

12-2009

STUDY ABROAD PROGRAM EVALUATION: WHAT CAN BE LEARNED FROM STUDENT SATISFACTION SURVEYS?

Jenny Brown

Clemson University, hjenny@clemson.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://tigerprints.clemson.edu/all_theses

 Part of the [Sociology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Brown, Jenny, "STUDY ABROAD PROGRAM EVALUATION: WHAT CAN BE LEARNED FROM STUDENT SATISFACTION SURVEYS?" (2009). *All Theses*. 747.

https://tigerprints.clemson.edu/all_theses/747

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses at TigerPrints. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Theses by an authorized administrator of TigerPrints. For more information, please contact kokeefe@clemson.edu.

**STUDY ABROAD PROGRAM EVALUATION:
WHAT CAN BE LEARNED FROM STUDENT
SATISFACTION SURVEYS?**

A Thesis
Presented to
the Graduate School of
Clemson University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science
Applied Sociology

by
Jenny Hunt Brown
December 2009

Accepted by:
Dr. John M. Coggeshall, Committee Chair
Dr. Catherine Mobley
Dr. Melissa Vogel

ABSTRACT

The rapid growth in the number of students going abroad has prompted a recent endeavor among international educators to begin the cumbersome undertaking of evaluating the quality of study abroad programs being offered at U.S. colleges and universities. In response to this increased participation in study abroad programs, the Office of International Affairs at Clemson University initiated an internal program evaluation in the spring of 2007. In collaboration with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment, an evaluation team assessed the components of these programs from the viewpoint of the participants. This study explored the following question: When it comes to study abroad program evaluation, what can be learned from student satisfaction surveys? In particular, this analysis will look for observable differences in program quality as measured by the responses of participants according to the type of program in which s/he participated. More specifically this study attempted to answer the question: Do certain components of the student's study abroad experience vary according to the program in which s/he participates?

The results of this study suggest that different program types do indeed have different outcomes. The Office of International Affairs will use these results to improve the programs and services being offered to students. The implications of these results could be a significant starting point for the development of University international program planning, policy and quality assurance.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

For fear of unintentionally leaving someone out, I will forgo listing all of the individuals whose contributions have made this possible. Thank you dearly for all of your encouragement, patience, support and dedication to my success.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	v
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	2
Background: Benefits and History of Study Abroad.....	2
Methodology in Study Abroad Program Evaluation.....	9
Program Classification.....	18
III. METHODS	25
Sample.....	25
Measures.....	26
Design.....	32
Procedures.....	35
IV. RESULTS	37
Data Analysis	37
Results.....	37
V. CONCLUSIONS.....	59
APPENDICES	63
A: Study Abroad Program—Pre-Departure Evaluation Survey.....	64
B: Study Abroad Program Evaluation	70
C: ANOVA Tables	79
REFERENCES	98

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
3.1 Program descriptors	26
3.2 Internal consistency reliability of scales	32
4.1 ANOVA for Study Abroad Office Pre-departure	80
4.2 ANOVA for Financial Aid.....	81
4.3 ANOVA for Housing.....	82
4.4 ANOVA for Excursions/Field Trips.....	83
4.5 ANOVA for Extracurricular Activities.....	85
4.6 ANOVA for Academic Experience	86
4.7 ANOVA for Individual Development	88
4.8 ANOVA for Site Coordinator.....	90
4.9 ANOVA for Facilities and Services	91
4.10 ANOVA for Overall Study Abroad Experience	93
4.11 ANOVA for Reentry.....	96

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

According to the Institute of International Education's *Open Doors 2007*, between the years 1995/96 and 2005/06, the number of U.S. students studying abroad increased by 150%, with a growth of 16.2% between 2003/04-2005/06 and steadily increasing participation rates for the last twenty years (Institute of International Education, 2007).

At Clemson University, participation in study abroad programs nearly doubled the national growth rates, increasing by 32.1% between 2003/04 and 2005/06. This rapid increase in the number of students going abroad has created several challenges for the Office of International Affairs. One of these challenges, and perhaps of greatest importance, is the need to systematically evaluate the study abroad programs that are offered through Clemson University and its third party affiliates.

In an effort to begin monitoring the quality of study abroad programs being offered, an evaluation team was formed within the Office of International Affairs in the spring of 2007. This evaluation team (with assistance from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment) created two survey instruments from which they collected data. These survey instruments, one in-person pencil and paper survey and one web-based survey, were created with the intention of assessing study abroad participant experiences. Accordingly, the results of this research will be utilized by the Office of International Affairs to improve program services and offerings.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Background: Benefits and History of Study Abroad

Studying abroad provides an opportunity for academic as well as cultural and social learning. Students who study abroad are exposed to different ways of thinking and behaving and this experience of being with peers from another culture encourages self-awareness and promotes intercultural communication skills (Forum on Education Abroad Glossary Wiki, 2008). The cultural and social learning that takes place is accumulated into cultural and social capital. It is in this way that study abroad contributes to the accumulation of cultural capital. Though the mainstream literature on Pierre Bourdieu's cultural capital theory and its role in education focuses on educational outcomes (Lareau and Weininger, 2003), the goal of this study is to assess the role of study abroad in the accumulation of cultural capital.

Cultural capital can be obtained by means of the academic experience and "has value that can be exchanged for resources" (Provenzo, 2008, 209) that support educational success. Thus, education researchers are interested in how cultural capital is acquired during the academic experience; the challenge lies in how to measure cultural capital. Traditional measures of educational success such as standardized test scores, grade-point averages, and participation in study abroad programs are most often emphasized when it comes to the accumulation of cultural capital and academic achievement in higher education (Provenzo, 2008). Academic achievements, and in particular education abroad, are considered to be a distinctive type of cultural capital,

cultural capital that grants access to top positions in economic and social fields.

Consequently, not having this cultural capital becomes a barrier (Weininger and Lareau, 2007).

Highlighting the cultural capital accumulation that is associated with education abroad, Sidhu (2005) discusses Singapore's Global Schoolhouse project. Sidhu says that cultural capital ("exposure") is driven by three factors: (1) desire for the acquisition of "self-goods" such as individual development, autonomy, confidence, and independence, (2) desire to have the appearance of being "cosmopolitan" which often occurs as a result of living and studying in another culture and locale, and (3) desire for upward mobility in terms of professional achievement and financial gain. While Sidhu pinpoints and categorizes study abroad participants' self-desires for cultural capital, he points out that surprisingly the potential social capital that is associated with education abroad is "not a notably common or valued aspect of exposure" (Sidhu, 2005, 57).

McLaughlin and Johnson (2006) contend that the possibility of understanding theoretical concepts is frequently absent in a classroom setting. Bringing about student learning therefore involves investigating how students learn and revamping instructional settings (McLaughlin and Johnson, 2006). An advantage of studying abroad is that it gives the ability to elevate academic work from theoretical to applied, and affords the opportunity for cross-cultural exchanges that become one's own experiences. According to Camp (2005), undergraduate students should not pass up the opportunity to study abroad. He says that our world is a global world, in which we must exchange commerce as well as culture. English may not always continue to be the international language of

economics and politics. Furthermore, Camp believes that theoretical development in the social sciences will come out of “Third-World,” rather than “First-World” experiences. Individuals who are likely to succeed professionally are those who are multi-lingual, appreciate other cultures, and can assimilate in multicultural situations. Given these changes, studying abroad is fundamental to a liberal arts education, and is important for any college student. Camp (2005) even goes so far as to say that studying abroad “may be the most formative experience of an American college education.”

Byram and Feng (2006) contend that it is assumed that studying abroad will increase the cultural capital of the participant, as well as improving international relations and heightening the educational experience (Byram and Feng, 2006).

With this in mind, there are assumptions about the benefits of study abroad that many researchers feel need to be explored further. Mendelson (2004), for example, investigated the following assumptions that Wilkinson (1995) had previously raised: (1) Study abroad guarantees extraordinary linguistic improvement, (2) More communication in the host language is likely while abroad, (3) Living with a host family is more beneficial than other housing arrangements abroad, (4) Living abroad ensures meaningful cultural understanding (as cited in Mendelson, 2004, 44).

A common approach to dealing with some of the questions these assumptions raise is to analyze participant attitudes regarding the study abroad experience. In doing so, Mendelson (2004) discovered that program duration appears to be a factor in students’ capacity to evaluate their abilities accurately, citing differences in students’ pre-program expectations and real experiences. For example, students reported being unable to

communicate in the host language, anxiety, fear, lack of motivation, and “avoidance” of contact, hanging around only those who spoke English. When students evaluated their experiences, two themes arose: “linguistic improvements” and “personal/emotional changes” including increased autonomy, self-reliance, maturity, and open-mindedness. Students also noted significant lifestyle differences which they felt had an effect on their personal lives; students experienced great dissatisfaction with their inability to communicate in the program location because of the language barrier (Mendelson, 2004).

In fact, the abundance of study abroad programs has caused both researchers and faculty to question the assumption that study abroad ensures cultural and language learning. In particular, questions have been raised regarding short-term programs and the likelihood for participants to have lasting, significant experiences in the host culture that facilitate language skills improvements and increased cultural understanding. Consequently, study abroad faculty are incorporating in-class assignments with participants’ experiences outside of the classroom with the intention of making cross-cultural learning possible. Despite its use, however, this integrative curriculum has yet to be sufficiently documented, again with mostly anecdotal evidence. Assessment of short-term programs has been particularly problematic (Talbert & Stewart, 1999).

Talbert and Stewart (1999) conducted an ethnography of the experiences of students participating in a five-week summer program in Spain to look at the association between participants’ in-class and out-of-class learning experiences. First, they focused on participants’ reasons for studying abroad. Then they observed the ways in which students defined their experiences abroad. Finally, they examined the participants’

acquisition of culture, and how this affected and had an effect on their formal and informal learning. In particular they examined the relationship between the coursework and activities of a Spanish civilization and culture course and participants' day-to-day interactions to learn how in-class activities can support students' connection with and critical thinking about Spanish culture. Their findings exhibited disparities in students' experiences in the program and perceptions of Spain according to race and gender (Talbert and Stewart, 1999).

Assumptions about language learning have more recently begun to be challenged. Freed, Segalowitz and Dewey (2004) systematically compared regular classroom, study abroad and domestic immersion program participants and found that language acquisition was greatest in the immersion context, followed by that of the study abroad context. Their findings challenge the assumption that participants in a study abroad program automatically increase proficiency in a second language to a greater extent than those who study a second language in another setting. It is not implied that the study abroad setting is inferior to the immersion setting academically, nor that the study abroad setting is less valuable and advantageous than has been assumed. Instead, their conclusions give insight into what occurs in different educational settings and that it is not solely the setting that facilitates learning. Instead it is the integration of the attempts to use the second language with the types and quality of the interactions that make one setting more successful than another regarding language learning (Freed, Segalowitz, and Dewey, 2004).

Another primary assumption about study abroad, according to Dwyer (2004), has been that “more is better”; that is to say, more educational, cultural and personal growth is likely to occur for those who study abroad for longer periods of time. The traditional belief is that significant acquisition of both foreign language and other academic disciplines through culture-specific curriculums necessitates an academic year abroad. Dwyer’s findings support the idea that studying abroad for an academic year as opposed to a semester or less has a greater and more lasting effect on students.

Although it has been assumed that study abroad transforms students’ lives, clarification of what types of actual transformations take place and what their long-term effects are has been lacking up until now. Dwyer demonstrated that study abroad does have a significant effect on participants’ sustained language usage, academic achievement, individual growth, and professional preferences. Most notably, Dwyer confirmed that participants continued to demonstrate this effect even after as many as fifty years. For some factors, when compared to semester participants, summer participants were as likely or even more likely to sustain long-term gains from studying abroad. Given the assumption that a shorter term study abroad program would mean a subsequent decreased effect, these results were surprising. Nevertheless, according to Dwyer, well-designed programs that are at least six weeks in length can have significant effects on participants in a range of measured outcomes. Though extensive preparation, proper execution, and sufficient support are needed to accomplish these results in a shorter period of time, these findings should strengthen the merit of short-term programs of at least six weeks in length. Whether or not these outcomes would be true for the

increasingly prevalent short-term (less than six weeks) programs has yet to be determined. Nonetheless, students who studied abroad for an academic year received the most benefits for every outcome measure (Dwyer, 2004).

Yet researchers are providing evidence that the assumptions about the benefits of study abroad are true. Chieffo and Griffiths (2003) found significant differences in cultural understanding and other “functional knowledge” indicators between short-term study abroad participants and their peers that did not study abroad. One “broad-based benefit” (2003, 29) that Chieffo and Griffiths refer to is the often assumed acquisition of social and cultural capital that one receives as a result of studying abroad. Their study showed that the students who studied abroad had an increased interest in foreign language fluency, more patience with non-English speakers in the U.S., an increased appreciation for the arts, more confidence in their ability to explain some aspect of U.S. foreign policy to someone from a foreign country, greater frequency of activities such as reading an article, watching a TV show, or speaking to someone about how Americans are viewed by people from other countries. Study abroad participants also reported learning about a much broader array of topics, which often included the appreciation and/or acquisition of knowledge of another country and/or culture, and exhibited increased participation rates in “global awareness activities” (Chieffo and Griffiths, 2003, 30). Again, these data are based on self-perceptions and therefore cannot be considered entirely objective in terms of outcomes evaluation. Nonetheless, it is evidence of the often-touted benefits of studying abroad.

Furthermore, studying abroad is an avenue to understanding key cultural differences in international business. International education and experience foster cultural awareness that is a prerequisite to doing business abroad (Bonvillian and Nowlin, 1994). Moreover, a recent survey of Georgia Tech alumni found that those who had studied abroad reported feeling better prepared to find a job, were more satisfied with their career progress and had higher incomes (Redden, 2008). However, despite the evidence of success that learning about cultural differences can bring, many companies do not invest in providing this type of training to their employees (Plog & Sturman, 2005).

Indeed, the primary accrediting organization for business schools, AACSB International, indicates in its criteria that management education should prepare its students for the increasingly global market, the diversity in cultural values among employees and clients, as well as the evolving technology in goods and services (as cited in Peppas, 2005). The AACSB International acknowledges the value of promoting a global viewpoint in business students and emphasizes that education and management application show that experience with different perspectives brings about higher-quality learning. Studying abroad is a way to attain this experience (Peppas, 2005).

Methodology in Study Abroad Program Evaluation

The rapid growth of the study abroad industry has consequently created a growing need for study abroad program quality assurance standards and assessment. This need has only recently been addressed, prompting many in the field of international education

to begin the task of evaluation as well as the development of standards. Recent studies offer various approaches to study abroad program assessment.

The approaches to study abroad program assessment methods vary from qualitative (ethnographies) to quantitative (surveys), from program benchmarking to student learning outcomes measurement, from student self-reports to ethnographic observation, as well as many mixed methods approaches.

In terms of college and university internationalization, success “is most often measured in the amount of activity, or in the inputs” (Redden, 2008), according to Christa Olson, the Associate Director of International Initiatives for the American Council on Education. In other words, success is measured by how many international courses and activities are being offered, or how many study abroad programs (Redden, 2008).

Michael Vande Berg, Vice President of Academic Affairs and Chief Academic Officer for the Council on International Educational Exchange (CIEE), agrees that institutions are using “the number of bodies going out the door” (Redden, 2008) as the measure of success. College and university presidents seem to be fixated on the percent of their students going abroad. Vande Berg further asserts that it is the emphasis on participation rates rather than learning outcomes that elicits uncertainty about the importance of studying abroad (Redden, 2008).

Chieffo and Griffiths point out that this information is not just good practice; the systematic assessment of study abroad programs could prove helpful in making a case to decision-makers who allocate a college or university’s limited resources. Most college and university study abroad offices do not have a full-time evaluator on staff, so limited

resources for project planning and data collection and analysis must be considered. Subsequently, knowing the deficiency of existing generalizable studies on short-term study abroad programs, the researchers wanted to use a broad scope rather than a limited and detailed one. According to Chieffo and Griffiths, their data “confirm what many have been saying all along about study abroad...these programs do have broad-based benefits to students” (Chieffo and Griffiths, 2003, 29).

In 2001, the Forum on Education Abroad (Forum) was created to establish standards in the interest of the evaluation and oversight of study abroad programs. As evidenced by the expansion of the study abroad enterprise that has occurred in the last twenty years, educators and students are recognizing the importance and usefulness of international education and cross-cultural awareness. However, historically, study abroad experiences have been measured for the most part through subjective accounts of students returning from study abroad experiences who offer anecdotal evidence of various self-perceived benefits ranging from social and cultural capital to practical or “functional”¹ knowledge (Chieffo and Griffiths, 2003, 29).

Education and its evaluation are frequently based on associating “rote learning” and student learning achievement. This achievement measurement is grounded in the idea that learning is committing information to memory and is not successful in encouraging higher-order thinking. McLaughlin and Johnson (2006) believe that field-based learning provides experiences that create an environment that promotes learning and insight. Their “Field Course Experiential Learning Model was developed as part of

¹Functional knowledge is referred to by Chieffo and Griffiths as the ability to or confidence with which one could locate points on a map or make a phone call to another country.

an assessment of short-term field course experiences in locations worldwide over a period of six years. Evaluation of participant outcomes directed the creation of a “course model” that incorporated three components: (1) online pre-departure research assignments; (2) a field-based study abroad component that incorporates hands-on experience, journaling, subject specific research and assignments, discussion groups, as well as independent exploration; and (3) post-trip online coursework which promote the incorporation and use of pertinent concepts. The purpose of this model is to promote student learning through participant involvement in the educational process. The ‘Field Course Experiential Learning Model’ demonstrates both academic and affective growth of program participants (McLaughlin and Johnson, 2006).

Kaufman, Ekstrom, and Shortridge-Baggett (2006) used a business model to assess potential international program opportunities. Applying a “product portfolio matrix”, they created the International Opportunities Assessment (IOA) Tool in order to evaluate new international program opportunities according to the principles of Market Attractiveness and Institutional Resources. They felt that this instrument was practical for program development of international prospects (Kaufman, Ekstrom, and Shortridge-Baggett, 2006).

Berquist, Sonntag-Krupp, and Zenatti-Daniels (2007) created the “GS-414: Tools for Quality Assurance in Administering International Exchange-AQUARIUS,” which they consider to be a practical guide to assessing international exchange partnerships. This guide includes a “Timeline for the international student exchange process,” a “Survey of ‘best practices’/ Maximal service,” “Performance indicators for each step of

the student exchange cycle”—a benchmarking list, as well as “Guidelines for Exchange Programme Development,” and a “Questionnaire.” These tools are intended to enable the evaluator to make a qualitative record from which to initiate fruitful discourse between exchange partners. According to the authors, these guidelines will facilitate an establishment of important standards that prospective new affiliates must meet. They say that answering their specific questions provides a viable appraisal of these important standards. Additionally, they believe clarifying the results to be quite simple: “if you come up with mostly positive answers, then the partnership is probably going to work well...negative answers will of course need to be addressed” (Berquist, Sonntag-Krupp, & Zenatti-Daniels, 2007, 27). This approach may be useful for individual institutions in cross-comparative analyses between multiple program partners. However, without the establishment of industry-wide standards, “positive” and “negative” is subjective in terms of evaluation.

Another approach to study abroad program evaluation is measuring self-perceived cultural competencies of students that have studied abroad and comparing them to those of students who remained at their home institution during the same time period.

Chieffo and Griffiths (2003) believe that meticulous evaluation designs are useful for modifying current programs and in developing new programs so that participants gain as much as possible from the experience. The researchers therefore took a program evaluation approach in measuring the outcomes of the participants’ knowledge gained abroad. The authors used an anonymous questionnaire that required students to self-assess their global awareness and participation in international activities, using the

previous 30 days as a reference. They hypothesized that, even though participants' experiences of various programs are different, certain attitudes and activities that are applicable to participants on any study abroad program would exist. Using Likert and frequency ratings, the questionnaire focused on four "areas": "communication, cultural issues, global interdependence and functional knowledge" (Chieffo and Griffiths, 2003, 28). Their questionnaire was not intended to measure concrete knowledge gained, changes in perspectives, or "functional knowledge" (Chieffo and Griffiths, 2003, 29) achievement. These measures may be more direct and tangible, but are also demanding of resources for both the researcher and the participants. Chieffo and Griffiths therefore utilized the students' reflections and observations regarding their own attitudes and activities (Chieffo and Griffiths, 2003).

Employing a case study method, Jackson (2005) assessed the intercultural learning of study abroad participants through their introspective accounts recorded in diaries and through an ethnographic field assignment. The author emphasizes that while conventional study abroad assessment attempts to quantify participant learning, many researchers know that "the experience abroad cannot be fully quantified: the outcome has to be measured in terms of the quality of the experience and of the skills acquired, particularly of transferable skills" (Jackson, 2005, 165).

Also, the emergent themes, "evidence of difficulties or 'culture bumps'" and "evidence of personal growth and emerging intercultural communicative competence" (Jackson, 2005, 169 & 174) gave insight into the outcomes of the participants' intercultural competence. Jackson also suggests useful ideas to further develop program

offerings by engaging the participants and really raising their understanding and expression of their intercultural learning. She points out that the methods provided evidence of learning outcomes “that observation could never have captured, and that no one would have thought of including as questions on a questionnaire” (Jackson, 2005, 180). Perhaps the most fruitful finding that Jackson’s study demonstrates is that a cultural awareness requirement can and perhaps should be a credit-bearing course configured into the framework of every study abroad program (Jackson, 2005).

Institutions are recognizing the importance of cultural awareness requirements, and many have lofty goals of increased participation in study abroad programs. For example, Clemson University’s Office of International Affairs states in the *Mission and Goals* section of its Website that its “goal is to double the number of students involved in international study, internships, service learning and research by 2015”² (<http://www.clemson.edu/ia/about/mission.html>). Some institutions, including Clemson University, have made studying abroad a requirement for particular majors, while others have even made it a general requirement for graduation. However, as William Hoffa, an adviser at the School for International Training stresses, “we have to change the infrastructure and regulation of study abroad” (Farrell, 2007, A49). Hoffa believes that the development of study abroad program standards should take precedence over the continued growth of participation rates (Farrell, 2007).

Furthermore, as McCarthy points out, “good intentions, broad consensus, and intricate plans are insufficient without sustained leadership and periodic formal

² No figure or date was given as a reference point for the goal “to double the number of students involved in international study, internships, service learning and research by 2015.”

assessments of progress” (McCarthy, 2007, B12). McCarthy claims that campus coordination is often lacking, and consequently so, too, is the accountability to generate outcomes. As a result, a lot of evaluations fail at the implementation phase (McCarthy, 2007).

Farrell (2007) emphasizes the difficulty of assessing study abroad programs. Since the study-abroad industry consists of U.S. and foreign universities, as well as independent third-party companies making countless programs available in over a hundred countries, determining the framework of a quality program and sorting out the high-quality from the substandard programs is, according to Sideli, "a very complex enterprise" (Farrell, 2007, A50). Nonetheless, the Forum has pinpointed characteristics of prominent programs and subsequently developed evaluation criteria. Through a pilot study of nineteen institutions' study abroad programs, they found that many institutions did not have clearly identifiable objectives or bases for their declared mission and goals of offering study abroad programs. The Forum did release guidelines for university sponsored programs, but did not provide assessment tools for programs led by third parties. As for now, assessing third party programs will probably continue to be complex and time-consuming (Farrell, 2007).

DiBiasio and Mello (2004) argue, however, that study abroad gives participants the opportunity for academic, professional and personal growth via cross-cultural experiences. Study abroad programs enable students to progress from subjective to objective knowledge by facilitating the recognition of varying viewpoints and cross-cultural issues. Many participants consider studying abroad to be a life-changing

experience, yet this claim is mainly supported anecdotally and although it bears emotional influence, anecdotal accounts are not often useful in eliciting objective learning outcomes or in program development. They believe that a variety of program models and lengths means a wide range of participant experiences and therefore wide-ranging outcomes, but also that evaluation of the learning experience is essential for continual program development and fulfillment of accreditation requirements. Moreover, proper pre-departure preparation, program oversight and multilevel evaluation that maintain academic integrity are key. DiBiasio and Mello's evaluation system is based on various "levels," and without any one level the educational assessment process is discredited. Their multi-dimensional evaluation methods consist of a rigorous participant selection process, a program/project evaluation, an advisor/project team manager evaluation, and an externally judged competition. Evaluation is used for continual program improvements. From these evaluation efforts, they have found a continual and significant gap between the quality of on-campus and off-campus participant outcomes. Their supposition is that characteristics such as learning styles, self-motivation, risk-taking, interpersonal skills as well as other personal characteristics distinguish the participants abroad from the students at their home campus.

DiBiasio and Mello's findings showed evidence that participants in the program abroad were better able to generate project goals, review and synthesize literature, and use appropriate methods than their on-campus peers. Participants were also able to perform the proper analysis, reach reliable conclusions, and communicate written outcomes better than non-participants. This particular program evaluation demonstrated

that a study abroad experience is better than an on-campus experience in fulfilling degree requirements. Additionally, the evaluation highlighted program aspects that required improvement while acting as a base from which to plan the improvements. And, because the evaluation was guided by the program's educational goals to avoid limitations due to over-dependence on anecdotal data, curriculums could be developed with confidence. In addition, they observed that participant outcomes and achievement of educational objectives are directly related to high-quality advising. Their evaluation conclusions have directed development and resource distribution for the on-campus program (DiBiasio and Mello, 2004).

Program Classification

Traditionally study abroad has been thought of as seeing the sights and socializing, with perhaps a class or two. However, currently study abroad programs expect academic and cultural learning outcomes. Students have also become more selective, comparing programs according to offerings, such as excursions as well as the type of housing offered (Farrell, 2007).

If the ideal of study abroad is cross-cultural competency through the acquisition of cultural capital, a classification system that reflects the extent of cultural immersion that particular types of programs strive for and facilitate would reveal the reality that different types of programs vary fundamentally when it comes to the cross-cultural competency of their participants. The goal of linguistic proficiency is clear when a student studies a foreign language. This provides context for a student's efforts by showing them their progress along a continuum with distinct levels that are clearly

labeled “elementary,” “intermediate” and “advanced” (Engle and Engle, 2003, 7). The goal of cross-cultural competency should be just as clear when a student studies abroad. No matter what a participant’s starting point, the aim of international education can be thought of as progressing as far as possible along this continuum (Engle and Engle, 2003).

That being said, classifying study abroad programs may be the most unsettled and contentious issue when it comes to evaluation. With this in mind, the Forum on Education Abroad has created a glossary that tries to combine numerous program characteristics into a few general types. However, their classifications will not yet be used for data collection pending extensive revision. An agreement on more concrete boundaries must be made prior to the creation of widely used categories; therefore their glossary is intended to create a dialogue rather than present standard definitions for the field (The Forum on Education Abroad, 2007).

Even though study abroad professionals agree that varying types of programs have varying outcomes, conclusive definitions of terms have yet to be decided upon. The Forum on Education Abroad’s Glossary initiates a standardization of terminology among international educators (The Forum on Education Abroad, 2008).

Program characteristics, such as length, location and format, are commonly used to classify study abroad programs. For the purposes of this study, program classification will be determined by the method that is used by the Clemson University Study Abroad staff. Their classification system consists of broad groupings according to the program

type. These program types are referred to as program *provider* and are classified as follows: Faculty-led, Third Party, Exchange, Direct or Other.

Previously, most evaluation research has considered study abroad generically, suggesting that variation in the types of programs was irrelevant. Vande Berg, Balkcum, Scheid and Whalen (2004) sought to learn which types of study abroad programs are likely to encourage or promote participant learning. Clearly different types of program settings affect learning outcomes, so they included the analysis of this assumption in their study. When it comes to measuring outcomes, they believe the system of study abroad program classification that Engle and Engle (2003) have created would be a better starting point than the traditional classification due to the fact that the traditional system does not consider relevant program components that conceivably impact the study abroad experience, such as the type of housing or the accessibility of excursions and extracurricular activities (Vande Berg, Balkcum, Scheid and Whalen, 2004).

Though few have focused on program type as a variable of comparison, Mendelson (2004) found that regardless of the variance in the language programs studied, students' accounts of their cultural exchanges are alike or sometimes the same. Conceivably it is students' attitudes toward this exchange that explain the comparable communication experiences. Also, the length of a program might play a role in student progress. Longer programs allow students to have more time to develop various skills. But program components, along with other characteristics of these groups such as pre-program oral proficiency, personal goals, attitudes, and personalities, could all have an effect on outcomes. After completing the program, however, students did not agree with

these suppositions. They learned that “the reality of study abroad is often very different from the glossy image advertised in program materials, and that there is another side that needs to be faced in order to learn effectively and live in the host culture” (Mendelson, 2004).

Engle and Engle (2003) are perhaps the most notable when it comes to study abroad program classification. They have developed a classification system to categorize study abroad programs according to their fundamental differences educationally and culturally. The basis of their classification system is five levels that clearly differentiate groupings of programs that are not to be subjectively defined by conceptions of “quality” but according to comparable objectively defined program components such as “program length”, “type of student housing”, the “language in which course work is given”, and “required linguistic competence for admission.” They claim that the establishment and use of a study abroad program classification system would create increasing demands for quality assurance in the study abroad field. Additionally, an evaluation of program types would potentially give prospective study abroad participants straightforward expectations, motivate students to better prepare for their experience, and encourage former participants to return for another more challenging yet more rewarding program. Furthermore, a classification system would compel institutions to reform language and other policies as well as to strengthen study abroad endeavors not only in terms of the quantity but in the quality, as defined as the extent of academic and cultural challenges that participants are adequately equipped and encouraged to face (Engle and Engle, 2003).

Engle and Engle's (2003) system of classification provides an honest outlook on study abroad that is indicative of where the cultural exploration of studying abroad can lead. Students can then base their program decisions on better information. If this system provides a more complete understanding of study abroad, it may compel students to prepare for and choose more challenging programs. Study abroad is about accepting the challenges that participation in a foreign setting presents, and taking the unconventional path to understanding another culture. Acknowledging this is at the core of cross-cultural awareness and appreciation. Study abroad inherently encourages participants to acknowledge and accept cultural diversity and facilitates the opportunity to acclimate to this diversity. Study abroad provokes modern ideals—civility, open-mindedness, refined judgment—that are the ideals of higher education at its most traditional. As students face these challenges, “a level-based classification system would provide a new, clarifying focus for international education and, in so doing, highlight its most noble goals.” Commitment to study abroad program classification is essential for the establishment of standards all the while keeping its educational intention at the forefront even in the face of current growth and pressure to provide increased services (Engle and Engle, 2003).

When it comes to study abroad program evaluation, the best method of assessment has yet to be determined. The evaluation of individual programs is not only complex, time-consuming, and expensive (taking into account that program sites span the globe); the greatest challenge lies in how to accurately measure outcomes and ultimately the quality of these programs.

Exemplified by the studies mentioned above is the dilemma facing all international educators: how to measure the quality of study abroad programs. Should study abroad programs be measured comparatively solely in terms of academic outcomes? Should they be measured as compared to the outcomes of students who do not study abroad? Should they be measured according to the type or length of the program? There are countless ways that study abroad programs can be evaluated and in the past no general consensus has been reached on how to do so.

Nonetheless, it is essential that the quality of study abroad programs is monitored. This study will make use of those who are directly involved in the programs—the students. These students (henceforth referred to as participants) offer a first-hand account of the study abroad experience. Furthermore, by utilizing participants, initial efforts of evaluating the quality of the program offerings will be efficient in terms of the recruitment, time, and the cost involved in data collection.

The myriad study abroad programs available to undergraduates at Clemson University can vary greatly according to provider (Faculty-led, Third Party, Direct, Exchange and Other), location, language incorporation, length of program, course offerings, and costs.

If the goal of study abroad programs is to foster the accumulation of cultural capital, the purpose of this study is to reveal observable and measurable differences in program quality present in the responses of participants according to the type of program in which s/he participates. More specifically: Are there significant differences in the accumulation of cultural capital that vary according to the program provider? While the

majority of the literature on Bourdieu's theory of cultural capital and its application is focused on its impact on educational outcomes (Lareau and Weininger, 2003), the goal of this study is to assess the role of study abroad in the accumulation of cultural capital. This study fills a gap in the study abroad literature by focusing on students' perceptions of their study abroad experiences which may indeed differ according to the type of program in which they participated.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODS

Sample

Participants included in this study were from the population of undergraduate and graduate students at Clemson University who participated in study abroad programs between the Fall of 2006 and the Spring of 2008. A sample was drawn from this population of approximately 854 participants, with 198 respondents. The response rate was 23.2%. The age range of the participants is 18-25 years of age.

The sampling methods and procedures used to collect the data for this study were non-experimental and non-random. The design was instead a descriptive³ (Trochim, 2005, 4) program evaluation. Purposive sampling was used to recruit from among the population of study abroad participants, though respondents were indeed volunteers. The participants from all study abroad programs between the Fall of 2006 and the Spring of 2008 were asked via email to complete the Study Abroad Program Evaluation upon the completion of their program. Two follow-up emails were sent to each of the participants in two week intervals. Participants were compensated with the incentive of a Clemson University Study Abroad t-shirt for their completion of the survey.

Because this study was only conducted at one large land grant university in the southeastern United States, the results may not be broadly generalizable. However, the survey was distributed over the period of five academic semesters which served to

³According to Trochim's *Research Methods*, "descriptive studies are designed primarily to document what is going on or what exists."

encapsulate a variety of types and lengths of programs represented in the general study abroad population.

Measures

The variables of interest in this study are *program provider, pre-departure, financial aid, academic experience, site coordinator, housing, facilities/services, excursions/field trips, extracurricular activities, individual development, re-entry, and overall experience*. The evaluation from which the data were drawn was intended to measure program quality which is reflected in the design of the survey instrument. However, this study is focused on the cultural capital accumulation associated with studying abroad. Cultural capital here is being measured as cross-cultural competency gains as operationalized as ratings of the dependent variables.

To measure how this cultural capital accumulation varies from program to program, the independent variable being used in this study is the provider of the study abroad program that the respondent participated in as classified by faculty-led, third party, direct, exchange at a foreign university, and other (i.e. *program provider*). These classifications⁴ are provided in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1 Program Descriptors as defined by the Forum on Education Abroad Glossary

Program Descriptors
Program type —A grouping of program models into a handful of broad categories.

⁴ All of the following definitions are provided by the Forum on Education Abroad Glossary, with the exception of the third-party program for which they did not include a definition. This definition of a third-party program is provided by the author and was created through the usage of this term by the study abroad staff at the time of this evaluation.

Direct enrollment—Study in an overseas university without going through a provider other than the student’s home institution.

Faculty-led program—A study abroad program directed by a faculty member from the home campus who accompanies the students abroad.

Student exchange—An exchange whose participants are students. At the post-secondary level, exchanges are typically on a person to person basis (e.g., one U.S. student spends time at an overseas university while a student from that university is enrolled at the U.S. university); or some mathematical variation (e.g., one U.S. student for two incoming international students). They often involve some system of “banking” tuition (and sometimes other fees) collected from the outgoing student for use by the incoming student.

Third-party program—For the purposes of this study, a third party program refers to any program that is offered by organizations outside of both the home institution and the foreign institution. These include language institutes, field studies, study tours, and immersion programs.

Other—This category of programs encompasses course-embedded and departmental (hybrid) study abroad programs.

Course-embedded program—A short study abroad experience that forms an integral part of, or an optional add-on to, a course given on the home campus. Most commonly the study abroad portion of the course takes place during a mid-semester break or after the end of the on-campus term.

Departmental program—A study abroad program operated by an academic department (or by a college within a university) with little or no participation by the institution’s study abroad office.

The dependent variables in this study are the program components *pre-departure*, *financial aid*, *housing*, *excursions/field trips*, *extracurricular activities*, *site coordinator*, *facilities/services*, *overall experience*, *re-entry*, and in particular *academic experience* and *individual development*.

The items within each independent variable were measured individually and their descriptions are as follows:

The *pre-departure* variable was in reference to the participant’s experience with the CU Study Abroad Office and included the items *Program advising/assistance*, *Pre-departure Orientation*, *Program materials I was given*, and *Overall service*. These items were on a five-point scale of *Excellent* to *Poor*.

The *financial aid* variable contained the items *I received my funding in a timely manner* and *The financial aid process went smoothly*. These items were on a five-point scale of *Strongly Agree* to *Strongly Disagree*.

The *housing* variable was made up of the items *I was satisfied with the condition of my housing*, *My housing arrangements gave me the opportunity to interact with host country students/peers*, and *My housing enhanced my study abroad/cultural experience*. These items were on a five-point scale of *Strongly Agree* to *Strongly Disagree*.

The *excursions/field trips* variable included the items *The excursions/field trips were well organized, The excursions/field trips contributed to my cultural understanding of the host country, The excursions/field trips allowed me to interact with host nationals, Excluding mandatory travel for courses, I had the opportunity to travel away from my study site, The excursions/field trips that were part of the program were relevant to my coursework, and I would have preferred FEWER excursions/field trips and MORE free time.* These items were on a five-point scale of *Strongly Agree* to *Strongly Disagree*.

The *extracurricular activities* variable contained the items *I participated in activities such as watching host country television, reading host country newspapers, having meals and traveling with host country nationals, I was helped by the site coordinator to find extra-curricular activities, Extra-curricular activities contributed to my cultural understanding of the host country, and Extra-curricular activities allowed me to interact with host nationals.* These items were on a five-point scale of *Strongly Agree* to *Strongly Disagree*.

The *site coordinator* variable was made up of the items *Knowledge about the program location, Organization/Efficiency, Availability/Responsiveness, and Dedication to your success.* These items were on a five-point scale of *Very Satisfied* to *Very Dissatisfied*.

The *facilities and services* variable referred to those available to participants while they were abroad and included the items *Bookstore/Library, Medical/Counseling Facilities, Computer Facilities/Email, Travel Agency, Gym, Study Areas/Lounges, and*

Internet in Student Rooms/Residence Halls. These items were on a five-point scale of *Very Satisfied* to *Very Dissatisfied*.

The *overall experience* variable contained the items *Assistance in choosing a study abroad program, Orientation/preparation for my study abroad program, Support during my study abroad program, Support after I returned from my study abroad program, Program Director/Site Coordinator, Program itinerary, Living arrangements, Meal arrangements, Program location, Program cost (was it a good value for the money), Academic work load, Language training, and Excursions/field trips.* These items were on a five-point scale of *Very Satisfied* to *Very Dissatisfied*.

The *re-entry* variable referred to the participants' experience upon their return from abroad and was made up of the items *My personal expectations of the program were fulfilled, My study abroad experience changed my academic objectives/career interests, As a result of studying abroad, I have an increased desire to travel/live/work abroad in the future, I would recommend this program to another student/friend, I have experienced reentry culture shock since returning home from abroad, and I would be interested in going abroad again through one of the programs available at CU.* These items were on a five-point scale of *Strongly Agree* to *Strongly Disagree*.

The *academic experience* variable included the items *Before studying abroad, I was interested in the subject matter of the course(s) that I took while abroad, The overall academic quality of the program abroad was comparable to the quality received at CU, In comparison to courses at CU, the courses I took abroad were equally challenging, In comparison to courses at CU, the quality of the instructor(s) abroad was comparable to*

the quality received at CU, Studying abroad helped me to develop an understanding of world cultures in historical and contemporary perspectives, Studying abroad helped me to recognize the importance of language in cultural contexts, I was adequately prepared for the language aspect of the program, and As a result of the program, my language skills have improved. These items were on a five-point scale of *Strongly Agree* to *Strongly Disagree*.

The *individual development* variable contained the items *I gained a better insight into myself as a result of studying abroad, I have gained a greater sense of independence and self-confidence as a result of studying abroad, Studying abroad increased my interest in social issue and world events, Studying abroad increased my interest in language learning, As a result of studying abroad, I am more receptive to different ideas and ways of seeing the world, Studying abroad increased my ability to adapt to new situations and surroundings, and Studying abroad has given me a new perspective on my own country.* These items were on a five-point scale of *Strongly Agree* to *Strongly Disagree*.

In order to test the internal consistency reliability⁵ (Trochim, 2005, 68) of the survey instrument, the number of items related to each of the constructs was used to calculate Cronbach's alpha (Trochim, 2005). With the exception of the *Reentry* scale, all of the scales had good internal consistency reliability (Nunally as cited in Pallant, 2005); all with Cronbach alphas above .7 (see Table 3.2).

⁵Using an internal consistency reliability estimate (Cronbach's alpha), each instrument, which was administered only once to the sample, was assessed according to how accurately the items on the instrument generate similar findings to other items that correspond to the same construct within each scalar measure.

Table 3.2 Internal Consistency Reliability of Scales

Scale	Cronbach's Alpha	N of items
<i>Pre-departure</i>	.897	3
<i>Financial Aid</i>	.985	2
<i>Housing</i>	.740	3
<i>Excursions/Field Trips</i>	.918	6
<i>Extra-curricular Activities</i>	.782	4
<i>Academic Experience</i>	.731	7
<i>Individual Development</i>	.730	7
<i>Site Coordinator</i>	.957	4
<i>Facilities and Services</i>	.820	8
<i>Overall SA Experience</i>	.801	13
<i>Reentry</i>	.507	6

Design

Though this study utilized existing data, the creation of the survey instruments is key in understanding the construct for the research questions being asked.

Successful study abroad program planning and development requires an efficient utilization of marketing and communications. In order to effectively market study abroad programs and inform students about how they can benefit from these opportunities, it is important for the Office of International Affairs to find out the following: How did students find out about the study abroad program? What was their

primary source of information? What resources helped them make the decision to study abroad? What barriers did they face in making their decision to study abroad? What resources helped them to choose a particular program? Is studying abroad a requirement for their major? What do they hope to gain from this experience? Did the Office of International Affairs provide them with adequate information and services? Did the Faculty-leader or Third party provider provide them with adequate information and services?

These are the questions that the Study Abroad Program Pre-Departure Evaluation Survey (refer to Appendix A) was created to answer. This instrument was targeted towards study abroad participants who were in the pre-departure phase of the study abroad experience at the time that they completed the survey. In addition to demographic variables (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, class level, major, etc.) and program indicator variables (i.e., location as well as Faculty-led, Third Party Provider, or Direct/Exchange), this survey instrument contained several sets of questions that were answered according to Likert-type response scales.

In evaluating study abroad programs, according to the Office of International Affairs, it is important to know the following: Were students satisfied with the overall itinerary? Were the living arrangements satisfactory? Did they find the location to be safe and conducive to learning? Were they satisfied with the efforts of the faculty in their knowledge about the country, efficiency at organizational aspects, approachability in case of problems, and dedication to the students' success? Did they feel the program overall was a good value for the money? Would they recommend it to others? Why or why not?

What do they wish they had known ahead of time? Was the work load appropriate? Too much? Too little? Would they have preferred more excursions (for higher program cost)? Would they have preferred fewer group excursions and more free time? Does this program reflect well on Clemson University?

These were the questions that the evaluation team were mindful of when designing the Study Abroad Program Evaluation instrument (refer to Appendix B). This instrument was designed to be a comprehensive evaluation of the study abroad experience that study abroad participants would complete upon their return from abroad.

The survey was divided into four substantive sections: *Background Information*, *Pre-Departure*, *Abroad Experience*, and *When You Returned*. In addition to demographic variables (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, class level, major, etc.) the *Background Information* section asked questions about program dates, location, and provider.

The *Pre-Departure*, *Abroad Experience*, and *When You Returned* sections contained various closed and open ended questions including several series of questions that were answered according to Likert-type response scales. These questions examined participants' experiences during their study abroad program.

The survey used three different Likert-type response scales: *Excellent to Poor*, *Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree*, and *Very Satisfied to Very Dissatisfied*. These scales were used to measure eleven program components: (1) *Pre-departure*, (2) *Financial Aid*, (3) *Housing*, (4) *Excursions/Field Trips*, (5) *Extra-curricular Activities*, (6) *Academic Experience*, (7) *Individual Development*, (8) *Site Coordinator*, (9) *Facilities and Services*, (10) *Overall Study Abroad Experience*, and (11) *Reentry*.

Participants rated their experiences on a series of 5-point Likert-type scales for each of these variables.

Procedures

Two components to the evaluation were used in this study: the Study Abroad Program Pre-Departure Evaluation Survey and the Study Abroad Program Evaluation.

For the first phase of the evaluation, data were collected from the Study Abroad Program Pre-Departure Evaluation Survey. The Study Abroad Program Pre-Departure Evaluation Survey was created by the Office of International Affairs evaluation team. This questionnaire included questions about the satisfaction with and preparedness provided by information and support from the study abroad staff, faculty directors and/or third party program staff. Additionally, the questionnaire addressed resources and barriers that helped or hindered participants' decision to study abroad as well as their choice of study abroad program.

The Study Abroad Program Pre-Departure Evaluation Survey instrument was a pencil and paper survey distributed and completed in-person upon the participants' completion of a pre-departure orientation led by the study abroad staff. The survey was designed to be concise so that it would only take approximately 5 minutes to complete. This survey was completed by 247 respondents.

The second component to the evaluation was the Study Abroad Program Evaluation. This evaluative instrument was a web-based survey distributed through email by the study abroad staff to the participant population upon the completion of their program. Survey questions inquired about the participants' appraisal of the study abroad

experience, and were intended to be comprehensive in nature, assessing the study abroad experience from pre-departure to return as per the participant. The survey was concise and was designed to take participants approximately 15 minutes to complete. This survey was completed by 198 respondents.

As this was the initial evaluation of study abroad programs at Clemson University, the Pre-Departure Survey was intended to be a preliminary test instrument. Some of the information included in this survey was also included in the Study Abroad Program Evaluation. However, it is important to note that these instruments were not intended to be used as pre/post measures as the information differs and the respondents' scores were not matched pairs. While the Pre-Departure Survey data will be useful to the Office of International Affairs in terms of marketing and communications (i.e., utilizing the most influential sources of information, and informing potential participants about common barriers to study abroad participation and how to handle them), it was not used in this study. The Study Abroad Program Evaluation data will be useful to the Office of International Affairs in terms of program and services assessment and was used for the purposes of this study.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Data Analysis

Utilizing the data collected from the Study Abroad Program Evaluation survey instrument, this study required various quantitative statistical analyses. Raw data and individual scores of individual participants were not used. Instead, scaled group data as well as measures of central tendency and variability were used.

Once reliability measures were established for each of the scales, the data were analyzed in terms of the purposiveness of the constructs as they are operationalized in this study. A one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted to explore the impact of the program type on cultural capital acquisition as measured by the construct variables. Subjects were divided into five groups according to the program provider (Group 1: CU Faculty; Group 2: Direct Enrollment; Group 3: Exchange; Group 4: Third Party; Group 5: Other). Statistically significant differences among the groups will be discussed below with the results for each variable (Pallant, 2005).

Results

DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLE

Gender and Race/Ethnicity. A total of 198 participants completed the web-based survey, 73% of which were female and 27% were male. This is fairly representative of the study abroad population at Clemson University and in the U.S. (65.1% female, 34.9% male) in general, though it is skewed slightly more female (Institute of International Education, 2008).

An overwhelming majority (90.7%) of participants were Caucasian, with only 3.1% being African American, 2.1% Hispanic, 2.1% who reported their race/ethnicity as *Other*, and 1% Multiracial. Only 1% of the participants were either Asian American/Pacific Islander or Native American/Native Alaskan.

This sample highlights the common underrepresentation of minority students in study abroad program participation. However, this trend is changing. In 1996/1997 minorities represented only 16% of the study abroad population in the U.S. and in 2006/2007 participation among minorities has increased to 18.2% (Institute of International Education, 2008).

Class Level. Nearly half (40.7%) of the participants were Juniors at the time that they studied abroad. Another one-fourth (24.7%) were Seniors and 23.2% were Sophomores and 3.6% were Freshman. The remaining 5.2% were Graduate students.

Academic College, Major and Minor. One-third (33.3%) of the participants were from the College of Business and Behavioral Sciences. Another 29.2% were from the College of Architecture, Arts and Humanities. 12.3% were from the College of Engineering and Science, 11.3% were from the College of Health, Education, and Human Development, 6.7% were from the College of Agriculture, Forestry and Life Sciences, and 5.1% were Calhoun Honors College students.

Marketing was the most common academic major (9.8%) among the participants, followed by Language and International Trade (8.2%) and Psychology (8.2%), Business Management (7.2%), Language and International Health (6.2%) and Mechanical Engineering (5.7%).

Spanish was the most common academic minor (15.7%) among the participants, followed by Business (10.8%) and Sociology (10.8%), Psychology (9.8%), and those with a double minor (7.8%).

Program Dates. Over half (51.2%) of the participants in this sample studied abroad during the summer. Another 35.1% studied abroad during the spring semester, and 13.8% studied abroad during the fall semester.

These numbers are comparable to those for the U.S. in general as more and more students are choosing short-term programs during the summer. Also, due to (1) international academic calendar differences and (2) the popularity of college football, many students who wish to study abroad for a semester choose to do so during the spring rather than the fall.

Program Location. Over half (51.5%) of the students in this sample studied abroad in Europe and Russia. Only 17% of the students studied abroad in Latin America and the Caribbean, and 13.9% studied in Australia and New Zealand. Other program locations included Asia and India (6.2%), Africa and the Middle East (4.6%), Multi-country (Europe) (4.6%), and Canada (1%).

Program Provider. Almost half (44.3%) of the respondents studied abroad through CU faculty-led programs, while almost one-third (29.4%) of the respondents studied abroad through third party programs. Another 9.8% studied abroad via direct enrollment in a foreign university, and 6.7% via exchange programs with foreign universities. 9.8% of the respondents chose *Other* as the program provider, in which case there may have been some program type overlap. For example, there are emerging programs that are

university initiatives that are called *hybrids* that are developed by the student's home institution in partnership with a foreign institution. The program may be administered and courses taught by the home institution, the foreign institution, or any combination of the two. Nevertheless, these programs do not fit neatly into the program categorizations that have been used in the past including this evaluation.

ANOVA RESULTS

Pre-departure. Almost one-third (31.4%) of participants said that they first found out about the study abroad program that they chose via a CU faculty member. Another 18.9% found out about the program from the Study Abroad Office and 18.4% through a friend or former participant of the program. Only 7.0% of participants reported that they found out about the program via the Study Abroad Fair, and only 5.9% said that they found out about the program through an informational poster or flyer.

While 31% of the students in this sample reported that they had no previous experience traveling abroad before their study abroad program, 32.1% said that they had traveled abroad. Another 10.9% of the respondents said that they had traveled and studied abroad previously, 7.1% said that they had traveled and volunteered abroad previously, and 6.5% said they had traveled and lived abroad previously. The remaining 12.4% of respondents reported various experiences studying, volunteering, living, and traveling abroad.

With this particular group, the most commonly (64.3%) reported reason for studying abroad was to *see new places/learn about other cultures*. Another 17.8% reported that they wanted to *begin/continue the study of a foreign language*, and 9.7%

wanted to *fulfill academic requirements in (my) major*. These reasons were followed by *improve career prospects* (4.3%), *gain a sense of independence/self-confidence* (3.2%), and *gain another perspective on the U.S.* (.5%). An overwhelming majority of students (96.7%) reported that these objectives were accomplished by studying abroad.

When rating the CU Faculty, 70.6% of participants chose the response *Excellent* or *Good* for overall service pre-departure. Almost seventy percent (69.6%) of participants rated Faculty advising and assistance pre-departure as *Excellent* or *Good*. More than sixty-five percent (66.6%) rated the Faculty pre-departure orientation as *Excellent* or *Good*. And, 64.7% rated the program materials that they received from the Faculty leader pre-departure as *Excellent* or *Good*.

When rating the Study Abroad Office, just over half (53.3%) of participants chose the response *Excellent* or *Good* for overall service pre-departure, while 22.3% chose *Poor* or *Fair*. Over half (55.4%) rated the Study Abroad Office pre-departure orientation as *Excellent* or *Good*, while 16.9% chose *Poor* or *Fair*. And, 57.8% rated the program materials that they received from the Study Abroad Office pre-departure as *Excellent* or *Good*, while 18.9% chose *Poor* or *Fair*. The ANOVA test revealed that there were no statistically significant differences between groups for the Study Abroad Office Pre-departure items (See Table 4.1).

Financial Aid. Less than forty percent (38.6%) of the participants reported meeting with a financial aid officer prior to going abroad. And just over one-third (36.8%) of the participants reported receiving financial aid for their study abroad experience.

Seventy-eight percent (of the 36.8% who received financial aid) reported that they received their funding in a timely manner. Likewise 81% (of the 36.8% who received financial aid) reported that the financial aid process went smoothly.

As depicted in Table 4.2, a one-way between groups analysis of variance revealed significant differences for the program providers [$F(4, 172)=2.985, p=.020$] at the $p<.05$ level for the item *I received my funding in a timely manner*. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for the *Exchange* group ($M=3.15, SD=2.075$) was significantly higher than the mean scores for the *CU Faculty* ($M=1.43, SD=1.847$), *Direct Enrollment* ($M=1.61, SD=2.090$), *Third Party* ($M=1.48, SD=1.833$) and *Other* ($M=2.33, SD=2.000$) groups.

Likewise a one-way between groups analysis of variance revealed significant differences for the program providers [$F(4, 172)=2.620, p=.037$] at the $p<.05$ level for the item *The financial aid process went smoothly*. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for the *Exchange* group ($M=3.08, SD=2.060$) was significantly higher than the mean scores for the *CU Faculty* ($M=1.44, SD=1.895$), *Direct Enrollment* ($M=1.78, SD=2.045$), *Third Party* ($M=1.52, SD=1.833$) and *Other* ($M=2.33, SD=2.000$) groups (See Table 4.2).

Housing. A large majority (87.6%) of the participants said that housing was provided by their study abroad program. Nearly one-fourth (23.1%) of participants reported that the type of housing they lived in abroad was an apartment, while 22.5% reported living in a home stay, 20.1% stayed in a hotel, 17.2% stayed in a dorm and another 17.2% described their housing as *other*.

When rating the condition of their housing, 77.1% of participants chose the response *Strongly Agree* or *Agree* to the statement “I was satisfied with the condition of my housing.” Nearly seventy-percent (68.2%) of the participants chose *Strongly Agree* or *Agree* to the statement “my housing enhanced my study abroad/cultural experience.” However, just over half (53.5%) chose *Strongly Agree* or *Agree* to the statement “my housing arrangements gave me the opportunity to interact with host country students/peers.”

A one-way between groups analysis of variance revealed significant differences for the program providers [$F(4, 164)=2.973, p=.021$] at the $p<.05$ level for the item *I was satisfied with the condition of my housing*. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for the *Direct Enrollment* group ($M=4.29, SD=.686$) was significantly higher than the mean scores for the *CU Faculty* ($M=3.95, SD=1.037$), *Exchange* ($M=2.90, SD=1.729$), *Third Party* ($M=4.12, SD=1.166$) and *Other* ($M=3.81, SD=1.223$) groups (See Table 4.3).

Excursions/Field Trips. Almost half (44.7%) of participants said that their program included 5 or more excursions/field trips. Nearly a quarter (24.1%) said that their program included 3-4 excursions/field trips, 14.7% said their program included 1-2 excursions/field trips, and 16.5% said that their program did not include any excursions/field trips.

Over one-third (35.2%) of the participants reported that the excursions/field trips that were a part of the program were not required. Almost thirty-five percent (34.6%) of

participants reported that they were required, and 30.2% reported that some were required and some were not required.

Excluding mandatory travel for courses, 80.8% of the participants said that they had the opportunity to travel away from their study site. Three-fourths (75.2%) of participants chose *Strongly Agree* or *Agree* to the statement “the excursions/field trips contributed to my cultural understanding of the host country.” Almost three fourths (74.6%) said that the excursions/field trips were well organized. Sixty percent (60.4%) of participants felt that the excursions/field trips that were part of the program were relevant to their coursework. Almost sixty percent (58.9%) of the participants chose *Strongly Agree* or *Agree* to the statement “the excursions/field trips allowed me to interact with host nationals. Interestingly, over half (55.1%) of the participants said that they would have preferred fewer excursions and more free time.

There were significant differences between groups for five of the six *Excursions/Field Trips* items (See Table 4.4). A one-way between groups analysis of variance revealed significant differences for the program providers [$F(4, 163)=5.382$, $p=.000$] at the $p<.01$ level for the item *The excursions/field trips were well organized*. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for the *Third Party* group ($M=3.94$, $SD=1.587$) was significantly higher than the mean scores for the *CU Faculty* ($M=3.79$, $SD=1.481$), *Direct Enrollment* ($M=2.44$, $SD=1.965$), *Exchange* ($M=1.90$, $SD=2.470$) and *Other* ($M=3.38$, $SD=1.821$) groups.

A one-way between groups analysis of variance revealed significant differences for the program providers [$F(4, 163)=7.506$, $p=.000$] at the $p<.01$ level for the item *The*

excursions/field trips contributed to my cultural understanding of the host country. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for the *Other* group (M=4.00, SD=1.633) was significantly higher than the mean scores for the *CU Faculty* (M=3.99, SD=1.552), *Direct Enrollment* (M=2.5, SD=2.000), *Exchange* (M=1.40, SD=2.271) and *Third Party* (M=3.80, SD=1.607) groups.

A one-way between groups analysis of variance revealed significant differences for the program providers [F(4, 162)=4.108, p=.003] at the p<.01 level for the item *The excursions/field trips allowed me to interact with host nationals.* Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for the *Third Party* group (M=3.43, SD=1.607) was significantly higher than the mean scores for the *CU Faculty* (M=3.42, SD=1.610), *Direct Enrollment* (M=2.38, SD=1.857), *Exchange* (M=1.50, SD=2.068) and *Other* (M=3.00, SD=1.826) groups.

A one-way between groups analysis of variance revealed significant differences for the program providers [F(4, 163)=2.978, p=.021] at the p<.05 level for the item *Excluding mandatory travel for courses, I had the opportunity to travel away from my study site.* Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for the *Third Party* group (M=4.20, SD=1.611) was significantly higher than the mean scores for the *CU Faculty* (M=3.91, SD=1.488), *Direct Enrollment* (M=4.19, SD=1.682), *Exchange* (M=2.30, SD=2.452) and *Other* (M=4.07, SD=1.710) groups.

A one-way between groups analysis of variance revealed significant differences for the program providers [F(4, 163)=6.389, p=.000] at the p<.01 level for the item *The excursions/field trips that were part of the program were relevant to my coursework .*

Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for the *CU Faculty* group (M=3.75, SD=1.623) was significantly higher than the mean scores for the *Third Party* (M=3.08, SD=1.605), *Direct Enrollment* (M=2.00, SD=1.862), *Exchange* (M=1.60, SD=2.119) and *Other* (M=3.31, SD=1.815) groups.

Extra-curricular Activities. Over eighty percent (81.2%) of the participants reportedly participated in activities such as watching host country television, reading host country newspapers, having meals and traveling with host country nationals. Eighty percent (80.6%) of participants said that extracurricular activities contributed to my cultural understanding of the host country. Almost three-fourths (74.2%) said that extracurricular activities allowed them to interact with host nationals. Less than half (47%) of the participants reported that they were helped by the site coordinator to find extracurricular activities.

A one-way between groups analysis of variance revealed significant differences for the program providers [F(4, 163)=3.452, p=.010] at the p<.01 level for the item *Extracurricular activities allowed me to interact with host nationals*. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for the *Direct Enrollment* group (M=4.53, SD=.514) was significantly higher than the mean scores for the *CU Faculty* (M=3.45, SD=1.492), *Third Party* (M=3.98, SD=1.051), *Exchange* (M=4.30, SD=.823) and *Other* (M=3.75, SD=1.483) groups (See Table 4.5).

Academic Experience. Almost half (47.1%) of participants said that they studied a *variety of subjects*, while 25.9% said they studied *language/literature/culture/history*, and

21.2% said their program was *thematic (business, art, etc)*, and only 5.9% said that their program was *strictly language study*.

While almost one-fourth (23.6%) of the participants reportedly studied in a country where the primary language was English, 43.4% said that before studying abroad, they had only completed 0 or 1 college-level courses in the host country language. Another 20.9% reported that they had completed *more than 3* college-level courses in the host country language.

Sixty percent (60.6%) of participants said that the courses that they took abroad were taught in English and 24.7% said that their courses were taught in the host country language. Another 9.4% said that their courses were taught both in English and the host country language.

When it came to rating the academic experience, 93.5% of participants chose the response *Strongly Agree* or *Agree* to the statement “studying abroad helped me to develop an understanding of world cultures in historical and contemporary perspectives.” 84% of the participants chose *Strongly Agree* or *Agree* to the statement “studying abroad helped me to recognize the importance of language in cultural contexts.” These two statements in particular were of interest because they are two of the University’s undergraduate curriculum cross-cultural awareness objectives.

Almost seventy percent (69.7%) of participants chose *Strongly Agree* or *Agree* to the statement “in comparison to courses at CU the quality of the instructor(s) abroad was comparable to the quality received at CU. And nearly seventy percent (68.9%) of participants chose *Strongly Agree* or *Agree* to the statement “the overall academic quality

of the program abroad was comparable to the quality received at CU.” Just over half (51.5%) of the participants chose the response *Strongly Agree* or *Agree* to the statement “in comparison to the courses at CU the courses I took abroad were equally challenging.” While these results may exhibit differences according to program type, these statements are limited in that they do not reveal whether the quality of the abroad program was superior to that of the University or vice versa.

Of particular concern were the results with regard to language preparedness and learning. Only 43.5% of participants felt adequately prepared for the language aspect of their program abroad. And only 57.7% of participants felt that their language skills had improved as a result of the program.

A one-way between groups analysis of variance revealed significant differences for the program providers [$F(4, 163)=3.153, p=.016$] at the $p<.05$ level for the item *Studying abroad helped me to realize the importance of language in cultural contexts*. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for the *Exchange* group ($M=4.50, SD=.707$) was significantly higher than the mean scores for the *CU Faculty* ($M=4.16, SD=1.212$), *Direct Enrollment* ($M=3.24, SD=1.954$), *Third Party* ($M=4.41, SD=.934$) and *Other* ($M=4.19, SD=1.276$) groups (See Table 4.6).

Individual Development. Nearly all (99.4%) of the participants reported that studying abroad increased their ability to adapt to new situations and surroundings. Likewise 95.9% of participants reported that they have a greater sense of independence and self-confidence as a result of studying abroad. Additionally, 95.2% said that they gained a better insight into themselves as a result of studying abroad. Also, 94.6% of the

participants reported that studying abroad had given them a new perspective on their own country. Ninety-four percent (94.1%) said that as a result of studying abroad they are more receptive to different ideas and ways of seeing the world. Ninety-one percent (91.6%) of the participants reported that studying abroad increased their interest in social issues and world events. And, 73.2% of participants reported that studying abroad increased their interest in language learning.

As depicted in Table 4.7, a one-way between groups analysis of variance revealed significant differences for the program providers [$F(4, 162)=4.097, p=.003$] at the $p<.01$ level for the item *I have gained a greater sense of independence and self-confidence as a result of studying abroad*. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for the *Direct Enrollment* group ($M=4.82, SD=.393$) was significantly higher than the mean scores for the *CU Faculty* ($M=4.45, SD=.664$), *Third Party* ($M=4.78, SD=.422$), *Exchange* ($M=4.80, SD=.422$) and *Other* ($M=4.81, SD=.403$) groups.

A one-way between groups analysis of variance revealed significant differences for the program providers [$F(4, 162)=3.483, p=.009$] at the $p<.01$ level for the item *Studying abroad increased my interest in language learning*. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for the *Third Party* group ($M=4.14, SD=1.339$) was significantly higher than the mean scores for the *CU Faculty* ($M=3.84, SD=1.395$), *Direct Enrollment* ($M=2.59, SD=2.123$), *Exchange* ($M=4.00, SD=1.491$) and *Other* ($M=3.88, SD=1.668$) groups (See Table 4.7).

Site Coordinator. Eighty-two percent (82.1%) of the participants reported being *Very Satisfied* or *Satisfied* with the site coordinator's knowledge about the program location. Over three-fourths (77.3%) of participants reported that they were *Very Satisfied* or *Satisfied* with the site coordinator's availability and responsiveness, while 12.5% reported being *Dissatisfied* or *Very Dissatisfied*. Almost three-fourths (73.8%) said that they were *Very Satisfied* or *Satisfied* with the site coordinator's dedication to their success, while 10.8% said they were *Dissatisfied* or *Very Dissatisfied*. Over seventy percent (71.4%) of the participants reported that they were *Very Satisfied* or *Satisfied* with the organization and efficiency of the site coordinator, while 13.6% reported being *Dissatisfied* or *Very Dissatisfied*.

There were significant differences between groups for all of the *Site Coordinator* items (See Table 4.8). A one-way between groups analysis of variance revealed significant differences for the program providers [$F(4, 162)=7.848, p=.000$] at the $p<.01$ level for the item *Knowledge about the program location*. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for the *Third Party* group ($M=4.45, SD=.891$) was significantly higher than the mean scores for the *CU Faculty* ($M=4.25, SD=1.092$), *Direct Enrollment* ($M=2.71, SD=1.829$), *Exchange* ($M=3.40, SD=1.776$) and *Other* ($M=3.94, SD=1.389$) groups.

A one-way between groups analysis of variance revealed significant differences for the program providers [$F(4, 162)=4.487, p=.002$] at the $p<.01$ level for the item *Organization/Efficiency*. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for the *Third Party* group ($M=4.00, SD=1.041$) was significantly higher

than the mean scores for the *CU Faculty* (M=3.95, SD=1.138), *Direct Enrollment* (M=2.65, SD=1.801), *Exchange* (M=3.30, SD=1.889) and *Other* (M=3.50, SD=1.549) groups.

A one-way between groups analysis of variance revealed significant differences for the program providers [F(4, 162)=5.880, p=.000] at the p<.01 level for the item *Availability/Responsiveness*. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for the *CU Faculty* group (M=4.25, SD=1.079) was significantly higher than the mean scores for the *Third Party* (M=4.12, SD=1.092), *Direct Enrollment* (M=2.76, SD=1.786), *Exchange* (M=3.30, SD=1.703) and *Other* (M=3.81, SD=1.471) groups.

A one-way between groups analysis of variance revealed significant differences for the program providers [F(4, 162)=7.120, p=.000] at the p<.01 level for the item *Dedication to your success*. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for the *CU Faculty* group (M=4.24, SD=1.137) was significantly higher than the mean scores for the *Third Party* (M=4.20, SD=.957), *Direct Enrollment* (M=2.76, SD=1.821), *Exchange* (M=3.00, SD=1.886) and *Other* (M=3.56, SD=1.413) groups.

Facilities and Services. Over sixty-three percent (63.7%) of the participants reported that they were *Very Satisfied* or *Satisfied* with the computer and email facilities and services during their program. Just over half (52.5%) of participants reported they were *Very Satisfied* or *Satisfied* with the study areas and lounges available to them during their program. Less than half (44.6%) said that they were *Very Satisfied* or *Satisfied* with the

bookstore and library facilities and services available to them. Only one-third (33%) of the participants reported that they were *Very Satisfied* or *Satisfied* with the travel agency facilities and services. Less than one-third (29.4%) of participants reported being *Very Satisfied* or *Satisfied* with the medical and counseling facilities and services. Less than one quarter (24.4%) said they were *Very Satisfied* or *Satisfied* with the gym facilities and services available on their program. And, only 19.9% of the participants reported that they were *Very Satisfied* or *Satisfied* with the internet facilities and services in the student rooms and residence halls, while 35% were *Dissatisfied* or *Very Dissatisfied*.

There were significant differences between groups for six of the eight *Facilities and Services* items (See Table 4.9). A one-way between groups analysis of variance revealed significant differences for the program providers [$F(4, 162)=4.100, p=.003$] at the $p<.01$ level for the item *Bookstore/Library*. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for the *Exchange* group ($M=4.00, SD=.943$) was significantly higher than the mean scores for the *CU Faculty* ($M=2.29, SD=1.858$), *Direct Enrollment* ($M=3.59, SD=1.502$), *Third Party* ($M=2.96, SD=1.443$) and *Other* ($M=2.56, SD=1.896$) groups.

A one-way between groups analysis of variance revealed significant differences for the program providers [$F(4, 161)=3.556, p=.008$] at the $p<.01$ level for the item *Medical/Counseling Facilities*. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for the *Third Party* group ($M=2.94, SD=1.638$) was significantly higher than the mean scores for the *CU Faculty* ($M=1.84, SD=1.752$),

Direct Enrollment (M=2.41, SD=1.805), *Exchange* (M=2.70, SD=1.889) and *Other* (M=1.69, SD=1.887) groups.

A one-way between groups analysis of variance revealed significant differences for the program providers [F(4, 161)=2.523, p=.043] at the p<.05 level for the item *Medical Facilities*. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for the *Third Party* group (M=2.71, SD=1.701) was significantly higher than the mean scores for the *CU Faculty* (M=1.75, SD=1.756), *Direct Enrollment* (M=2.35, SD=1.801), *Exchange* (M=2.60, SD=1.776) and *Other* (M=1.88, SD=1.857) groups.

A one-way between groups analysis of variance revealed significant differences for the program providers [F(4, 162)=4.329, p=.002] at the p<.01 level for the item *Gym*. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for the *Direct Enrollment* group (M=2.94, SD=1.919) was significantly higher than the mean scores for the *CU Faculty* (M=1.77, SD=1.744), *Third Party* (M=2.29, SD=1.720), *Exchange* (M=2.90, SD=1.595) and *Other* (M=.88, SD=1.408) groups.

A one-way between groups analysis of variance revealed significant differences for the program providers [F(4, 160)=4.055, p=.004] at the p<.01 level for the item *Study Areas/Lounges*. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for the *Direct Enrollment* group (M=3.76, SD=1.200) was significantly higher than the mean scores for the *CU Faculty* (M=2.73, SD=1.671), *Third Party* (M=3.52, SD=1.321), *Exchange* (M=3.70, SD=.823) and *Other* (M=2.40, SD=1.844) groups.

A one-way between groups analysis of variance revealed significant differences for the program providers [F(4, 160)=2.734, p=.031] at the p<.05 level for the item

Internet in student rooms/residence halls. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for the *Exchange* group (M=2.80, SD=1.549) was significantly higher than the mean scores for the *CU Faculty* (M=1.51, SD=1.546), *Direct Enrollment* (M=2.00, SD=1.541), *Third Party* (M=2.31, SD=1.764) and *Other* (M=1.75, SD=1.342) groups.

Overall Study Abroad Experience. Nearly all (86.5%) of participants said that this was their first experience in the particular country that they studied. Almost half (47.3%) of the participants reported that they spent less than one quarter of their time abroad with students and friends from the host country. Another 23.7% of participants reported that they spent 25-50% of their time with students and peers from the host country.

When students rated their overall study abroad experience, 95.3% of the participants reported that they were *Very Satisfied* or *Satisfied* with the program location. Over eighty percent (81.6%) of participants reported they were *Very Satisfied* or *Satisfied* with the program director or site coordinator. Eighty-one percent said that they were *Very Satisfied* or *Satisfied* with the program cost; they felt it was a good value for the money. Almost eighty percent (78.6%) of the participants reported that they were *Very Satisfied* or *Satisfied* with the program itinerary. Also, 78.6% of participants were reported they were *Very Satisfied* or *Satisfied* with the academic work load of their program. And 77.4% said they were *Very Satisfied* or *Satisfied* with the excursions and field trips included in their program. Three-fourths (75.4%) were satisfied with their living arrangements. Almost seventy percent (69.7%) of the participants reported that they were *Very Satisfied* or *Satisfied* with the orientation and preparation for their study

abroad program. Sixty-three percent (63.1%) of participants were *Very Satisfied* or *Satisfied* with the support they received during their study abroad program. Sixty percent (60.7%) said that they were *Very Satisfied* or *Satisfied* with the meal arrangements during their program. Just over half (58.9%) were satisfied with the assistance they received in choosing a study abroad program. Less than half (45.8%) of the participants reported being *Very Satisfied* or *Satisfied* with the language training that was part of their study abroad experience. And, only 38.7% of participants reported that they were *Very Satisfied* or *Satisfied* with the support they received after they returned from their study abroad program, while 19.3% were *Dissatisfied* or *Very Dissatisfied*.

There were significant differences between groups for six of the thirteen *Overall Study Abroad Experience* items (See Table 4.10). A one-way between groups analysis of variance revealed significant differences for the program providers [$F(4, 162)=3.172$, $p=.015$] at the $p<.05$ level for the item *Support during my study abroad program*. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for the *CU Faculty* group ($M=3.96$, $SD=1.071$) was significantly higher than the mean scores for the *Third Party* ($M=3.47$, $SD=1.276$), *Direct Enrollment* ($M=3.41$, $SD=1.121$), *Exchange* ($M=2.90$, $SD=.994$) and *Other* ($M=3.38$, $SD=1.147$) groups.

A one-way between groups analysis of variance revealed significant differences for the program providers [$F(4, 162)=3.483$, $p=.009$] at the $p<.01$ level for the item *Program Director/Site Coordinator*. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for the *CU Faculty* group ($M=4.23$, $SD=1.047$) was significantly higher than the mean scores for the *Third Party* ($M=4.22$, $SD=.941$), *Direct*

Enrollment (M=2.82, SD=2.007), *Exchange* (M=3.60, SD=1.776) and *Other* (M=3.88, SD=1.455) groups.

A one-way between groups analysis of variance revealed significant differences for the program providers [F(4, 162)=5.941, p=.000] at the p<.01 level for the item *Program Itinerary*. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for the *Third Party* group (M=4.20, SD=.979) was significantly higher than the mean scores for the *CU Faculty* (M=4.09, SD=1.141), *Direct Enrollment* (M=3.18, SD=1.667), *Exchange* (M=2.50, SD=1.958) and *Other* (M=3.50, SD=1.633) groups.

A one-way between groups analysis of variance revealed significant differences for the program providers [F(4, 162)=2.972, p=.021] at the p<.05 level for the item *Meal arrangements*. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for the *CU Faculty* group (M=3.67, SD=1.245) was significantly higher than the mean scores for the *Third Party* (M=3.55, SD=1.555), *Direct Enrollment* (M=2.35, SD=1.835), *Exchange* (M=3.20, SD=1.687) and *Other* (M=3.44, SD=1.459) groups.

A one-way between groups analysis of variance revealed significant differences for the program providers [F(4, 162)=3.668, p=.007] at the p<.01 level for the item *Language training*. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for the *Third Party* group (M=3.43, SD=1.803) was significantly higher than the mean scores for the *CU Faculty* (M=2.65, SD=1.805), *Direct Enrollment* (M=1.65, SD=1.835), *Exchange* (M=2.30, SD=1.767) and *Other* (M=2.25, SD=2.176) groups.

A one-way between groups analysis of variance revealed significant differences for the program providers [F(4, 162)=6.374, p=.000] at the p<.01 level for the item

Excursions/Field Trips. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for the *Third Party* group (M=4.14, SD=1.339) was significantly higher than the mean scores for the *CU Faculty* (M=4.03, SD=1.507), *Direct Enrollment* (M=2.41, SD=1.938), *Exchange* (M=2.40, SD=2.119) and *Other* (M=3.69, SD=1.621) groups.

Reentry. Nearly all (95.2%) of the participants reported that as a result of studying abroad they had an increased desire to travel, live and/or work abroad in the future. Over ninety percent (90.5%) of participants reported that they would recommend their program to another student or friend. Almost ninety percent (88.6%) said that their personal expectations of the program were fulfilled. Seventy percent of the participants reported that they would be interested in going abroad again through one of the programs available at CU. While almost half (46.1%) of participants reported experiencing reentry culture shock after returning home from abroad, almost half (46.1%) said that their study abroad experience changed their academic objectives and career interests.

Almost forty percent (39.4%) of the participants reported that the courses that they took abroad fulfilled a requirement for their major or minor. Fifteen percent (15.2%) of participants reported that the courses that they took abroad fulfilled a requirement for their major or minor and an elective, while 12.7% said that the courses fulfilled a requirement for an elective credit.

A one-way between groups analysis of variance revealed significant differences for the program providers [F(4, 159)=2.981, p=.021] at the p<.05 level for the item *I have experienced reentry culture shock since returning home from abroad.* Post-hoc

comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for the *Direct Enrollment* group (M=3.65, SD=1.412) was significantly higher than the mean scores for the *CU Faculty* (M=2.73, SD=1.338), *Third Party* (M=3.38, SD=1.226), *Exchange* (M=3.60, SD=1.265) and *Other* (M=3.06, SD=1.652) groups (See Table 4.11).

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS

Discussion

It was expected by the researcher that differences would be found between the types of programs for some or all of the program components and indeed this was the case. The results revealed statistically significant differences for items within all of the program component variables except for the *Study Abroad Office predeparture* variable. It seems as though participants had similar experiences (prior to their departure) with the Study Abroad Office across all types of programs.

That was not true for any of the other variables, however. In fact, third party program participants reported having the most organized excursions and field trips, and that these excursions and field trips allowed them the most interaction with host nationals. Additionally, third party participants reported having the most opportunity to travel away from their program location outside of the travel that was part of their program. Third party participants also reported that studying abroad increased their interest in language learning more than any of the other programs. And, they were the most satisfied with the site coordinator's knowledge about the program location and organization and efficiency. Furthermore, third party program participants were the most satisfied with the medical and counseling facilities available to them. Finally, when it came to the overall study abroad experience, third party participants were the most satisfied with the program itinerary, language training, and excursions and field trips.

Direct enrollment program participants reported being the most satisfied with the condition of their housing. Additionally, direct enrollment participants reported that extracurricular activities allowed them to interact with host nationals more than any of the other programs. Direct enrollment students also reported having gained the greatest sense of independence and self-confidence as a result of studying abroad. And, they were the most satisfied with the gym facilities and services, as well as the study areas and student lounges. Along with this, though, direct enrollment program participants reported experiencing the most culture shock upon returning home from abroad.

CU Faculty program participants reported that the excursions and field trips that were part of their program were relevant to their coursework more than any of the other programs. Additionally, CU Faculty participants were the most satisfied with the site coordinator's availability and responsiveness and dedication to their success. CU Faculty program students also reported the most support during their study abroad program. And, they were the most satisfied with the program director/site coordinator as well as the meal arrangements.

When it came to the financial aid process, participants in the exchange programs reportedly had the best experience. Exchange program participants also reported that studying abroad helped them to recognize the importance of language in cultural contexts more than any of the other programs. Additionally, they were the most satisfied with the bookstore and library facilities and services available to them. And, exchange students were the most satisfied with the availability of internet in the student rooms and residence halls.

Finally, participants of *Other* programs reported that the excursions and field trips contributed to their cultural understanding of the host country more than any of the other programs.

Clearly, the third party programs had the most of the highest mean scores across the items. However, and not surprisingly, the majority of these items were more related to the program services and offerings for which these programs are touted than the acquisition of cultural capital. The fact that third party participants reported that field trips and excursions gave them more opportunity than the other programs to interact with host nationals may reflect that the time on those excursions and field trips was the only time that the participants spent with host nationals. Participants of third party programs also indicated the most increased interest in language learning, which suggests that this either was not a part of their program and they found that language skills would have been helpful, or perhaps this was their first experience with learning a new language. Likewise, as the third party participants rated the language training as highest, this may reflect that these participants either were or were not specifically participating in their particular program for the language component.

In contrast, exchange program participants reported that studying abroad helped them to recognize the importance of language in cultural contexts. During their experience abroad, exchange students must be independent and assertive, and the ability to communicate undoubtedly plays a role in their experience as these programs provide less of a cultural bubble for students. They must either sink or swim.

Direct enrollment participants, not surprisingly, seem to have acquired the most cultural capital. They not only reported that extracurricular activities allowed them the most interaction with host nationals, but direct enrollment students also reported having gained the greatest sense of independence and self-confidence as a result of studying abroad. In fact, perhaps the most telling indicator of their cultural capital accumulation is that they reported experiencing the most culture shock upon returning home from abroad.

CU Faculty program participants were consistently pleased by the dedication, organization, and support of the program director or site coordinator. Though these programs may not have clear indicators of being the best mode of cultural capital acquisition, these findings are a testament to the efforts on the part of the faculty that coordinate study abroad programs in bridging the cultural divide for students that might not otherwise have discovered the benefits of studying abroad.

These findings will not only help the Office of International Affairs to identify reported program and services strengths and weaknesses, but this information can also be used to systematically investigate program offerings further. Other benefits of this study included allowing students to share their experiences as study abroad participants and world travelers, which can be shared with future and potential study abroad participants.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Study Abroad Program—Pre-Departure Evaluation Survey

As study abroad participants, you are the most valuable resource that future study abroad participants need in order to make informed decisions about their study abroad choices. Please take a few minutes to complete this survey candidly so as to provide the best information possible to the study abroad staff and future study abroad participants. The information from this survey will be used to improve the study abroad experience.

(1) Gender

- Male
- Female

(2) Race/Ethnicity (optional)

- African-American
- Asian American or Pacific Islander
- Caucasian, Non-Hispanic
- Hispanic
- Native American/Native Alaskan
- Multi-Racial
- Other (please specify):_____

(3) Class level (at the time of study abroad)

- Freshman
- Sophomore
- Junior
- Senior
- Graduate
- Other (please specify):_____

(4) Academic College/Program

- Agriculture, Forestry and Life Sciences
- Architecture, Arts and Humanities
- Business and Behavioral Science
- Calhoun Honors College
- Engineering and Science
- Health Education and Human Development
- Other (please specify):_____

(5) Academic Major:_____

(6) Academic Minor (if applicable):_____

(7) Program Dates

- Summer 2007
- Fall 2007
- Spring 2008
- Academic Year 2007-2008

(8) Program Location

City, Country (Please specify): _____

(9) Is your study abroad program a...

- Clemson University or faculty-led program
- Third party provider program—Study Abroad companies and colleges or universities other than CU that arrange your trip, including accommodations and excursions (Ex: CEA, Study Abroad Italy, Boston University)
- Exchange program—participation in a program at a foreign university that where you will pay CU tuition
- Direct Enrollment—programs in which you are pay tuition to the foreign institution

(10) Is this your first experience traveling abroad?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

(11) If no, was your previous travel abroad for

- Study
- Work
- Volunteer
- Leisure
- Other (Please specify): _____

Please answer the following questions using the following scale:

- Very Satisfied
- Satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

To what extent are you satisfied with the following study abroad pre-departure components?

(12) Availability of information

- Very Satisfied
- Satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

(13) Accessibility of forms/documents

- Very Satisfied
- Satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

(14) Assistance from Study Abroad Staff

- Very Satisfied
- Satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Dissatisfied

- Very dissatisfied

(15) Assistance from Clemson Faculty or Third Party Program

- Very Satisfied
 Satisfied
 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
 Dissatisfied
 Very dissatisfied

(16) Pre-departure Orientation

- Very Satisfied
 Satisfied
 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
 Dissatisfied
 Very dissatisfied

(17) Is there anything about the pre-departure process that you are particularly satisfied or dissatisfied with that was not mentioned above? If so, please explain.

(18) What was your primary source of information about your study abroad program? (Please check one)

- Clemson University Study Abroad Office Staff
 Clemson University Faculty
 Third Party Program Sponsor
 Website
 Other (please specify):_____

(19) What do you feel will be the most important benefit of participating in a study abroad program? (Please check one)

- Increased level of foreign language proficiency
 Increased knowledge in my major area of study
 A broadened intellectual perspective
 Cross culture adaptability
 More employment opportunities
 Other (please specify):_____

Please answer the following questions according to the following scale:

- Very Great Extent
 To Some Extent
 A Small Extent
 Not At All

To what extent were the following instrumental in your decision to study abroad:

(20) Informational posters/pamphlets

- Very Great Extent
 To Some Extent
 A Small Extent

Not At All

(21) Informational table or booth at a campus fair/festival

- Very Great Extent
- To Some Extent
- A Small Extent
- Not At All

(22) Presentations by Study Abroad Office faculty/staff

- Very Great Extent
- To Some Extent
- A Small Extent
- Not At All

(23) Presentations by study abroad program alumni

- Very Great Extent
- To Some Extent
- A Small Extent
- Not At All

(24) E-mails from the Study Abroad Office/Program to the entire student population

- Very Great Extent
- To Some Extent
- A Small Extent
- Not At All

(25) Link to the Study Abroad Office on the university's front door website

- Very Great Extent
- To Some Extent
- A Small Extent
- Not At All

To what extent were the following instrumental in your choice of study abroad program:

(26) Informational posters/pamphlets

- Very Great Extent
- To Some Extent
- A Small Extent
- Not At All

(27) Informational table or booth at a campus fair/festival

- Very Great Extent
- To Some Extent
- A Small Extent
- Not At All

(28) Presentations by Study Abroad Office faculty/staff

- Very Great Extent
- To Some Extent
- A Small Extent
- Not At All

(29) Presentations by study abroad program alumni

- Very Great Extent
- To Some Extent
- A Small Extent
- Not At All

(30) E-mails from the Study Abroad Office/Program to the entire student population

- Very Great Extent
- To Some Extent
- A Small Extent
- Not At All

(31) Link to the Study Abroad Office on the university's front door website

- Very Great Extent
- To Some Extent
- A Small Extent
- Not At All

To what extent were the following barriers to your ability to participate in a study abroad program:

(32) Lack of information about study abroad

- Very Great Extent
- To Some Extent
- A Small Extent
- Not At All

(33) Cost of study abroad programs

- Very Great Extent
- To Some Extent
- A Small Extent
- Not At All

(34) Access to financial aid

- Very Great Extent
- To Some Extent
- A Small Extent
- Not At All

(35) Peer pressure

- Very Great Extent
- To Some Extent
- A Small Extent
- Not At All

(36) Study abroad credit not counted toward degree requirements

- Very Great Extent
- To Some Extent
- A Small Extent
- Not At All

(37) Lack of foreign language competence

- Very Great Extent
- To Some Extent

- A Small Extent
- Not At All

(38) General public apathy in the U.S. about study abroad

- Very Great Extent
- To Some Extent
- A Small Extent
- Not At All

(39) Family reluctance

- Very Great Extent
- To Some Extent
- A Small Extent
- Not At All

(40) Health, safety and security issue

- Very Great Extent
- To Some Extent
- A Small Extent
- Not At All
- Other (please specify): _____

Appendix B

Study Abroad Program Evaluation

The following survey has been included for the purposes of content only. The actual survey is active online and can be accessed at the following web address:

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=qbPtdeOrTt8lv2pnPIIwEQ_3d_3d



Study Abroad Program Evaluation

As study abroad participants, you are the most valuable resource that future study abroad participants need in order to make informed decisions about their study abroad choices. Please take a few minutes to complete this survey candidly so as to provide the best information possible to the study abroad staff and future study abroad participants. The information from this survey is confidential and will be used to improve the study abroad experience.

This survey will take approximately 15 minutes to complete.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Gender

- Male
- Female

2. Race/Ethnicity (optional)

- African-American
- Asian American or Pacific Islander
- Caucasian, Non-Hispanic
- Hispanic
- Native American/Native Alaskan
- Multi-Racial
- Other (please specify): _____

3. Class level (at the time of study abroad)

- Freshman
- Sophomore
- Junior
- Senior
- Graduate
- Other (please specify): _____

4. Academic College/Program at CU

- Agriculture, Forestry and Life Sciences
- Architecture, Arts and Humanities
- Business and Behavioral Science
- Calhoun Honors College

- Engineering and Science
- Health Education and Human Development
- Other (please specify):_____

5. **Academic Major:**_____

6. **Academic Minor (if applicable):**_____

7. **Program Dates (Please specify Semester and Year. Ex: Fall 2007):**_____

8. **Program Location**

City, Country (Please specify):_____

9. **Program provider**

- CU Faculty
- Third Party--Please specify (USAC, AIFS, CES, etc.):_____
- Exchange—Please specify:_____
- Direct Enrollment—Please specify:_____
- Other—Please specify:_____

PRE-DEPARTURE

10. **I first found out about this study abroad program via**

- Informational Flyer/Poster
- Study Abroad Office
- Study Abroad Website
- Study Abroad Fair
- CU Faculty Member
- Freshman/Transfer Student Orientation
- Former Participant/Friend
- Other—Please specify:_____

11. **My primary reason for participating in this program was (Check only one)**

- Fulfill academic requirements in my major
- Begin or continue study of a foreign language
- Improve my career prospects
- Gain a sense of independence/self-confidence
- See new places/learn about other cultures
- Gain another perspective on the U.S.

12. **I feel that this objective was accomplished by studying abroad.**

- Yes
- No

13. **Why or why not?**_____

14. **Previous experience abroad: (check all that apply)**

- Travel
- Study
- Volunteer
- Lived
- Other—Please specify:_____

No Previous Experience Abroad

15. If the host country language was not English, before studying abroad I had completed ___ college-level courses in the host country language.

- 0-1
- 2-3
- More than 3
- I was fluent in the host country language.
- N/A (if host country language is English)

16. I met with a financial aid officer prior to going abroad.

- Yes
- No

17. I received financial aid for my study abroad experience.

- Yes
- No

Please answer the following questions using the following scale:

Excellent	Good	Average	Fair	Poor	N/A
○	○	○	○	○	○

18. When considering the PRE-DEPARTURE study abroad experience, please rate the assistance you received from the Office of International Affairs Study Abroad Office.

Pre-departure	Excellent	Good	Average	Fair	Poor	N/A
Program advising/assistance	○	○	○	○	○	○
Pre-departure Orientation	○	○	○	○	○	○
Program materials I was given	○	○	○	○	○	○
Overall service	○	○	○	○	○	○

19. If you participated in a CU Faculty-led program (otherwise skip to question 20), when considering the PRE-DEPARTURE study abroad experience, please rate the assistance you received from the CU Faculty Site Coordinator.

Pre-departure	Excellent	Good	Average	Fair	Poor	N/A
Program advising/assistance	○	○	○	○	○	○
Pre-departure Orientation	○	○	○	○	○	○
Program materials I was given	○	○	○	○	○	○
Overall service	○	○	○	○	○	○

Please answer the following questions using the following scale:

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
<input type="radio"/>					

20. When considering the FINANCIAL AID process for study abroad, to what extent do you agree/disagree with the following?

Financial Aid	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
I received my funding in a timely manner.	<input type="radio"/>					
The financial aid process went smoothly.	<input type="radio"/>					

21. Before going abroad, I wish I had known about or been more prepared for...

ABROAD EXPERIENCE

22. This was my first experience in this particular country.

- Yes
- No

23. My program of study was

- Strictly language study
- Thematic (i.e. business, art, etc.)
- Language/literature/culture/history
- Variety of subjects

24. The courses that I took abroad were taught in

- English
- Host country language (please specify): _____
- Both English and the host country language
- Other (please specify): _____

25. My program included __ excursions/field trips.

- 0
- 1-2
- 3-4
- 5 or more

26. The excursions/field trips that were a part of the program were required.

- Yes
- No
- Some were required, some were not required.

27. Housing was provided by my study abroad program.

- Yes
- No

28. The type of housing I lived in abroad was

- Home stay

- Apartment
- Dorm
- Hotel
- Other—Please specify: _____

29. I spent __ percentage of my time abroad with students/friends from my host country?

- < 25%
- 25%-50%
- 50%-75%
- > 75%

Please answer the following questions using the following scale:

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
○	○	○	○	○	○

30. When considering your HOUSING for study abroad, to what extent do you agree/disagree with the following?

Housing	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
I was satisfied with the condition of my housing.	○	○	○	○	○	○
My housing arrangements gave me the opportunity to interact with host country students/peers.	○	○	○	○	○	○
My housing enhanced my study abroad/cultural experience.	○	○	○	○	○	○

31. When considering the EXCURSIONS/FIELD TRIPS during your study abroad experience, to what extent do you agree/disagree with the following?

Excursions/Field Trips	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
The excursions/field trips were well organized.	○	○	○	○	○	○
The excursions/field trips contributed to my cultural understanding of the host country.	○	○	○	○	○	○
The excursions/field trips allowed me to interact with host nationals.	○	○	○	○	○	○
Excluding mandatory travel for courses, I had the opportunity to travel away from my study site.	○	○	○	○	○	○
The excursions/field trips that were part of the program were relevant to my coursework.	○	○	○	○	○	○
I would have preferred FEWER excursions/field trips and MORE free time.	○	○	○	○	○	○

32. When considering the EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES during your study abroad experience, to what extent do you agree/disagree with the following?

Extra-curricular Activities	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
I participated in activities such as watching host country television, reading host country newspapers, having meals and traveling with host country nationals.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				
I was helped by the site coordinator to find extra-curricular activities.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				
Extra-curricular activities contributed to my cultural understanding of the host country.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				
Extra-curricular activities allowed me to interact with host nationals.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				

33. When considering the ACADEMIC EXPERIENCE abroad, to what extent do you agree/disagree with the following?

Academic Experience	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
Before studying abroad, I was interested in the subject matter of the course(s) that I took while abroad.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				
The overall academic quality of the program abroad was comparable to the quality received at CU.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				
In comparison to courses at CU, the courses I took abroad were equally challenging.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				
In comparison to courses at CU, the quality of the instructor(s) abroad was comparable to the quality received at CU.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				
Studying abroad helped me to develop an understanding of world cultures in historical and contemporary perspectives.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				
Studying abroad helped me to recognize the importance of language in cultural contexts.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				
I was adequately prepared for the language aspect of the program.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				
As a result of the program, my language skills have improved.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				

34. When considering your INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT while abroad, to what extent do you agree/disagree with the following?

Individual Development	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
I gained a better insight into myself as a result of studying abroad.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				
I have gained a greater sense of independence and self-confidence as a result of studying abroad.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				
Studying abroad increased my interest in social issue and world events.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				
Studying abroad increased my interest in language learning.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				
As a result of studying abroad, I am more receptive to different ideas and ways of seeing the world.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				
Studying abroad increased my ability to adapt to new situations and surroundings.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				
Studying abroad has given me a new perspective on my own country.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				

Please answer the following questions using the following scale:

Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	N/A
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				

35. Please rate your satisfaction with the SITE COORDINATOR in the following areas: (For CU Faculty-led programs, the Site Coordinator is the Faculty leader. For third party or exchange programs, the Site Coordinator is the Program Director for your particular program or at your host institution.)

Site Coordinator	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	N/A
Knowledge about the program location	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				
Organization/Efficiency	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				
Availability/Responsiveness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				
Dedication to your success	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				

36. Is there anything about the SITE COORDINATOR that you are particularly satisfied or dissatisfied with that was not mentioned above? If so, please explain. _____

37. Please rate your satisfaction with the following FACILITIES AND SERVICES available to you abroad:

Facilities and Services	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	N/A
Bookstore/Library	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				
Medical/Counseling Facilities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				
Computer Facilities/Email	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				

Medical Facilities	<input type="radio"/>					
Travel Agency	<input type="radio"/>					
Gym	<input type="radio"/>					
Study Areas/Lounges	<input type="radio"/>					
Internet in Student Rooms/Residence Halls	<input type="radio"/>					

38. Please list any FACILITIES OR SERVICES that were not available to you abroad that you would recommend? _____

39. When considering the OVERALL STUDY ABROAD EXPERIENCE, to what extent were you satisfied/dissatisfied with the following?

Overall Study Abroad Experience	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	N/A
Assistance in choosing a study abroad program	<input type="radio"/>					
Orientation/preparation for my study abroad program	<input type="radio"/>					
Support during my study abroad program	<input type="radio"/>					
Support after I returned from my study abroad program	<input type="radio"/>					
Program Director/Site Coordinator	<input type="radio"/>					
Program itinerary	<input type="radio"/>					
Living arrangements	<input type="radio"/>					
Meal arrangements	<input type="radio"/>					
Program location	<input type="radio"/>					
Program cost—was it a good value for the money?	<input type="radio"/>					
Academic work load	<input type="radio"/>					
Language training	<input type="radio"/>					
Excursions/field trips	<input type="radio"/>					

40. Is there anything about the study abroad experience that you are particularly satisfied or dissatisfied with that was not mentioned above? If so, please explain. _____

WHEN YOU RETURNED

41. The course(s) that I took abroad fulfilled a requirement for...

- Major/Minor
- General education
- Elective
- No credit
- Unsure

Please answer the following questions using the following scale:

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
<input type="radio"/>					

42. When considering your reentry since returning home from abroad, to what extent do you agree/disagree with the following?

Reentry	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
My personal expectations of the program were fulfilled.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				
My study abroad experience changed my academic objectives/career interests.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				
As a result of studying abroad, I have an increased desire to travel/live/work abroad in the future.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				
I would recommend this program to another student/friend.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				
I have experienced reentry culture shock since returning home from abroad.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				
I would be interested in going abroad again through one of the programs available at CU.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				

43. Does this program reflect well on Clemson University? Why or why not? _____

44. What could we do to incorporate a greater international perspective in on-campus courses and activities? _____

If you would like to be contacted by the Office of International Affairs Study Abroad Office please provide the following contact information:

Name: _____

Email: _____

Thank you for your time and assistance in improving our programs and services! For questions or concerns regarding this survey, contact:

Clemson University Office of International Affairs
Study Abroad Office
 Clemson University
 E-309 Martin Hall
 Clemson, South Carolina 29634
 Phone: 864-656-2457
 Fax: 864-656-6468
 Email: abroad-L@clemson.edu
www.clemson.edu/IA

References:

- Clemson University Study Abroad Program Evaluation, Clemson University, 2005.
- Study Abroad Program Evaluation Survey, University of Pittsburgh.
- The Guide to Successful Short-term Programs Abroad*, NAFSA.
- Wheaton College Study Abroad Program Evaluation, Wheaton College, 2007.

Clemson University, July 2007

Appendix C

ANOVA Tables

Table 4.1 ANOVA for Study Abroad Office Pre-departure

Item	Program Provider	Mean	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p-value
<i>Study Abroad Office Pre-departure Orientation</i>	CU Faculty	3.52	10.714	4	2.678	1.306	.270
	Direct	3.61					
	Exchange	2.62					
	Third Party	3.29					
	Other	3.50					
<i>Study Abroad Office Pre-departure Program Materials</i>	CU Faculty	3.45	8.671	4	2.168	.970	.425
	Direct	3.56					
	Exchange	2.85					
	Third Party	3.60					
	Other	3.06					
<i>Study Abroad Office Pre-departure Overall Service</i>	CU Faculty	3.39	1.669	4	.417	.205	.935
	Direct	3.22					
	Exchange	3.15					
	Third Party	3.33					
	Other	3.11					

*Significant at the $p < .05$ level

**Significant at the $p < .01$ level

Table 4.2 ANOVA for Financial Aid

Item	Program Provider	Mean	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p-value
<i>I received my funding in a timely manner</i>	CU Faculty	1.43	43.145	4	10.786	2.985	.020*
	Direct	1.61					
	Exchange	3.15					
	Third Party	1.48					
	Other	2.33					
<i>The financial aid process went smoothly</i>	CU Faculty	1.45	38.492	4	9.623	2.620	.037*
	Direct	1.78					
	Exchange	3.08					
	Third Party	1.52					
	Other	2.33					

*Significant at the $p < .05$ level

**Significant at the $p < .01$ level

Table 4.3 ANOVA for Housing

Item	Program Provider	Mean	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p-value
<i>I was satisfied with the condition of my housing</i>	CU Faculty	3.95	14.786	4	3.696	2.973	.021*
	Direct	4.29					
	Exchange	2.90					
	Third Party	4.12					
	Other	3.81					
<i>My housing arrangements gave me the opportunity to interact with host country students/peers</i>	CU Faculty	3.14	13.873	4	3.468	1.627	.170
	Direct	3.71					
	Exchange	2.90					
	Third Party	3.67					
	Other	3.06					
<i>My housing enhanced my study abroad/cultural experience</i>	CU Faculty	3.73	10.903	4	2.726	1.592	.179
	Direct	4.24					
	Exchange	3.20					
	Third Party	3.98					
	Other	3.44					

*Significant at the p<.05 level

**Significant at the p<.01 level

Table 4.4 ANOVA for Excursions and Field Trips

Item	Program Provider	Mean	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p-value
<i>The excursions/field trips were well organized</i>	CU Faculty	3.79	59.439	4	14.860	5.382	.000**
	Direct	2.44					
	Exchange	1.90					
	Third Party	3.94					
	Other	3.38					
<i>The excursions/field trips contributed to my cultural understanding of the host country</i>	CU Faculty	3.99	83.505	4	20.876	7.506	.000**
	Direct	2.50					
	Exchange	1.40					
	Third Party	3.80					
	Other	4.00					
<i>The excursions/field trips allowed me to interact with host nationals</i>	CU Faculty	3.42	46.529	4	11.632	4.108	.003**
	Direct	2.38					
	Exchange	1.50					
	Third Party	3.43					
	Other	3.00					
<i>Excluding mandatory travel for courses, I had the opportunity to travel away from my study site</i>	CU Faculty	3.91	31.646	4	7.912	2.978	.021*
	Direct	4.19					
	Exchange	2.30					
	Third Party	4.21					
	Other	4.07					
<i>The excursions/field trips that were part of the program were relevant to my coursework</i>	CU Faculty	3.75	73.029	4	18.257	6.389	.000**
	Direct	2.00					
	Exchange	1.60					
	Third Party	3.08					
	Other	3.31					

<i>I would have preferred FEWER excursions/field trips and MORE free time</i>	CU Faculty	1.99	11.309	4	2.827	1.824	.127
	Direct	1.75					
	Exchange	0.90					
	Third Party	1.80					
	Other	1.63					

*Significant at the $p < .05$ level

**Significant at the $p < .01$ level

Table 4.5 ANOVA for Extracurricular Activities

Item	Program Provider	Mean	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p-value
<i>I participated in activities such as watching host country television, reading host country newspapers, having meals and traveling with host country nationals</i>	CU Faculty	3.90	4.782	4	1.195	.931	.448
	Direct	4.24					
	Exchange	3.90					
	Third Party	4.24					
	Other	4.19					
<i>I was helped by the site coordinator to find extra-curricular activities</i>	CU Faculty	3.00	6.474	4	1.619	.732	.571
	Direct	2.94					
	Exchange	2.90					
	Third Party	3.16					
	Other	2.44					
<i>Extra-curricular activities contributed to my cultural understanding of the host country</i>	CU Faculty	3.65	11.119	4	2.780	1.644	.166
	Direct	4.41					
	Exchange	4.10					
	Third Party	4.06					
	Other	4.00					
<i>Extra-curricular activities allowed me to interact with host nationals</i>	CU Faculty	3.45	22.346	4	5.586	3.452	.010**
	Direct	4.53					
	Exchange	4.30					
	Third Party	3.98					
	Other	3.75					

*Significant at the p<.05 level

**Significant at the p<.01 level

Table 4.6 ANOVA for Academic Experience

Item	Program Provider	Mean	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p-value
<i>The overall academic quality of the program abroad was comparable to the quality received at CU</i>	CU Faculty	3.83	4.863	4	1.216	.744	.563
	Direct	3.41					
	Exchange	3.40					
	Third Party	3.55					
	Other	3.81					
<i>In comparison to courses at CU, the courses I took abroad were equally challenging</i>	CU Faculty	3.23	.965	4	.241	.139	.967
	Direct	3.47					
	Exchange	3.20					
	Third Party	3.29					
	Other	3.19					
<i>In comparison to courses at CU, the quality of the instructor(s) abroad was comparable to the quality received at CU</i>	CU Faculty	3.64	4.210	4	1.052	.599	.664
	Direct	3.59					
	Exchange	3.20					
	Third Party	3.73					
	Other	4.00					
<i>Studying abroad helped me to develop an understanding of world cultures in historical and contemporary perspectives</i>	CU Faculty	4.50	1.186	4	.297	.511	.728
	Direct	4.35					
	Exchange	4.60					
	Third Party	4.39					
	Other	4.63					
<i>Studying abroad helped me to recognize the importance of language in cultural contexts</i>	CU Faculty	4.16	18.722	4	4.681	3.153	.016*
	Direct	3.24					
	Exchange	4.50					
	Third Party	4.41					
	Other	4.19					

*Significant at the $p < .05$ level

**Significant at the $p < .01$ level

Item	Program Provider	Mean	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p-value
<i>I was adequately prepared for the language aspect of the program</i>	CU Faculty	2.83	4.560	4	1.140	.385	.819
	Direct	2.35					
	Exchange	2.70					
	Third Party	2.94					
	Other	2.87					
<i>As a result of the program, my language skills have improved</i>	CU Faculty	3.04	22.612	4	5.653	1.639	.167
	Direct	2.53					
	Exchange	3.20					
	Third Party	3.71					
	Other	3.00					

*Significant at the $p < .05$ level

**Significant at the $p < .01$ level

Table 4.7 ANOVA for Individual Development

Item	Program Provider	Mean	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p-value
<i>I gained a better insight into myself as a result of studying abroad</i>	CU Faculty	4.37	2.908	4	.727	2.002	.097
	Direct	4.65					
	Exchange	4.60					
	Third Party	4.57					
	Other	4.75					
<i>I have gained a greater sense of independence and self-confidence as a result of studying abroad</i>	CU Faculty	4.45	4.818	4	1.204	4.097	.003**
	Direct	4.82					
	Exchange	4.80					
	Third Party	4.78					
	Other	4.81					
<i>Studying abroad increased my interest in social issues and world events</i>	CU Faculty	4.49	.617	4	.154	.324	.862
	Direct	4.53					
	Exchange	4.60					
	Third Party	4.43					
	Other	4.63					
<i>Studying abroad increased my interest in language learning</i>	CU Faculty	3.84	31.298	4	7.824	3.483	.009**
	Direct	2.59					
	Exchange	4.00					
	Third Party	4.14					
	Other	3.88					
<i>As a result of studying abroad, I am more receptive to different ideas and ways of seeing the world</i>	CU Faculty	4.47	.559	4	.140	.371	.829
	Direct	4.35					
	Exchange	4.60					
	Third Party	4.53					
	Other	4.50					
<i>Studying abroad increased my ability to adapt to new situations and surroundings</i>	CU Faculty	4.60	1.507	4	.377	1.633	.168
	Direct	4.65					
	Exchange	4.60					
	Third Party	4.82					
	Other	4.63					

*Significant at the $p < .05$ level

**Significant at the $p < .01$ level

Item	Program Provider	Mean	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p-value
<i>Studying abroad has given me a new perspective on my own country</i>	CU Faculty	4.53	.383	4	.096	.263	.901
	Direct	4.47					
	Exchange	4.60					
	Third Party	4.61					
	Other	4.50					

*Significant at the $p < .05$ level

**Significant at the $p < .01$ level

Table 4.8 ANOVA for Site Coordinator

Item	Program Provider	Mean	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p-value
<i>Knowledge about the program location</i>	CU Faculty	4.25	45.962	4	11.490	7.848	.000**
	Direct	2.71					
	Exchange	3.40					
	Third Party	4.45					
	Other	3.94					
<i>Organization/Efficiency</i>	CU Faculty	3.95	29.668	4	7.417	4.487	.002**
	Direct	2.65					
	Exchange	3.30					
	Third Party	4.00					
	Other	3.50					
<i>Availability/Responsiveness</i>	CU Faculty	4.25	36.736	4	9.184	5.880	.000**
	Direct	2.76					
	Exchange	3.30					
	Third Party	4.12					
	Other	3.81					
<i>Dedication to your success</i>	CU Faculty	4.24	44.766	4	11.191	7.120	.000**
	Direct	2.76					
	Exchange	3.00					
	Third Party	4.20					
	Other	3.56					

*Significant at the $p < .05$ level

**Significant at the $p < .01$ level

Table 4.9 ANOVA for Facilities and Services

Item	Program Provider	Mean	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p-value
<i>Bookstore/Library</i>	CU Faculty	2.29	45.917	4	11.479	4.100	.003**
	Direct	3.59					
	Exchange	4.00					
	Third Party	2.96					
	Other	2.56					
<i>Medical/Counseling Facilities</i>	CU Faculty	1.84	43.336	4	10.834	3.556	.008**
	Direct	2.41					
	Exchange	2.70					
	Third Party	2.94					
	Other	1.69					
<i>Computer Facilities/Email</i>	CU Faculty	3.29	11.986	4	2.996	1.962	.103
	Direct	4.00					
	Exchange	3.80					
	Third Party	3.78					
	Other	3.38					
<i>Travel Agency</i>	CU Faculty	1.93	27.402	4	6.851	1.976	.101
	Direct	2.88					
	Exchange	2.70					
	Third Party	2.76					
	Other	2.19					
<i>Gym</i>	CU Faculty	1.77	51.166	4	12.792	4.329	.002**
	Direct	2.94					
	Exchange	2.90					
	Third Party	2.29					
	Other	0.88					

*Significant at the p<.05 level

**Significant at the p<.01 level

Item	Program Provider	Mean	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p-value
<i>Study Areas/Lounges</i>	CU Faculty	2.73	37.044	4	9.261	4.055	.004**
	Direct	3.76					
	Exchange	3.70					
	Third Party	3.52					
	Other	2.40					
<i>Internet in Student Rooms/Residence Halls</i>	CU Faculty	1.51	27.849	4	6.962	2.734	.031*
	Direct	2.00					
	Exchange	2.80					
	Third Party	2.31					
	Other	1.75					

*Significant at the $p < .05$ level

**Significant at the $p < .01$ level

Table 4.10 ANOVA for Overall SA Experience

Item	Program Provider	Mean	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p-value
<i>Assistance in choosing a study abroad program</i>	CU Faculty	3.49	4.393	4	1.098	.592	.669
	Direct	3.65					
	Exchange	3.30					
	Third Party	3.22					
	Other	3.44					
<i>Orientation/preparation for my study abroad program</i>	CU Faculty	3.91	6.261	4	1.565	1.481	.210
	Direct	3.53					
	Exchange	3.60					
	Third Party	3.49					
	Other	3.56					
<i>Support during my study abroad program</i>	CU Faculty	3.96	16.591	4	4.148	3.172	.015*
	Direct	3.41					
	Exchange	2.90					
	Third Party	3.47					
	Other	3.38					
<i>Support after I returned from my study abroad program</i>	CU Faculty	3.32	6.471	4	1.618	1.085	.366
	Direct	2.94					
	Exchange	2.90					
	Third Party	2.90					
	Other	3.06					
<i>Program Director/Site Coordinator</i>	CU Faculty	4.23	31.678	4	7.920	5.167	.001**
	Direct	2.82					
	Exchange	3.60					
	Third Party	4.22					
	Other	3.88					
<i>Program itinerary</i>	CU Faculty	4.09	38.328	4	9.582	5.941	.000**
	Direct	3.18					
	Exchange	2.50					
	Third Party	4.20					
	Other	3.50					

*Significant at the $p < .05$ level

**Significant at the $p < .01$ level

Table 4.10 ANOVA for Overall SA Experience (continued)

Item	Program Provider	Mean	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p-value
<i>Living arrangements</i>	CU Faculty	3.81	9.449	4	2.362	1.848	.122
	Direct	4.00					
	Exchange	3.50					
	Third Party	4.20					
	Other	3.50					
<i>Meal arrangements</i>	CU Faculty	3.67	25.108	4	6.277	2.972	.021*
	Direct	2.35					
	Exchange	3.20					
	Third Party	3.55					
	Other	3.44					
<i>Program location</i>	CU Faculty	4.57	1.526	4	.382	.878	.478
	Direct	4.47					
	Exchange	4.40					
	Third Party	4.69					
	Other	4.75					
<i>Program cost—was it a good value for the money?</i>	CU Faculty	4.09	6.570	4	1.642	1.483	.210
	Direct	4.06					
	Exchange	4.20					
	Third Party	4.22					
	Other	3.50					
<i>Academic work load</i>	CU Faculty	3.79	6.104	4	1.526	1.182	.321
	Direct	3.65					
	Exchange	3.80					
	Third Party	4.18					
	Other	3.88					

*Significant at the $p < .05$ level

**Significant at the $p < .01$ level

Table 4.10 ANOVA for Overall SA Experience (continued)

Item	Program Provider	Mean	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p-value
<i>Language training</i>	CU Faculty	2.65	49.803	4	12.451	3.668	.007**
	Direct	1.65					
	Exchange	2.30					
	Third Party	3.43					
	Other	2.25					
<i>Excursions/field trips</i>	CU Faculty	4.03	61.990	4	15.498	6.374	.000**
	Direct	2.41					
	Exchange	2.40					
	Third Party	4.14					
	Other	3.69					

*Significant at the $p < .05$ level

**Significant at the $p < .01$ level

Table 4.11 ANOVA for Reentry

Item	Program Provider	Mean	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p-value
<i>My personal expectations of the program were fulfilled</i>	CU Faculty	4.20	3.847	4	.962	1.123	.347
	Direct	4.29					
	Exchange	3.90					
	Third Party	4.48					
	Other	4.31					
<i>My study abroad experience changed my academic objectives/career interests</i>	CU Faculty	3.19	7.733	4	1.933	1.187	.319
	Direct	3.53					
	Exchange	2.70					
	Third Party	3.27					
	Other	2.75					
<i>As a result of studying abroad, I have an increased desire to travel/live/work abroad in the future</i>	CU Faculty	4.59	.732	4	.183	.437	.782
	Direct	4.76					
	Exchange	4.50					
	Third Party	4.58					
	Other	4.50					
<i>I would recommend this program to another student/friend</i>	CU Faculty	4.60	1.860	4	.465	.587	.673
	Direct	4.53					
	Exchange	4.20					
	Third Party	4.50					
	Other	4.38					
<i>I have experienced reentry culture shock since returning home from abroad</i>	CU Faculty	2.73	21.518	4	5.380	2.981	.021*
	Direct	3.65					
	Exchange	3.60					
	Third Party	3.38					
	Other	3.06					

<i>I would be interested in going abroad again through one of the programs available at CU</i>	CU Faculty	4.08	17.982	4	4.496	2.078	.086
	Direct	3.53					
	Exchange	3.80					
	Third Party	3.38					
	Other	3.38					

*Significant at the $p < .05$ level

**Significant at the $p < .01$ level

REFERENCES

- Berquist, B., Sonntag-Krupp, R., & Zenatti-Daniels, E. (2007). GS-414: Tools for quality assurance in administering international exchange-AQUARIUS. *Practical handbook for quality assurance in international student exchange*, 1-11.
- Bonvillian, G. & Nowlin, W. (1994). Cultural awareness: An essential element of doing business abroad. *Business Horizons*, 37, 44-50.
- Byram, M. and Feng, A. (2006). Living and studying abroad: research and practice. United States: Multilingual Matters.
- Camp, R. (2005). Deepening scholarship through study abroad. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 12, 157-159.
- Chieffo, L. & Griffiths, L. (2003). What's a month worth? Student perceptions of what they learned abroad. *International Educator*, ??, 26-31.
- DiBiasio, D. and Mello, N. (2004). Multilevel assessment of program outcomes: Assessing a nontraditional study abroad program in the engineering disciplines. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 10, 237-252.
- Dwyer, M. (2004). More is better: The impact of study abroad program duration. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 10, 151-163.
- Engle, L., & Engle, J. (2003). Study abroad levels: Towards a classification of program types. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 9, 1-20.
- Farrell, E. F. (2007). Study abroad blossoms into big business. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 54, A49.
- Freed, B. F., Segalowitz, N., & Dewey, D. P. (2004). Context of learning and second language fluency in French: Comparing regular classroom, study abroad, and intensive domestic immersion programs. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26, 275-302.
- Glossary of Education Abroad*, The Forum on Education Abroad Glossary Wiki, 2008. http://itech.dickinson.edu/forumea/index.php?title=IV._Education_Abroad_Program_Features_and_Types Retrieved 8 April 2008.
- Jackson, J. (2005). Assessing intercultural learning through introspective accounts. *Frontiers: The interdisciplinary journal of study abroad*, 11, 165-186.

- Kaufman, S., Eckstrom, D., & Shortridge-Baggett, L. (2006). Assessing international opportunities in higher education: A matrix-based assessment tool. *Frontiers: The interdisciplinary journal of study abroad*, 12, 23-42.
- McLaughlin, J. and Johnson, K. (2006). Assessing the field course experiential learning model: Transforming collegiate short-term study abroad experiences into rich learning environments. *Frontiers: The interdisciplinary journal of study abroad*, 12, 65-85.
- McCarthy, J. S. (2007). A roadmap for creating the global campus. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 53, B12.
- Mendelson, V. (2004). "Hindsight is 20/20:" Student perceptions of language learning and the study abroad experience. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 10, 43-63.
- Open Doors: Report on International Student Mobility*, Institute of International Education, 2007. www.opendoors.iienetwork.org Retrieved 13 Nov. 2007.
- Pallant, J. (2005). *SPSS survival manual*. New York: Open University Press.
- Peppas, S. (2005). Business study abroad tours for non-traditional students: an outcomes assessment. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 11, 143-163.
- Plog, S. & Sturman, M. (2005). The problems and challenges of working in international settings: A special topic issue of the Cornell Quarterly. *Cornell Hotel & Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 46, 116-124.
- Provenzo, E. (2008). Cultural Capital. In *Encyclopedia of the social and cultural foundations of education* (Vol. 1, p.209). United States: Sage.
- Redden, E. (2008). The assessment craze knows no boundaries. *Inside Higher Ed*, 2008. <http://insidehighered.com/news/2008/02/25/assessment> Retrieved 12 March 2008.
- Sidhu, R. (2005). Building a global schoolhouse: International education in Singapore. *Australian Journal of Education*, 49, 46-65.
- Talbert, S. and Stewart, M. (1999). What's the subject of study abroad?: Race, gender, and "living culture." *The Modern Language Journal*, 83, ii, 163-175.

- The Standards of Good Practice for Education Abroad*, The Forum on Education Abroad, 2007. http://www.forumea.org/documents/ForumonEducationAbroadStandardsOfGoodPractice3rdedition2007_001.pdf. Retrieved 2 Dec. 2007.
- Trochim, W. (2005). *Research methods: The concise knowledge base*. United States: Thomson.
- Vande Berg, M. J., Balkcum, A., Scheid, V., & Whalen, B. J. (2004). The Georgetown University consortium project: A report at the halfway mark. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 10, 101-116.
- Weininger, E. and Lareau, A. (2007). Cultural Capital. In *Encyclopedia of Sociology*. Ed. George Ritzer. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Wilkinson, S. (1995). *Foreign language conversation and the study abroad transition: A case study*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University.