstone course, thesis project, comprehensive exam, etc.)
9. None of the above

OVERALL SATISFACTION WITH COLLEGE

24. Indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements: (Circle one response for each.)

- 1 = Strongly disagree 3 = Agree
 2 = Disagree 4 = Strongly agree
 9 = Don't know/Never thought about this
- I feel comfortable on campus 1 2 3 4 9
 - My college/university is supportive of me..... 1 2 3 4 9
 - If I had to do it over again, I would choose the same college or university..... 1 2 3 4 9
 - I feel that I am a member of the campus community..... 1 2 3 4 9
 - I feel a sense of belonging to the campus community..... 1 2 3 4 9

25. How satisfied have you been with each of the following aspects of your academic experience at your college or university? (Circle one response for each.)

- 1 = Very dissatisfied 3 = Satisfied
 2 = Dissatisfied 4 = Very satisfied
- The intellectual quality and challenge of the classes I have taken..... 1 2 3 4
 - The size of my classes 1 2 3 4
 - The relevance of the course material to issues that are important to me 1 2 3 4
 - The opportunity to get into classes that I really want to take 1 2 3 4

2003-04 Residence Environment Study

- The amount of effort I am putting into my courses1 2 3 4
- The amount of interaction between instructors and students1 2 3 4
- The quality of relationships with my instructors.....1 2 3 4
- The quality of relationships with college/university staff members.....1 2 3 4
- Your overall satisfaction with this college/university.....1 2 3 4

26. Do you plan to return to the same college or university next fall? (Circle one response.)

1. Yes
2. No, I am graduating this year
3. No, I am enrolling at a different college or university
4. No, I will not be pursuing any form of education next fall
5. Undecided

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

27. What is your gender? (Circle one response.)

1. Male
2. Female
3. Transgender

28. Please indicate your sexual orientation: (Circle one response.)

1. Bisexual
2. Gay or Lesbian
3. Heterosexual

29. Please circle the one response that you think best applies to your race/ethnicity: (Circle one response.)

1. African American/Black (not of Hispanic origin)
2. Asian or Pacific Islander (includes the Indian sub-continent)
3. American Indian or Alaskan Native
4. Hispanic/Latino (of Spanish culture or origin)
5. White/Caucasian (not of Hispanic origin, having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, North Africa, or the Middle East)
6. Multi-racial or multi-ethnic
7. Race/ethnicity not included above

30. Please indicate your citizenship and/or generation status: (Circle one response.)

1. Your grandparents, parents, and you were born in the U.S.
2. Either or both your parents and yourself were born in the U.S.
3. You were born in the U.S., but at least one of your parents was not
4. You are a foreign born, naturalized citizen
5. You are a foreign born, resident alien/permanent resident
6. You are on a student visa

31. What is your current religious affiliation? (Circle one response.)

- | | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| 0. None | 3. Hindu |
| 1. Buddhist | 4. Jewish |
| 2. Christian (e.g., Catholic, Protestant, etc.) | 5. Muslim |
| | 6. Other: _____ |

32. What is the highest level of education completed by one or both of your parent(s) or guardian(s)? (Circle one in each column, if applicable.)

	<u>Father/ M Guardian</u>	<u>Mother/ F Guardian</u>
Don't know.....	0	0
High school or less.....	1	1
Some college.....	2	2
Associates degree.....	3	3
Bachelors degree.....	4	4
Masters degree.....	5	5
Doctorate or professional degree (JD, MD, PhD).....	6	6

33. What is your best estimate of your parents' total income last year? Consider income from all sources before taxes. (Circle one response.)

- | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. Less than \$6,000 | 8. \$40,000 to \$49,999 |
| 2. \$6,000 to \$9,999 | 9. \$50,000 to \$59,999 |
| 3. \$10,000 to \$14,999 | 10. \$60,000 to \$74,999 |
| 4. \$15,000 to \$19,999 | 11. \$75,000 to \$99,999 |
| 5. \$20,000 to \$24,999 | 12. \$100,000 to \$149,999 |
| 6. \$25,000 to \$29,999 | 13. \$150,000 to \$199,999 |
| 7. \$30,000 to \$39,999 | 14. \$200,000 or more |

2003-04 Residence Environment Study

HIGH SCHOOL INFORMATION

34. What were your average grades in high school? (Circle one response.)

- | | |
|-------------|-----------------------|
| 1. A+ or A | 5. C or C- |
| 2. A- or B+ | 6. D+ or lower |
| 3. B | 7. No high school GPA |
| 4. B- or C+ | |

35. Please write your combined SAT and/or ACT score on the blanks provided: (e.g., 1200)

SAT Composite

ACT Composite

COLLEGE INFORMATION

36. What is your current class level? (Circle one response.)

- | | |
|---------------|---------------------|
| 1. First year | 4. Senior |
| 2. Sophomore | 5. Graduate student |
| 3. Junior | 6. Other |

37. What is your best estimate of your grades so far in college? (Circle one response.)

- | | |
|--------------|-------------------|
| 1. 3.50-4.00 | 4. 2.00-2.49 |
| 2. 3.00-3.49 | 5. 1.99 or less |
| 3. 2.50-2.99 | 6. No college GPA |

38. Did you receive financial aid in 2003-2004 in the form of: (Circle all that apply.)

0. Not receiving financial aid
1. Loans
2. Need-based scholarships or grants
3. Non-need-based scholarships or grants
4. Work-study
5. Athletic scholarship
6. Other: _____

These 2 questions will be customized for each institution.

39. Please specify which living-learning program(s) you have ever participated in while in college: (Circle all that apply.)

1. Beyond the Classroom
2. CIVICUS Program
3. College Park Scholars Program
4. Gemstone Program
5. Global Communities
6. Hinman CEOs Program
7. Honors Humanities Program
8. Jimenez-Porter Writing House
9. Language House
10. University Honors Program

40. Which living-learning program are you currently participating in? (Circle one response only.)

1. Beyond the Classroom
2. CIVICUS Program
3. College Park Scholars Program
4. Gemstone Program
5. Global Communities
6. Hinman CEOs Program
7. Honors Humanities Program
8. Jimenez-Porter Writing House
9. Language House
10. University Honors Program

41. Is there anything else you would like to share about your residence experiences?

Appendix B

(p. 129-139)

Study Abroad Survey

1. Informed Consent

The primary purpose of this study is to understand college students' study abroad experiences and the impact of study abroad programs on learning outcomes. This research is not designed to help you personally. The researcher involved with this project does not believe that there are any risks associated with participation in this study. Your participation in this study is voluntary, and you may skip any questions on the survey that you do not wish to answer.

Please be assured that, to the extent permitted by law, personal information obtained for this project will remain confidential, and will not be shared with anyone not associated with this project. Any publications of the study will be based on grouped data and will not reveal your identity.

If you have any questions about this study, please feel free to contact:

Jill Neppel
3100 Hornbake Library, South Wing
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742
301-314-7928
jneppel@umd.edu

or

Dr. Karen Inkelas
3214 Benjamin Building
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742
301-405-7998
ki21@uemail.umd.edu

If you have questions about your rights as a research subject, please contact:

Institutional Review Board Office
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742
irb@deans.umd.edu
301-405-4212

*** 1. I state that I am 18 years of age or older and wish to participate in this study.**

Yes



No



Study Abroad Survey

2. Your Study Abroad Experience

Please help us to learn more about your study abroad experience.

If you have participated in more than one study abroad program, please base your answers on your most recent study abroad experience. (You will have the opportunity to provide information on your other study abroad experiences at the end of the survey.) Thank you for your cooperation!

2. Please indicate what organization or institution coordinated your study abroad program.

University of Maryland

Other (please specify)

*** 3. Please specify what type of study abroad program you participated in.**

Academic Year

Semester

Winter Term

Summer (4 weeks or more)

Summer (Less than 4 weeks)

Other (please specify)

4. Please indicate whether your program was stationed in one set location or whether it involved traveling to multiple locations.

Stationed in one set location

Traveled to multiple locations

5. Please indicate the location(s) of your study abroad program. (Check all that apply.)

Africa

Antarctica

Asia

Australia or New Zealand

Europe

North America

South America

6. Please indicate whether your study abroad program was stationed in one or more countries where English was not the native language.

Study Abroad Survey

Yes

No

7. Please indicate whether English was the language of instruction for the majority of your classes.

Yes

No

8. Please indicate which statement best describes your experience of taking classes while abroad.

- The majority of my classmates were natives of the host country
- The majority of my classmates were other international students (not host nationals)
- The majority of my classmates were other students from the United States
- I took classes with a combination of host nationals, international students and other U.S. American students

9. Please indicate which statement best describes your experience of taking classes while abroad.

- The majority of my instructors were natives of the host country
- The majority of my instructors were foreign (but not native to the host country)
- The majority of my instructors were from the United States
- I took classes from a combination of host national instructors, international instructors and U.S. American instructors

10. Please indicate where you lived during your study abroad program. (Check all that apply.)

- Home stay with a host family
- University housing
- Private dormitory
- Private apartment
- Hotel(s)
- Other (please specify) _____

11. Please provide more information about your roommates and living situation.

- I lived alone.
- I lived with a host family, and did not have other U.S. American roommates.
- I lived with a host family, and did have other U.S. American roommates.
- I lived with one or more U.S. American students, but not with a host family.
- I lived with one or more host national students, but not with a host family.
- I lived with one or more international students, but not with a host family.
- I lived with a combination of host national, international and/or U.S. American students, but not with a host family.

[<< Previous](#) [Next >>](#)

Study Abroad Survey

3. Your Study Abroad Experience

12. To what extent do you think that your study abroad experience contributed to your growth in the following areas?

	Not grown at all	Grown somewhat	Grown	Grown very much
Becoming more aware of different philosophies, lifestyles, and cultures	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Developing your own values and ethical standards	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Understanding yourself and your abilities, interests, and personality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Improving your ability to get along with people different than yourself	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ability to put ideas together and to see relationships between ideas	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ability to learn on your own, pursue ideas, and find information you need	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Appreciation of racial/ethnic differences	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ability to critically analyze ideas and information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Learning more about things that are new to you	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Appreciation of art, music, and drama	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Gaining a broad general education about different fields of knowledge	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Openness to views that you oppose	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ability to discuss controversial issues	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Motivation to further explore ideas presented in class	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

13. As a result of your study abroad experience, how confident do you feel in the following areas?

	Not at all confident	Somewhat confident	Confident	Very confident
Expressing ideas orally	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Working as part of a team	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Leadership ability	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

[<< Previous](#)

[Next >>](#)

Study Abroad Survey

4. Background Information

14. What is your gender?

Male

Female

15. Please indicate the one response that you think best applies to your race/ethnicity.

African American/Black (not of Hispanic origin)

Asian or Pacific Islander (includes the Indian sub-continent)

American Indian or Alaskan Native

Hispanic/Latino (Spanish culture or origin)

White/Caucasian (Persons not of Hispanic origin, having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, North Africa, or the Middle East)

Multi-racial or multi-ethnic

Race/ethnicity not included above

Other (please specify)

16. What is your best estimate of your parents' total income last year? Consider income from all sources before taxes.

Less than \$6,000

\$6,000 to \$9,999

\$10,000 to \$14,999

\$15,000 to \$19,999

\$20,000 to \$24,999

\$30,000 to \$39,999

\$40,000 to \$49,999

\$50,000 to \$59,999

\$60,000 to \$74,999

\$75,000 to \$99,999

\$100,000 to \$149,999

\$150,000 to \$199,999

\$200,000 or more

17. Before coming to college, how many times did you change residence with your family?

Never

Once

Twice

Three times

Study Abroad Survey

- Four times
- Five times
- Six times or more

18. Before your study abroad experience, how many times had you traveled outside of the United States?

- None, this was my first time going abroad
- Once
- Twice
- Three times
- Four times
- Five times
- Six times or more

19. Before this study abroad experience, what was the longest amount of time (in weeks) you had spent in another country during a single visit?

- Less than one week
- 2 weeks
- 3 weeks
- 4 weeks
- 5 weeks
- 6 weeks
- 7 weeks
- 8 weeks
- 9 weeks
- 10 weeks
- 11 weeks
- 12 weeks
- 13 weeks
- 14 weeks
- 15 weeks
- 16 weeks
- 17 weeks
- 18 weeks
- 19 weeks
- 20 weeks
- 21 weeks
- 22 weeks
- 23 weeks
- 24 weeks or more

Study Abroad Survey

5. College Information

20. What is the name of the college that houses your academic major?

- Letters and Sciences
- Agriculture and Natural Resources
- Architecture, Planning and Preservation
- Arts and Humanities
- Behavioral and Social Sciences
- Robert H. Smith School of Business
- Computer, Mathematical and Physical Sciences
- Education
- James Clark School of Engineering
- Health and Human Performance
- Information Studies
- Phillip Merrill College of Journalism
- Life Sciences
- Public Policy
- Individualized Major
- Other

21. What is your current class standing?

- Already graduated
- First year
- Sophomore
- Junior
- Senior
- Graduate student
- Other

[<< Previous](#) [Next >>](#)

Study Abroad Survey

6. Final Questions

22. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
I wish my study abroad program would have been for a shorter amount of time	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I wish my study abroad program would have been for a longer amount of time	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am happy that I chose to study abroad in the country where I studied	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I wish I would have studied abroad in a different country than the one where I did study	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I believe that studying abroad was a waste of my time	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I believe that studying abroad was a great experience	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I believe that more students should study abroad	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In the future I will encourage more students to study abroad	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I would like to participate in another study abroad program in the future	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I would like to do more international traveling in the future	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

23. Please indicate the study abroad program(s) in which you anticipate participating in the future. (Check all that apply.)

- Academic Year Program
- Semester Program
- Winter Program
- Summer Program (4 weeks or more)
- Summer Program (Less than 4 weeks)
- None, I have already graduated
- None, I will graduate soon
- None, I do not plan to study abroad again
- Other (please specify)

Study Abroad Survey

24. Please indicate which of the following factors you found to be personal barriers to studying abroad. (Check all that apply.)

- Money
- Leaving family
- Leaving friends
- My academic major
- Co-curricular or extracurricular commitments
- Fear of living in another country
- Fear of not being able to communicate
- Other (please specify)

25. Please use the space below to share any additional information about your study abroad experience(s). If you have participated in more than one program while at the University of Maryland, please use this space to list the multiple programs, including the length of the program(s) and the location(s).

[<< Previous](#) [Next >>](#)

Study Abroad Survey

7. Thank You

Thank you for taking the time to complete the Study Abroad Program Survey! If you wish to be entered into the drawing to win one of four \$50 Target gift cards, please provide your name, e-mail address and mailing address below. You will be contacted if you are selected as a winner.

26. Name

27. E-mail Address

28. Mailing Address

[<< Previous](#) [Next >>](#)

Appendix C

(p. 140-141)

NSLLP 2004 Composite Scales

	Variable Name	2003 Pilot test Factor Loading	2003 Pilot test Cronbach Alpha	2004 NSLLP Cronbach Alpha
INTELLECTUAL GROWTH				
COGGROW Growth in cognitive complexity				
	Ability to critically analyze ideas & information	Q10h	.694	
	Ability to learn on own, pursue ideas, find info needed	Q10f	.595	
	Learning more about things that are new to you	Q10i	.579	
	Ability to put ideas together, see relationships between ideas	Q10e	.534	
			.821	.817
LIBGROW Growth in liberal learning				
	Openness to views that you oppose	Q10l	.740	
	Ability to discuss controversial issues	Q10m	.596	
	Motivation to further explore ideas presented in class	Q10n	.516	
	Gaining a broad general education different fields of knowledge	Q10k	.515	
	Appreciation of art, music, & drama	Q10j	.440	
	Increased appreciation of racial/ethnic differences	Q10g	.440	
			.816	.803
PERSGROW Growth in personal philosophy				
	Developing own values & ethical standards	Q10b	.706	
	Understanding self & own abilities, interests, personality	Q10c	.649	
	Becoming more aware of different philosophies, lifestyles, cultures	Q10a	.567	
	Improving ability to get along with different kinds of people	Q10d	.556	
			.808	.799
SELF-CONFIDENCE				
INTCON Interpersonal self-confidence				
	Leadership ability	Q11k	.731	
	Expressing ideas orally	Q11h	.628	
	Working as part of a team	Q11i	.625	
			.737	.744

References

- Amel, E., & Uhrskov, A. (2002) Designing the academic course: Principles and practicalities. In S.E. Spencer & K. Tuma (Eds.), *The guide to successful short-term programs abroad* (pp. 73-106). Washington, D.C.: NAFSA: Association of International Educators.
- Arum, S., & Van de Water, J. (1992). The need for a definition of international education in U.S. universities. In C.B. Klasek, B.J. Garavalia, & K.J. Kellerman (Eds.), *Bridges to the future: Strategies for internationalizing higher education*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.
- Astin, A. (1989). Summary of effects. In Kuh, G.D., Bean, J.P., Hossler, D., and Stage, F.K. (Eds.), *College students* (pp. 297-319). Needham Heights, MA: Ginn Press.
- Astin, A. (1996). Studying college impact. In Stage, F.K., Anaya, G.L., Bean, J.P., Hossler, D., & Kuh, G.D. (Eds.), *College students: The evolving nature of research* (pp. 66-79). Needham Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster Custom Publishing.
- Astin, A. (1999). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *The Journal of College Student Development*, 40, 518-529.
- Astin, H.S., & Kent, L. (1983). Gender roles in transition: Research and policy implications for higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 54, 309-324.
- Bikson, T.K. & Law, S.A. (1994). *Global preparedness and human resources: College and corporate perspectives*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation, Institute on Education and Training.

- Blimling, G.S. (2001). Diversity makes you smarter. *Journal of College Student Development, 42*, 517-519.
- Carlson et al. (1990). *Study abroad: The experience of American undergraduates in Western Europe and the United States*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Carlson, J.S., & Widaman, K.F. (1988). The effects of study abroad during college on attitudes toward other cultures. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 12*, 1-17.
- Carsello, C., & Creaser, J. (1976). How college students change during study abroad. *College Student Journal, 10*, 276-278.
- Chickering, A.W. (1969). *Education and identity*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Chickering, A., & Reisser, L. (1996). Key influences on student development. In Stage, F.K., Anaya, G.L., Bean, J.P., Hossler, D., & Kuh, G.D. (Eds.), *College students: The evolving nature of research* (pp. 196-204). Needham Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster Custom Publishing.
- Coehlo, G.V. (1962). Personal growth and educational development through working and studying abroad. *Journal of Social Issues, 18*, 55-67.
- Dunbar, E. (2003, February, 20). Warnings jeopardize Middle East programs: Officials say a war could affect other study abroad programs. *Minnesota Daily*. Retrieved December 11, 2004, from <http://www.mndaily.com/articles/2003/02/20/4972>
- Dwyer, M.M., & Peters, C.K. (2004). The benefits of study abroad: New study confirms significant gains. *Transitions Abroad Magazine*. Retrieved May 6, 2004, from www.transitionsabroad.com/publications/magazine/0403/benefits_study_abroad.shtml

- El-Khawas, E. (2003). The many dimensions of student diversity. In S.R. Komives & D.B. Woodard, Jr. (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (4th ed., pp. 45-62). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Farrelly, M.J. (2003, March 26). Iraq war affects study abroad. *Iraq Crisis Bulletin*. Retrieved December 11, 2004 from http://www.iraqcrisisbulletin.com/archives/032603/html/iraq_war_effects_study_abroad.html
- Feldman, K.A. & Newcomb, T.M. (1989). Persistence and change after college. In Kuh, G.D., Bean, J.P., Hossler, D., and Stage, F.K. (Eds.), *College students* (pp. 359-371). Needham Heights, MA: Ginn Press.
- Florida Atlantic University. (2002, December). Common data set definitions. Retrieved on December 11, 2004 from <http://iea.fau.edu/cds/def.htm>
- Gmelch, G. (1997). Crossing cultures: Student travel and personal development. *The International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 21, 475-489.
- Hacker, A. (2003). How the B.A. gap widens the chasm between men and women. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved October 20, 2003 from <http://chronicle.com/weekly/v49/i41/41b01001.htm>
- Hansel, B. (1986). The AFS impact study: Final report. *AFS Research Reports*, 33, pp. 2-34.
- Harari, M. (1992). The internationalization of curriculum. In C.B. Klasek, B.J. Garavalia, & K.J. Kellerman (Eds.), *Bridges to the future: Strategies for internationalizing higher education*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.

- Hensley, T.R., & Sell, D.K. (1979). A study-abroad program: An examination of impacts on student attitudes. *Teaching Political Science*, 6, 387-411.
- hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge.
- Hovde, P. (2002a). Building institutional support. In S.E. Spencer & K. Tuma (Eds.), *The guide to successful short-term programs abroad* (pp. 11-23). Washington, D.C.: NAFSA: Association of International Educators.
- Hovde, P. (2002b). Opening doors: Alternative pedagogies for short-term programs abroad. In S.E. Spencer & K. Tuma (Eds.), *The guide to successful short-term programs abroad* (pp. 1-7). Washington, D.C.: NAFSA: Association of International Educators.
- Institute of International Education. (2004, November). Open doors report 2004: Report on international educational exchange. Retrieved on November 15, 2004 from <http://opendoors.iienetwork.org/>
- Jenkins, K. (2002). Off the beaten path: Studying abroad in 'nontraditional' locations. *Black Issues in Higher Education*, 19, 50-51.
- Juhasz, A.M., & Walker, A.M. (1987/1988). The impact of study abroad on university students' self-esteem and self-efficacy. *College Student Journal*, 22, 329-341.
- Kauffmann, N.L., Martin, J.N., & Weaver, H.D. (1992). *Students abroad: Strangers at home*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press, Inc.

- Kinsella, J., Smith-Simonet, M., & Tuma, K. (2002). Orientation and reentry. In S.E. Spencer & K. Tuma (Eds.), *The guide to successful short-term programs abroad* (pp. 203-237). Washington, D.C.: NAFSA: Association of International Educators.
- Koester, J. (1985). A profile of the U.S. student abroad. New York: Council on International Educational Exchange.
- Kuh, G.D. (1991). Characteristics of involving colleges. In G.D. Kuh & J.H. Schuh (Eds.), *The role and contribution of student affairs in involving colleges* (pp. 11-29). Washington, D.C.: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.
- Kuh, G.D. (1996). In their own words: What students learn outside the classroom. In Stage, F.K., Anaya, G.L., Bean, J.P., Hossler, D., & Kuh, G.D. (Eds.), *College students: The evolving nature of research* (pp. 101-122). Needham Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster Custom Publishing.
- Lee, R. (2002). Reflections on field experience. In S.E. Spencer & K. Tuma (Eds.), *The guide to successful short-term programs abroad* (pp. 281-286). Washington, D.C.: NAFSA: Association of International Educators.
- Light, R.J. (2001). *Making the most out of college*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Limburg-Weber, L. (1999/2000, Winter). Send them packing: Study abroad as an option for gifted students. *Journal of Secondary Gifted Education*, 11, 43-51.

- Marion, P.B. (1980). Relationships of student characteristics and experiences with attitude changes in a program of study abroad. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 21*, 58-64.
- Marklein, M.B. (2003, November 11). Students' interest in overseas study still rising. *USA Today*, p. D7.
- McGuigan, F.J. (1959). Further study of psychological changes related to intercultural experiences. *Psychological Reports, 5*, 244-248.
- McMillan, A.R., & Opem, G. (2004). Study abroad: A lifetime of benefits. *Abroad View Magazine*. Retrieved May 6, 2004, from www.abroadviewmagazine.com/spring_04/study.html
- Nash, D. (1976). The personal consequences of a year of study abroad. *The Journal of Higher Education, 47*, 191-203.
- National Association of Student Personnel Administrators & American College Personnel Association. (2004). *Learning reconsidered: A campus-wide focus on the student experience*. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- National Survey of Student Engagement. (2004). *Student engagement: Pathways to collegiate success*. Indiana University: Center for Postsecondary Research.
- Pallant, J. (2001). *SPSS Survival Manual*. Berkshire, UK: Open University Press.
- Pascarella, E.T., & Terenzini, P.T. (1996). How college makes a difference: A summary. In Stage, F.K., Anaya, G.L., Bean, J.P., Hossler, D., & Kuh, G.D. (Eds.), *College students: The evolving nature of research* (pp. 246-272). Needham Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster Custom Publishing.

- Pearson, C.S., Shavlik, D.L., & Touchton, J.G. (Eds.). (1989). *Educating the majority: Women challenge tradition in higher education*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Pinkus, F.L. (2000). Discrimination comes in many forms: Individual, institutional, and structural. In Adams et al., (Eds.), *Readings for diversity and social justice* (pp. 31-35). New York: Routledge.
- Pulley, J.L. (2002, October 25). Money talks, more so when it walks: A billionaire philanthropist withholds gifts to Cleveland charities until Case Western overhauls its board. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved December 4, 2003 from <http://chronicle.com/weekly/v49/i09/09a02901.htm>
- Pyle, K.R. (1981). International cross-cultural service/learning: Impact on student development. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 22, 509-514.
- Quade, P. (2002). "It changed my life": Strategies for assessing student learning. In S.E. Spencer & K. Tuma (Eds.), *The guide to successful short-term programs abroad* (pp. 149-170). Washington, D.C.: NAFSA: Association of International Educators.
- Raphael, A., & Lloyd, J.M. (2004, November 16). The use of self-report in assessment: What is the literature saying? *Net Results*. Retrieved December 18, 2004, from <http://www.naspa.org/netresults/index.cfm>
- Rubin, A.M. (1995, November 24). Educators call for research on study-abroad programs. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved April 16, 2004 from <http://chronicle.com/prm/che-data/articles.dir/art-42.dir/issue-13.dir/13a03401.htm>

- Salter, C.A., & Teger, A.I. (1975). Change in attitudes toward other nations as a function of the type of international contact. *Sociometry*, 38, 213-222.
- Sampson, D.L., & Smith, H.P. (1957). A scale to measure world-minded attitudes. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 45, 99-106.
- Sell, D.K. (1983). Research on attitude change in U.S. students who participate in foreign study experiences: Past findings and suggestions for future research. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 7, 131-147.
- Sowa, P.A. (2002, Spring). How valuable are student exchange programs? *New Directions for Higher Education*, 117, 63-70.
- Spencer, S.E., & Tuma, K. (2002). Introduction. In S.E. Spencer & K. Tuma (Eds.), *The guide to successful short-term programs abroad* (pp. xv-xvii). Washington, D.C.: NAFSA: Association of International Educators.
- Stage, F.K., & Anaya, G.L. (1996). A transformational view of college student research. In Stage, F.K., Anaya, G.L., Bean, J.P., Hossler, D., & Kuh, G.D. (Eds.), *College students: The evolving nature of research* (pp. xi-xxii). Needham Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster Custom Publishing.
- Tuma, K. (2002a). Marketing and promotion. In S.E. Spencer & K. Tuma (Eds.), *The guide to successful short-term programs abroad* (pp. 135-139). Washington, D.C.: NAFSA: Association of International Educators.
- Tuma, K. (2002b). Program models. In S.E. Spencer & K. Tuma (Eds.), *The guide to successful short-term programs abroad* (pp. 65-72). Washington, D.C.: NAFSA: Association of International Educators.

The New York Times (1998, December 6). USA: Women students outnumber men at colleges/universities. *Women's International Network News*, 25, 73.

Thelin, J.R. (2003). Historical overview of American higher education. In S.R. Komives & D.B. Woodard, Jr. (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (4th ed., pp. 3-22). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

United States Department of Education. (n.d.). Our role in international education.

Retrieved on December 12, 2004 from

<http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ous/international/edlite-edrole.html>

United States Department of State, Office of the Spokesman. (2004, September 10).

Public announcement: Worldwide caution. Retrieved on December 11, 2004 from

<http://travel.state.gov/travel/wwc1.html>

University of Maryland-College Park, Office of Institutional Research and Planning.

(2004, September). Who's on campus now? General profile. Retrieved on

October 30, 2004 from <http://oirp.umd.edu/WOCN/general.cfm>

University of Maryland-College Park, Study Abroad Office. (2004, November 17). Study

Abroad Programs. Retrieved on January 12, 2005 from

<http://www.inform.umd.edu/EdRes/Intl/studyabroad/idxprog.html>

Vogt, K.E., Longerbeam, S.D., Inkelas, K.K., & Owen Casper, J. (in review). *Evidence of*

the Reliability and Validity of Living-Learning Program Environment and

Outcome Measures. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Woodard, D.B., Jr., & Komives, S.R. (2003). Shaping the future. In S.R. Komives &

D.B. Woodard, Jr. (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (4th ed.,

pp. 637-655). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.