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ABSTRACT

Globalization has become an important concept in social science studies and its many facets intensely influence our current economic, cultural, and political spheres. Many within the higher education realm believe that globalization is a converging force imposing itself on higher education institutions. However, some scholars believe globalization could also become a force to recover universities’ local characteristics. In a university context, study abroad programs are viewed as an important component of international activities on campus and have been increasingly advocated as a way to provide students with the knowledge and skills required for individuals and nation-states to compete in a global market—a direct linkage to globalization. On the other hand, study abroad programs are also bound in their specific local contexts and history. So, how do globalization and universities’ local contexts influence these study abroad programs?

This thesis is a comparative case study focusing on four North American universities’ study abroad programs. The project investigates why and how these programs are organized at the university level within the context of globalization and explores how the local and the global interplay to shape the arrangement of study abroad programs in universities.

The results of this study demonstrate that globalization forces some universities to be strategic players emphasizing internationalization as a direct response. In turn, such emphasis on internationalization enhances the development of study abroad programs in these universities. The desire to present students with the opportunities for developing cross-cultural communication skills also contributes to the development of study abroad programs. Yet the many facets of globalization also present challenges to study abroad programs. From influences of the economic aspect of globalization, the market ideology is creeping into the organizing process, raising the risk of losing these programs’ long-term educational integrity to satisfy
customer's needs. As travel costs make these programs more expensive, study abroad programs have to compete with other more cost-effective on-campus international activities for increasingly limited resources. From the perspective of a cultural version of globalization, the moving of people and ideas creates spaces for cultural exchange, and thus, adds the agenda of expanding certain ideological influences in some universities' study abroad programs. All these issues create a complex reality for the development of study abroad programs on university campuses. Further research on how the internationalization process influences the development of study abroad programs is needed to expand our understanding of impacts of economic globalization.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

This is a comparative study of four different North American universities' study abroad programs. The study looks at how these universities organize their study abroad programs and examines why these programs are organized in certain ways. The project explores how local and global factors shape the arrangements of study abroad programs at the university level.

Study Abroad Programs in Higher Education Institutions

Though the phenomenon of individual students studying in foreign institutions is not new in the field of higher education—tracing back to the Middle Ages when universities were first established in Europe (de Ridder-Symoens, 1992)—it was not until after the Second World War that large scale organized study abroad programs became popular. Nation-states as well as universities, especially in industrialized countries, started to rationalize activities of sending their own students to other countries in organized programs as a way to learn about other cultures and to enhance national security. Since the 1980s, under the intense influence of globalization, organized student mobility programs have come to be perceived by many as a way to provide students with the required knowledge and skills to compete in global markets. Thus, preparing students with knowledge of other countries, cultures, and languages is increasingly used as a rationale to develop institutional student mobility programs. Higher education institutions (HEIs) use such opportunities to advertise themselves in the market place. The availability of these programs has become one of the benchmarks used to demonstrate HEIs’ profile of offering a quality higher education experience.
Despite the importance of study abroad programs, there is no agreement on what the term really means. Terms such as “education abroad program” and “student mobility program” are often used interchangeably. A broad range of programs are categorized under study abroad program such as short-term travel studies, institutional exchange programs, and long-term immersion programs. However, it is possible to note some common characteristics among these programs: students are sent abroad for educational purposes under their home institutions’ arrangements. This is often undertaken as part of degree programs, thus granting students academic credit. The current study focuses on programs with these characteristics.

Numerous studies have been undertaken in the area of education abroad. At the macro level, there are discussions of the growth of study abroad programs, their various impacts on participants, their value to society, policy issues related to study abroad, educational cooperation across institutions and countries, and some discussions about research in the area. At the micro level, there are descriptions of specific programs, evaluations of study abroad programs, guides for students who want to participate in such programs, and discussions of various aspects of study abroad programs (e.g. language, curriculum, safety, host family, and intercultural competence issues).

Despite the general impression that education abroad is a very practical field and that some practical guides about organizing study abroad programs have been published (e.g. Liew and Mendis, 1996), few researchers actually deal with the basic question of how universities organize their study abroad programs at the institutional level. Most studies only focus on descriptions of specific programs rather than looking at the larger
institutional level (e.g. Koskinen and Tossavainen, 2004; Cooley, Cloutman, and Tasker, 1993).

Few studies explore why study abroad programs are set up in the ways they are. Even fewer studies examine the impacts of globalization and internationalization of HEIs on the ways study abroad programs are organized. Several questions arise here: has the process of globalization shaped the purpose of study abroad programs or has the study abroad field just latched on to another media popularized cliché (McCabe, 2001)? If globalization does influence the study abroad field, as many assume it does, how do institutional factors influence study abroad programs in the context of globalization? This study looks at how universities organize their study abroad programs and examines why these programs are organized in certain ways. It will clarify how the interplay between local and global processes impacts the organization of different universities’ study abroad programs.

**Context: Globalization and Study Abroad Programs**

*Local Responses to Globalization*

Globalization has become a buzzword. It is regarded as comprising multiple and drastic changes in all areas of social life, particularly in the realms of economy and culture (Stromquist & Monkman, 2000). Some scholars argue that globalization has become a more fully ‘emerged’ theory in the social sciences since the 1990s, and, in a very important sense, it follows debates on modernity and post-modernity in the understanding of sociocultural change (Featherstone & Lash, 1995).
There is no agreement regarding what globalization actually means. As Torres and Rhoads point out, "globalization has many manifestations that interact simultaneously in a fairly convoluted fashion" (2006, p. 8). Instead of using one notion of globalization, Torres and Rhoads (2006) present five possible forms of globalization: the "globalization from above," which is framed by the ideology of neoliberalism; the "globalization from below," which is manifested in individual and social movements against the first type of globalization with the motto of "no globalization without representation"; the globalization represented by the movement and exchange of people and ideas and the subsequent influence on culture; the globalization of human rights that emerges from increased international integration and pertains more to rights than to markets; and the globalization of the international war against terrorism. When discussing educational reforms, Davies and Guppy (1997) also mention two facets of globalization: the economic globalization that "stresses the imperatives of market competition and global capital in promoting a convergence of institutional arrangements among core nations, and thus among education systems" (p. 436) and the global rationalization that stresses the idea of a unitary cultural system. It is not the intention of this study to get into the theoretical debates regarding the many facets of globalization. Yet, the emphasis on at least two sides of globalization is particularly important for this study: economic globalization with its emphasis on a global free market, and cultural globalization triggered by the movement and exchange of people and ideas, which shapes many aspects of local life. While economic globalization may drive the organizing of study abroad programs in an increasingly commercial way and may, in a sense, dilute their educational objectives, cultural globalization may create more spaces for their further development.
Globalization theory has been applied to cover debates focusing on local/global issues (Stromquist & Monkman, 2000). The increasing influence of global markets as well as the rapid development and spread of new information and communication technology are changing the ways things are handled at the local level more dramatically than ever before in human history. Most advocates of the economic version of globalization see it as a single path of converging forces imposing itself on local, regional, and national communities (Newson, 1998). Within this context, because of the converging force of globalization, the world we are living in is experiencing a process of increasing homogeneity. Yet, as Davies and Guppy (1997) correctly point out, “globalizing forces also provoke reactions from movements seeking increased local control” (p. 458). Hence, the opposite argument can be made: rather than extinguishing local differences, globalization becomes a force for recovering locality, regionality, and the nation as meaningful and effective sites of social, cultural, political, and economic inventiveness (Newson, 1998). Perhaps the term “glocalization” used by Robertson (1995) expresses these processes best: Globalization –in the broadest sense– the compression of the world, is a process that has involved and increasingly involves the creation and the incorporation of locality, and such a process itself largely shapes, in turn, the compression of the world as a whole (Robertson, 1995). What exactly is going on at the local level? How does the local community respond to the seemingly unstoppable globalization?

*Higher Education Institutions and the Global Context*

Higher education institutions have been particularly influenced by globalization in its varied manifestations. As Stromquist and Monkman argue, “Globalization and its sophisticated use of technology implies a salient role for postsecondary education” (2000,
This can be observed in three crucial and interactive aspects, namely, technology, finance, and markets. The development of information and communication technology is one of the most important characteristics of globalization and it has significant impacts on higher education. In the current knowledge society driven by information and communication technology, information and knowledge are easily codified and manipulated to meet a multitude of needs and to be transmitted instantly all over the world (Rubenson & Schuetze, 2000). Universities have solidified their position by producing advanced knowledge and knowledge workers for the market, and by conducting research. Furthermore, information and communication technology itself has created new opportunities for teaching and learning, making it possible to package and deliver knowledge as a commodity in the global market.

In financial terms, several authors point out that most governments are under pressure to reduce the growth of public spending on education (Stromquist, 2002; Carnoy, 2000; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). Such constriction of monies available for postsecondary education has crucial influences on universities. The concept of “user pays” has spread to almost all universities (Currie, 1998), resulting in increasing tuition fees for students and their families. In addition, universities are encouraged to generate revenues to lower normal operating costs. Recruiting international students who pay full tuition fees, exporting educational programs to other countries, establishing overseas campuses, and cooperatively conducting research with the business sector, to name a few, are strategies used by many universities to generate revenues to support themselves.

Market ideology is creeping into universities and many practices from the business world have been adopted by universities (Currie, 1998). The “user pays” practice can also
be viewed as a direct reflection of the market ideology since users are supposed to pay for services they receive. Knowledge is now packaged as commodities in different formats (e.g. distance education programs, intellectual property) and sold in the market place. With the decrease in state funding for research in public HEIs, universities have turned to the business world for financial support for their research projects. This has led to the adoption of more applied research agendas with the accompanying loss in funding for curiosity-driven research and research in social cultural areas (Currie, 1998). Competition is no longer just a word for the business world and has in fact become an important concept in HEIs, whether it is about the competition among faculty members for research funds or the competition among universities to be ranked as world leaders in higher education.

In most industrialized countries and in some developing countries, higher education has entered the phase of mass systems, a process which contrasts with the elite systems of the past. Whereas elite systems were designed to offer exclusive opportunities, mass higher education systems cease to be selective and are more inclusive. Under the mass systems, the old links between higher education and elite occupations are inevitably diluted (Scott, 1998). This adds to the competition among different universities in the sense that universities have to find their uniqueness to survive in the market place. For many universities, how to be the elite among the masses, at least in a few areas, becomes crucial. To sum up, the challenge of globalization to universities has become one of the most serious issues since the medieval universities faced the rise of nationalism and the Protestant Reformation in the 16th century (Altbach, 2001).
Accompanying the concept of globalization, the concept of internationalization of HEIs has been stressed in the higher education field. The terms globalization and internationalization of HEIs are used interchangeably by some academics (de Wit, 2002). However, as de Wit (2002) points out, such interchangeable use is highly questionable because “globalization should be considered as a too complex and ideologically loaded term” (p. 143). McCabe’s (2001) distinction of these two terms is useful: globalization represents a worldwide process implying standardization across cultures that occurs as technology, migration, and education become dispersed around the globe. Internationalization, on the other hand, is more oriented toward bilateral and/or multilateral processes involving knowledge of specific countries, which leads to the development of business, educational, social, and cultural relationships (McCabe, 2001). Another view identifies globalization with an emphasis on homogeneity and internationalization on diversity (Kishun, 1998). For Scott (1998), globalization is a much broader concept than internationalization. He points out that “not all universities are (particularly) international, but all universities are subject to the same processes of globalization—partly as objects, victims even, of these processes, but partly as subjects, or key agents” (Scott, 1998, p. 122). In the context of HEIs, Jane Knight’s view is that globalization is expressed by the flow of technology, economy, knowledge, people, values, ideas etc. across borders (Knight, 1999). She also argues that globalization affects countries in different ways due to a nation’s individual history, traditions, cultures, and priorities. To her, internationalization of HEIs expresses a strategic response to globalization and, at the same time, it respects the individuality of the nation (Knight, 1999).
Examining the national higher education policies of four industrialized countries under global influence, Slaughter (1998) argues that "globalization is a universal force to which countries, states, and provinces develop unique responses, but the system effects are so powerful that higher education policies in some areas—access, curricula, research, autonomy for faculty and institutions—converge" (p. 47). Some authors argue that changes caused by globalization are modified by the particular circumstances and choices of local institutions (Fisher & Rubenson, 1998; Tjeldvoll, 1998). Such a view emphasizes the local contexts that universities are bound in and their responses to globalization are contextualized in their unique institutional backgrounds.

In the present study, globalization is approached as a broad context in which HEIs are embedded. Internationalization of HEIs is viewed as a specific response to this global context. Globalization is changing the way universities are operated and, as I will argue, this is consequential for the way study abroad programs are organized. How does this interplay of global and local processes shape the realities of university and particularly their programs aimed at securing their access to international markets?

**Globalization and University Study Abroad Programs**

Globalization impacts the development of HEIs' study abroad programs in many ways, as Falk and Kanach suggest:

Economic globalization, together with the communications revolution, is perceived by some to be responsible for a homogenizing effect on societies around the world. A consumerist ethos disseminated by huge advertising budgets and the ease and speed of communication lend a certain plausibility to such perceptions. Some argue that if such trends persist, the growing familiarity of world regions with one another will gradually yield to a kind of sameness. If such is the case, the pedagogical benefits of travel and a foreign perspective will presumably diminish, if not altogether disappear. If cyberspace becomes the milieu of choice in the years ahead, then it would appear
to matter little, if at all, where to situate coordinates of time and space. (Falk & Kanach, 2000, p. 155)

Globalization may offer opportunities for the development of organized student mobility programs at university level. This can be manifested by the fact that organized study abroad opportunities within HEIs have not only been advocated as a means for personal and cultural enrichment for individual students involved, but also as an instrument for improving HEIs’ education quality and their international competitiveness. As McCabe (2001) points out:

Our world is characterized by ‘cultural pluralism, interconnectedness, and international economic competition,’ and such, it is increasingly necessary to ensure that our students have the ‘knowledge, skills, and attitudes’ that will position them to become successful citizens of the world. (p. 144)

For universities, offering students study abroad opportunities is considered a necessary condition for the preparation of students to engage with a globally interdependent world. Yet, only a few studies actually explore in concrete terms the impact of globalization on study abroad programs within universities.

The present study is a comparative case study focusing on four North American universities which offer institutional study abroad programs. The purposes of the study are to comparatively analyze the ways that universities organize their study abroad programs from an institutional perspective and to explore the factors that shape the structure, content, and organizational status of these programs in the context of globalization. Exploring these issues will provide practitioners with insights regarding the local and global contexts that affect study abroad programs. For those seeking to develop study abroad programs in their own institutions, results of the study will also provide
some valuable suggestions with regard to how to make good use of their institutional resources in the process of developing study abroad programs.

**Organization of the Thesis**

The first chapter of this thesis briefly lays out the research topic, the context of the study, the theoretical framework underpinning the study, and the research questions. The rest of this thesis is structured in four parts. Chapter 2 covers the existing literature dealing with study abroad programs in HEIs and positions the current study within that related literature. Chapter 3 outlines the research methods, the data collection process, and data analysis strategies. Chapter 4 presents the research findings in terms of the organizing process of these programs, the organizational status of these offices, program content, and faculty members' and students' involvement in these programs. The last chapter discusses findings in chapter 4 and reaches some general conclusions while also making some recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter, I briefly review the history of organized study abroad programs and identify the major trends. I then turn to the existing literature, exploring the individual, social, and political rationales underpinning these programs. I also review selected studies related to student participation in study abroad programs and research done on particular aspects of these programs. Finally, I offer a critique of the literature and raise questions about the conceptualization and organization of study abroad programs. I end this chapter by restating the research questions that will guide me throughout the study.

A Brief History of Study Abroad Programs

In its broadest sense, studying abroad can be understood as any individual or collective action of pursuing education opportunities in a foreign country. Such phenomena in HEIs can be traced back to the origin of modern universities: in the medieval period, students traveled across borders to pursue knowledge. International mobility among scholars was not rare at that time (Ridder-Symoens, 1992). Until the seventeenth century, all universities taught in Latin, and curricula and degrees were almost the same, therefore a student could begin a course at one university and continue it at another or even several others (Ridder-Symoens, 1992). Such “academic pilgrimage” in medieval universities was common until the creation of the nation-state in the 19th century (Ridder-Symoens, 1992; Lavroff, 1983).

Contemporary study abroad programs differ from the medieval academic pilgrimage. They are institutionally organized educational activities. Their inception can be traced directly to the junior year abroad programs of “Ivy League” Eastern colleges in the
United States in the 1920s (Bowman, 1987). In 1921, Professor Raymond Kirkbride from Delaware College in the U.S. urged his institution to establish a program in which students could study for a year in Paris and receive credit at their home institution. After Dr. Kirkbride spent a year in France setting up the program, the first group of eight students sailed for Europe in 1923. Since then, other U.S. universities have adopted similar plans and these programs have grown rapidly with considerable enthusiasm and substantial support (Bowman, 1987). Bowman argues that “the ‘study abroad’ program is a uniquely American invention” (Bowman, 1987, p. 10).

Despite the fact that the Second World War and the years immediately after forced the suspension of all the American programs in Europe, study abroad programs began to proliferate in the 1950s with varying approaches and strong support from the U.S. government. These approaches reflected different types of educational institutions and their educational objectives. For example, in the late 1950s, Stanford University started its unique attempt to transplant its own academic operation in foreign sites. The University of California adopted another approach: setting up programs to help students enroll in regular classes in host institutions. By the end of the 1950s it became apparent to many educators in the U.S. that the different types of organized study abroad programs represented a new educational approach with significant promise for the enrichment of undergraduate education (Bowman, 1987). This strong emphasis on organized (rather than individual) mobility programs has also influenced study abroad programs in European countries (Altbach & Teichler, 2001).

1 Hulstrand (2006) points out that the existence of short-term education abroad programs dates even earlier. For example, she mentions that Indiana University’s first short-term study abroad program was established in 1879. See Hulstrand, J. (2006).
Numbers and Trends

Since the 1980s, the number of foreign students studying outside their home countries has expanded dramatically, as has the number of students who participate in institutional study abroad programs. Table 1 shows the number of foreign students in two or three of the most popular academic destinations on each continent and the percentage of foreign students in a country’s tertiary enrollment. The United States is still the main host of foreign students though their enrollment represents 3% to 4% of the total tertiary enrollment in the US. The United Kingdom, Germany, France, and Australia are also popular destinations for foreign students and their enrollment accounts for 8% to 18% of the countries’ total tertiary enrollment.

Table 1: Foreign Students in Tertiary Education by Host Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>15,494</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>4,190</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,502</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>56,552</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59,691</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>18,337</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>17,654</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>16,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia, North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>451,935</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>475,168</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>35,543</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40,033</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America, South</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chili</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1,513</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>3,477</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>2,833</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>3,255</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>232,540</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>222,936</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>225,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>178,195</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>187,033</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>199,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>130,952</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>137,084</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>147,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>117,485</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>105,764</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>6,900</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8,210</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UNESCO Global Education Digest CD-ROM 2005, Table P: Foreign students in tertiary education by hosting country and continent of origin.
Additional data about the number of students who study abroad in various countries for credit as part of their degree at home institutions is less systematic. In some highly industrialized countries, this number has increased dramatically since the 1980s. In 1987, the European Commission started its famous ERASMUS (the European Community Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students) programs to promote the mobility and exchange of their teaching staff and students. In the academic year 1987-1988, there were 3,244 students who participated in ERASMUS mobility programs. This number increased to 135,586 in the academic year of 2003-2004, or an increase of about 41 times. By the year 2004, about 1.2 million students of the member institutions had participated in student mobility programs just under ERASMUS programs alone (European Union, 2005).

According to the data of Open Doors, between 1991-1992 and 2002-2003, the number of U.S. higher education students studying abroad for credit increased by about 145%, from 71,154 to 174,629 (Open Doors, 2004). With regard to Canada, there are no systematic data regarding the number of Canadian students attending study abroad programs for credit in foreign HEIs. This is also reflected in the OECD’s (2004) document description, which argues that there is a lack of systematic or reliable means of gathering information on Canadian students studying abroad as part of a Canadian degree. Notwithstanding, there is little doubt that a similarly increasing trend exists among Canadian universities, as Canadian universities have been very active in

---

2 Open Doors is the key publication of the Institute of International Education on international students in the United States and U.S. students who sojourn abroad as part of their academic experience.

3 In order to find related information, I did a search from Statistics Canada – Canada’s national statistical agency – and several other major educational organizations in Canada, including the Canadian Bureau for International Education, Canadian Education Association, Canadian Education Statistics Council, and the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. No related data was found.
internationalizing themselves since the late 1980s and study abroad opportunities have been recognized as one of the important means in this process by many Canadian institutions.

Table 2: Percentage of US Students Studying abroad by Region in Selected Years between 1985 and 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America *</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Regions</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Percentage</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students</td>
<td>48,483</td>
<td>70,727</td>
<td>76,302</td>
<td>89,242</td>
<td>113,959</td>
<td>143,590</td>
<td>154,168</td>
<td>160,920</td>
<td>174,629</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes Antarctica in 2002-2003


The data from Table 2 gives a good sense of where U.S. students went for their study abroad programs in selected years. Even though the percentage of participants in European programs has declined from 79.6% in 1985/86 to 62.9% in 2002/03, European countries are still the most popular destinations for U.S. students to study abroad. Accompanying the decline of participant percentage in European programs, there is an increasing interest from U.S. students to participate in Latin American, Asian, and African programs.

Analyzing the trend of expanding interest of U.S. study abroad students to non-European countries, Zachrisson (2001) offers a comprehensive list of possible factors: 1)
the shifts in numbers are driven by both student interest and institutional opportunities made available to them; 2) the broadening of overseas curricula from the traditional areas of study which focus on language and culture to programs which include offerings in business, natural sciences and other subjects not formerly offered in the typical non-European study site may also contribute to such a trend; 3) the development of new program formats such as internships has attracted a broader range of undergraduate interests; 4) the increasing number of short-term programs has broadened the appeal of new venues; 5) instruction in English has made a broader range of sites available, especially in countries whose languages are less commonly studied; 6) as awareness to the need for global education has become more widespread, overseas experience in developing economies is increasingly perceived as a positive addition to a résumé.

In sum, the number of foreign students studying in another country for degrees has been increasing dramatically since the 1980s. Systematic data show that a few highly industrialized countries are major destinations of most foreign students. Data about students who study abroad as part of their home institutions’ degree programs are less accessible but an increase in the number of students who participated in some of these programs in the United States and Europe since 1980s is observable. Considering U.S. students studying abroad, even though European countries are still the major destinations, there is an increasing interest of U.S. students to study in Latin America, Africa, and Asia. Systematic data about Canadian students studying abroad is needed in order to better understand the trend in Canada. Available data about Canada’s international education focuses on statistics of incoming international students. Systematic data collection about
Canadian students going abroad to study would contribute to a more comprehensive description about the status of Canada’s international education efforts.

**Why Study Abroad?**

Looking at the increasing rates of student participation in study abroad programs in HEIs, one can simply not ignore the following questions: Why were study abroad programs organized within universities in the first place? Why did the development of these programs experience a boom after the Second World War? Why did these programs expand rapidly after the 1980s, as shown by the data above? In what follows, I attempt to offer some answers regarding the factors underlying these processes.

*Improving Cross-Cultural Competence— The Individual Dimension*

One of the most frequently mentioned benefits of study abroad programs is the positive impact on participants’ cross-cultural competence. This usually includes improved competence in foreign languages, knowledge about foreign civilizations and international affairs, and the student’s appreciation of his or her cultural heritage (e.g. Sowa, 2002; Carlson et al, 1991; Abrams, 1965). Yet, as far as Abrams (1965) argues, this learning can also be taught at a home campus and “it is what happens to the student outside the classroom that leaves the greatest impression upon him” or her (p. 33). The stimulation outside the classroom can never be matched by that in the lecture hall (Abrams, 1965). Further, according to Abrams (1965), a well designed program can produce three highly significant gains for a student’s general education: 1) a better understanding of the “alien” culture; 2) a more objective understanding of his/her own culture; 3) and student’s personal growth. There are different ways of defining cross-
cultural competence; however, similar arguments about improving students' cross-cultural competence, by sending them through organized programs, have become one of the major justifications for HEIs establishing study abroad programs.

**International Peace—The Social Dimension**

It is often argued that improving an individual student's cross-cultural understanding and developing an individual's personal skills eventually facilitate the emergence of a more peaceful world. As Allaway (1994) argues, the real power of educational exchange is its contribution to world peace. Study abroad programs help to develop citizens whose international views are experience-based. Such programs will facilitate the mediation of conflict between cultures while potentially producing academic and political leadership with the necessary skills for the international arena (Allaway, 1994). Through these individual benefits, study abroad programs are perceived as having a significant impact on the development of students as citizens of today's world (McCabe, 2001), and thus help produce a more peaceful world.

**The Political Dimension**

The strong national support (as is the case in the U.S.) and regional support (as it is in Europe) for study abroad programs means that nation-states have designs upon modern universities (Kerr, 1990). The contemporary university is a project of the nation-state (Scott, 1998; Enders, 2002). As Enders (2002) argues:

The contemporary university was born of the nation state, not of medieval civilisation, and it was only in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, following the establishment of clear national economic interests, that universities acquired their identification with science and technology. Their regulatory and funding context was, and still is, national; their contribution to national cultures was, and still is, significant; students tended to be, and still are, trained to become
national functionaries; and universities played, and still play, a considerable role in what some have called the military-industrial complex of nation states. (p. 3)

Therefore, the political dimension of institutional study abroad programs, especially in the part of defending national security, ideology propaganda, and maintaining economic competitiveness, cannot be ignored.

National Security

After World War II, and especially during the Cold War, study abroad programs were regarded as an important way of defending national security, especially in the United States. When U.S. Senator William Fulbright introduced a bill to use U.S. credits in foreign currencies in order to finance academic exchanges, his argument was that “given the dominant position of the United States in international affairs after the war, it became vital to the national security to understand the minds of people in other societies and to have American aspirations and problems understood by others” (Quoted in Bu, 2003, p. 155). Knowing other cultures or languages no longer stands by itself as an end; it is allied to the need for a nation-state to protect itself. The rationale of cross-cultural understanding underpinning institutional study abroad programs has become a means of defending national security.

Ideological Propaganda

During the Cold War, educational and cultural exchange and technical assistance were used by the U.S. and Soviet Union to spread their respective dominant ideologies worldwide. Speaking of the U.S. experience, Bu (2003) points out that the U.S. government’s initiatives gave rise to new meanings of international educational exchange
activities, and these activities served as an instrument of mutual defense, opposing the spread of communism:

World War II was the watershed that made international educational and cultural exchanges increasingly an irrevocable component of U.S. foreign policy. The government constructed a new cultural diplomacy to fight the Cold War. Educational exchanges, which were first designed as an important instrument to counter Soviet propaganda, took on their own force and evolved into the propaganda media to project the great success of the American system. As technical assistance and educational exchanges were integrated with economic and military aid, the spread of American technology and culture in the world contributed to the achievement of the ‘total diplomacy’ in the Cold War. (Bu, 2003, p. 174)

As the headquarters of socialist countries, the Soviet Union provided similar educational exchange opportunities and other aids to its allies to solidify its ideology.

**Economic Competitiveness**

Since the 1980s, preparing students for economic competitiveness has become a key rationale for institutional study abroad programs. The interdependence of national economies and the globalization of business itself have given a new emphasis to the international aspects of higher education. Now the competition is among countries, among graduates of higher education from different countries, and among institutions of higher education (Wagner & Schnitzer, 1991). To successfully compete in the global economy, nation-states need citizens who function both in the global and local contexts. Also, individuals need a certain world awareness to survive in the increasingly globalized labor market. It is generally believed that if planned properly, studying abroad benefits students in developing their skills such as language proficiency, cross-cultural understanding, and an awareness of one’s own ethnocentric tendencies (McCabe, 2001). With the pressure from both nation-states and individuals, universities felt pressured to
add international components to their curricula and study abroad programs became a popular option for doing this.

**Post “9/11” in the United States**

What happened on “9/11” in 2001 alerted both Americans and the rest of the world, and it has presented both opportunities and challenges for study abroad professionals and the field. One may think that such a tragedy would negatively influence American students’ aspirations of going on study abroad programs. However, the number of participants in study abroad programs has continued to increase ever since (see Table 2). In an online survey conducted by the Institute of International Education (IIE) in October 2001, 97% of the 600 international education professionals responding said that international education exchange, including study abroad, was regarded as more important or equally important on their campuses in the aftermath of September 11 (IIE, 2001). “Knowing others” as part of enhancing national security is emphasized again on the political agenda of international education. This is clearly reflected in the Association of International Educators’ (NAFSA) policy statement:

> September 11 sealed the case; on that date, international education became, beyond question, a national security imperative. It is now clearer than ever that the end of the cold war did not mean an end to international, civil, and ethnic conflict. The defense of U.S. interests and the effective management of global unrest in the twenty-first century will require more, not less, ability on the part of Americans to understand the world in terms other than their own. (NAFSA, 2003, p. 1)

International and cross-cultural awareness are now considered to be crucial to effective U.S. leadership, competitiveness, prosperity, and national security (NAFSA, 2003). Under this policy, study abroad programs continue to receive attention from
different sectors of society. In fact, the U.S. Congress declared 2006 as the “Year of Study Abroad” (Hulstrand, 2006).

Nonetheless, conflicts among different rationales in sending students on study abroad programs do exist, especially after “9/11”. One case in point is U.S. universities’ study abroad programs in the Middle East. In 2001-2002 and 2002-2003 the number of American students studying abroad increased from 160,920 to 174,629, an increase of 7.9%. Yet, the number of participants in Middle East programs dropped from 0.8% to 0.4% (Open Doors, 2004). Clearly, the political realities in which these international programs operate remain an obstacle.

Research about Study Abroad Programs

Numerous studies have been undertaken in the field of education abroad. There are studies which focus on the question of who participates in study abroad programs, as well as studies that look at more specific aspects of education abroad programs. In what follows, I offer an overview of the research undertaken to date.

Studies of Participants

Asking the question of who actually participates in institutional study abroad programs is important. Studies focusing on this question usually ask why certain students choose to participate in such programs while others do not, or what makes certain groups of students choose to participate in certain programs. For example, by comparing study abroad groups and those who stay at their home institution, Carlson et al. (1991) found that the primary reasons for studying abroad are students’ desire to experience new cultures and to learn the language of the host country. Academic reasons appear to be of
secondary importance. For the stay-at-home students, the main reasons not to undertake a study abroad program are mainly academic considerations: 50% of the participants in the study thought it is not necessary for their course of study; 40% thought it would not be appropriate for their majors; and 46% thought it might delay their graduation (Carlson et al., 1991).

**Evaluation Studies of Study Abroad Programs**

One of the largest evaluation projects of Study Abroad Programs is the ERASMUS evaluation project sponsored by the European Community. The ERASMUS evaluation research project received input from students, coordinators, and other experts and has sponsored more than 20 special studies on specific problems (Teichler, 1996). One of the findings shows that the ERASMUS Program has successfully encouraged students’ interest in studying abroad and learning different European languages, thus contributing to consolidate intra-European links between institutions, faculty and students. Likewise, studying abroad contributes to the transition to and competency in occupations involving international knowledge and understanding of other countries, cultures, and thinking (Teichler, 1996). Another example is Immelman and Schneider’s (1998) assessment of student learning in study abroad programs. Based on data collected in two focus groups from two private liberal arts colleges, the study concluded that studying abroad complements traditional academic programs which emphasize cognitive development by fostering student development in attitudinal and social domains. Such evaluation studies help us perceive the concrete impact of study abroad programs on students and thus encourage program participation.
Studies of Particular Aspects of Study Abroad Programs

There are also studies which focus on more specific aspects of study abroad programs. One direction of such research focuses on language issues in study abroad programs. For example, Adams (2000) evaluated Brigham Young University's study abroad programs dealing with language learning strategy use, and pointed out that study abroad programs do not seem to automatically increase students' use of language learning strategies. His conclusion reminds program designers not to take language benefits of such programs for granted while also demonstrates that conscious design of language components should be included during program designing stages if language acquisition is part of the program's goals. Further, there are writings concerning the security aspect of study abroad programs. Ritchie's study (2003) offers a good example of risk management in study abroad programs. The re-entry aspects of study abroad programs drew the attention of several researchers. Kauffmann, Martin and Weaver (1992) undertook a qualitative study focusing on students' returning experience from studying abroad. Lo's pilot survey study (2006) discusses the role of peer advisors in study abroad programs by investigating their qualifications, extent of training, and responsibilities. Research into these aspects enhances communication among practitioners in the field, contributing to improved organization of the different aspects of these programs.

Critique of the Literature

The Problem of Conceptualization

In the literature, there is no agreement as to what study abroad programs are or should be. Many authors realize that there are various programs in different institutions and
some scholars have suggested ways to classify them. Engle and Engle’s (2003) article is a case in point. In order to give prospective participants and their advisors with systematic information about available choices, the authors identify five types of programs: the study tour, the short-term study, the cross-cultural contact program, the cross-cultural encounter program, and the cross-cultural immersion program. They also identify seven defining components for each program type: the length of student sojourn; entry target-language competence; language used in course work; context of academic work; types of student housing; provisions for structured cultural interaction and experiential learning; and guided reflection on cultural experience (Engle & Engle, 2003). Speaking of U.S. study abroad programs, Sowa’s article (2002) roughly divides these programs differently by proposing three “models”: total immersion, protective studies, and tour models. Placing American students in a foreign university for at least one semester and typically for a year, the immersion model allows students to participate in academic courses while experiencing the language and culture of the host country (Sowa, 2002). The protective studies abroad model sends students to a United States’ program with resident advisors and instructors while the study tour is usually short in duration, lasting from about two weeks to a summer (Sowa, 2002).

However, lacking consistent criteria, these classifications become so general that programs from individual institutions either fall into several categories or do not fall into any of these categories. This begs several questions: do study abroad programs mean the same thing for different institutions? Do HEIs usually choose one particular model or category of such programs or do they develop different program types simultaneously?
A closely related question to the conceptualization of study abroad programs is the question of how these programs are organized at the university level – and why they are organized the way they are. Discussions concerning how institutions organize their study abroad programs are important if researchers are to understand the impact of these programs. Not asking this question makes it difficult to evaluate the effects of these programs. Yet existing studies either focus on one specific program’s description and its influence on students and/or general society, or they ignore this question altogether. This lack of comparative perspective as to how different universities organize their study abroad programs limits our understanding because how the programs are constructed, and why they are undertaken in the first place, directly influence their effects in general.

Further, describing how different universities organize their study abroad programs would prove valuable to students’ choice of study abroad programs. As mentioned, while some studies examine why certain students participate in study abroad programs, they do not ask if the way universities organize their study abroad programs influences students’ decision to participate. Institutional organization of these programs may limit the participation of certain groups of students. Without clearly asking how universities do so, it is hard to understand why students choose or do not choose certain programs. In addition, there remains the question of why individual universities organize their programs in specific ways. Few studies explore what motivates HEIs to organize study abroad programs. Surely, research has demonstrated the benefits of study abroad programs to individual students and general society. However, we need to explore other reasons driving HEIs to start such practice. Why were study abroad programs set up in
different HEIs? What factors trigger institutions to organize study abroad programs in the way they do? In what follows, I offer several factors that were found to shape study abroad programs.

**Globalization and Study Abroad Programs**

The inter-relations between study abroad programs and globalization are central to the present thesis. Globalization has changed economic, political, and cultural aspects of human life across nations. With the influence of globalization and new information technology, how issues are dealt with locally may become increasingly similar. On the other hand, globalization may also help recover locality and thus help diversify local realities (Newson, 1998). Within such a complex and dynamic context, one issue remains consistent: higher education institutions face new challenges. One of the main challenges on this list is: what kind of graduates do HEIs need to cultivate when facing this new global knowledge society? By implication, what are the challenges study abroad programs face in securing this end? In other words, how does the current trend of globalization and university’s local context interplay to shape the organization of study abroad programs?

Globalization has many facets. For some, globalization represents the imperatives of a global free market (Davies & Guppy, 1997). For others, it represents the idea of “a unitary cultural system” (Davies & Guppy, 1997). What does each of these facets mean for study abroad programs? Which version of globalization dominates university study abroad programs, the economic or the cultural? How do these visions of globalization coincide with the universities’ traditions and contexts of practice?
Faculty Members' and Students' Involvement in Study Abroad Programs

Faculty members and students are two of the major stakeholders of HEIs and their contributions to HEIs influence every aspect of HEIs' institutional life. Faculty members contribute to teaching, research, and various institutional innovations. Students are the major population in HEIs, and one of the missions of modern universities is to serve students' learning needs. Therefore, understanding how HEIs organize their study abroad programs necessarily requires understanding faculty members' and students' involvement. What are their roles in the decision making process of study abroad programs? Who gets to participate in the decision making process? In what form? These are important questions to ask both in terms of examining faculty members' and students' involvement and understanding why activities and programs are organized in certain ways.

Aim and Scope of the Present Study

The present study raises questions regarding the ways in which universities organize their study abroad programs while also exploring how the interplay of global and local processes influences the way these programs are set up at the university level. The study adopts a comparative perspective. It compares the arrangements of study abroad programs and their organizational structures in four different universities and explores the local and global factors influencing program organization.

The study examines four university-based study abroad programs in relation to globalization. Thus, questions related to universities' international policies and international activities are central to the present thesis. Also, the present study investigates the formats and organizational structures of study abroad programs. The aim
is to clarify how local and global factors influence these programs' organization and the involvement of faculty members and students.
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODS

The present chapter deals with the technical aspects of the current study and discusses the research methods used. I first describe how the institutions were chosen, and how data were collected. I then articulate how I analyzed the data. The chapter includes a discussion of the limitations of the study.

Research Sample

Universities in the Study and Confidentiality

This study is a comparative qualitative case study involving four universities. The four universities are mid- to large size universities located in the western part of Canada and the United States. In order to conceal the identity of interviewees, pseudonyms of the universities are used. University Apple is a large public university in the US, and is one of the ten campuses of a major state university, University Apple-Pie. University Bear is a large private religious university in the US. University Cherry is a large public university in Canada. University Dew is a mid-size private religious university in Canada. These pseudonyms are also used in italics to replace university names when quoted in the interviewing data. This indicates that interviewees mentioned the corresponding names of the universities. The names of the selected study abroad program offices are also pseudonyms.\(^4\) Some identifiable names in the interview data are likewise eliminated for considerations related to confidentiality. Table 3 presents detailed information of these universities and their study abroad programs.

\(^4\) In some institutions, there is more than one office which deals with study abroad programs. Pseudonyms are also used to avoid identification of the university.
Table 3: Information on Selected Universities Included in the Present Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>University Type</th>
<th>Types of Study abroad Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Apple</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Long-term immersion programs with overseas centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Bear</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>Private religious</td>
<td>Short-term travel study programs &amp; long-term immersion programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Cherry</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Student exchange programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Dew</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Private religious</td>
<td>Short-term travel study programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Selection Criteria**

I used a purposeful sampling strategy to select the four cases. Given that one of the main purposes of this study is to explore how cultural and economic facets of globalization influence university study abroad programs in their local contexts, it was considered important to include a wide spectrum of university types and their study abroad programs. Therefore, sampling was divided into two different steps.

At the first stage of the sampling, the detailed criteria included: geographic location, size, and type (e.g., public, private). I limited my selection to the West Coast and Middle West of Canada and the United States with some practical considerations, particularly the possibility of traveling to the site and conducting face-to-face interviews. To ensure diversity, both public and private universities were considered. In addition, I intentionally considered religious universities versus secular universities with the assumption that they will be sensitive to different aspects of globalization, whether economic or cultural. In a second stage, with some suggestions from experts in the field, I closely checked study abroad programs in eight universities through the internet; four in each of the United States and Canada. These universities were chosen because their study abroad programs represent some typical models existing in the field, for example, long-term immersion programs as compared to short-term travel study programs.
The selected four cases reflect comparable characteristics. These universities have contrasting backgrounds with two public universities, one in each of Canada and the U.S. The two public universities also present themselves as research universities. In addition, two private religious universities were chosen, one in each of Canada and the U.S. University Cherry’s primary model of student mobility programs is student exchange programs with other programs co-existing. University Dew’s primary model is short-term travel study programs with other models co-existing. University Apple has long-term immersion programs offered by the central University Apple-Pie’s education abroad office, and other types of programs from University Apple’s own campus. University Bear’s central institutional international study program office offers a mix of both long term immersion programs and short-term travel study programs.

Data Collection

The data resources used in this study included face-to-face open-ended interviews. I also collected documents from the internet and during the interview field trip. The original design of the study was to interview the president or the vice president who oversaw international education issues in the selected universities as well as the directors of the education abroad offices. This choice was based on the possible contribution of these administrators’ expertise to the research topic. However, I soon realized that accessing the university president or vice president would prove challenging due to these administrators’ busy schedules and the relatively tight schedule of my field trips. As a result, the face-to-face interviews were limited to the directors of the study abroad program offices.
Eight interviews were conducted between March and May of 2005 with at least a two-day field trip made to each campus. At University Cherry, I was able to interview the associate vice president supervising international issues at the university as well as the director of the chosen study abroad office, Office CC. At University Apple, two directors of the education abroad office, Office AA, were interviewed. These included the campus administrative director and the campus academic director. At University Bear, both the director of the international center and the director of the study abroad office, Office BB, who is under the former’s direct supervision, were interviewed. Interviewees at University Dew exhibit a special situation. The chosen study abroad office, Office DD, was under major personnel changes as the previous director had recently retired and there was the possibility that the office might be transferred to another unit on campus. Thus, at University Dew, I interviewed the previous program director and the program coordinator as both are the key persons to talk to.

Each interview lasted about one- to one-and-a-half hour in length. Interviewees were interviewed at times convenient for them. Given tight schedules, there were two interviews that were divided into two separate interviews over two days. Seven of the eight interviews were conducted in the interviewees’ offices. One interview was conducted at a comfortable place of the interviewee’s choice. The questions asked were all open ended questions, listed in Appendix C. A few minor modifications were made prior to conducting each interview due to specific institutional contexts. Whenever possible, documents such as program background and related institutional policies were also collected during or after each interview.

Information from the internet provided another major data source for this study as most international programs’ information is available on-line. Several interviewees
actually mentioned that program information they were offering could be found on their websites. Many institutional policy documents could also be accessed through the internet. Therefore, web resources represent a major data source in addition to interview data.

To ensure the confidentiality of the interviewees, references to the websites of the selected universities were deleted from the reference list. Instead, these sources were listed in Appendix D. The dates the researcher retrieved the online information and a short description of what information these websites contained are listed in Appendix D as well.

Data Analysis

I recorded and transcribed the interviews. Two of the eight transcripts were sent back for modification as requested by the interviewees.

Data analysis is organized in five parts. The first part locates study abroad programs within their institutional policy contexts. This part provides an overview of study abroad programs in each university and briefly looks at the formats of existing programs on each campus. Focusing on study abroad program offices, the remaining data are organized in four themes. The first theme examines the selected study abroad offices in terms of how they are organized in general. This section specifically describes the organizing offices, the program formats they have adopted, and the general educational philosophy of these programs. The second theme looks specifically at the organizational status of the organizing offices and explores their main functions, their history, development, and uniqueness. The third theme focuses on the content of these programs and tries to identify the global and local factors that help to define program content. The last theme explores
how faculty members and students are involved in these programs beyond traditional teaching and learning roles. A special section follows to summarize the impact of globalization on these programs.

Limitations

Despite efforts made to ensure a wide spectrum of universities, generalizing from the findings remains problematic. Some of the interview questions are related to the history of the study abroad programs within each university, however, because of the change of personnel in some of the program offices, not all the questions about the programs' or offices' history were answered. Documents or information obtained from the internet could have supplemented such unanswered questions, but the historical information obtained from internet was quite limited. This constrains my analysis of local characteristics of the selected study abroad program offices.

Another limitation comes from the different sizes of the selected universities and their programs. For large universities like University Apple and University Cherry, the scale of their study abroad programs is much larger than a mid-size university like University Dew. This brings some imbalance when certain comparisons are made.

Moreover, the study remains limited due to access and time constraints as interviews with university presidents or vice presidents were not conducted as originally planned. Thus, data had to be collected also through the internet. Clearly, accessing these administrators to obtain first hand information as to the direction of institutional international education policy would have strengthened this study significantly.

The aforementioned limitations may affect certain aspects of the study’s results. The insufficient historical background data of some program offices challenges the purpose of
seeing changes in these program offices’ development, and thus, affects the analysis of the local institutional factors’ influences on these programs. Lack of access to top institutional administrators also limits the researcher’s perspective of local strategic policy response to global influence; thus, limiting my understanding as to the interplay between local and global processes.
CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS

In this chapter, I first describe the selected institutions and their study abroad programs. Based on the chosen theoretical framework and the main research questions asked, I then organize the research findings into four themes in order to compare the selected cases. The first theme investigates how the reviewed programs are organized and provides a general description of their administrative offices, their adopted program formats, and the general education philosophy of these programs. The second theme focuses on the reviewed offices' organizational status: their main functions, their history, and some of their unique characteristics. The third theme turns to the perspective of program content and examines the global and local factors that help define program content. The final theme analyzes the different formats of faculty and students' involvement in study abroad programs as well as the nature of their involvement. Based on this data, I then reflect on the impact of globalization on these programs.

An Overview of Study Abroad Programs in the Selected Universities

Study Abroad Programs at University Apple

University Apple, a public research university, is one of the 10 campuses of a major state university system, University Apple-Pie. It is located in a metropolitan city in the US.

Seeking international recognition and visibility around the world, University Apple views internationalization as a significant issue. Offering study abroad opportunities is considered an important part of the university's education. As one interviewee mentioned:

In fact the chancellor, just in the last month, has issued a statement, saying that internationalization is one of his three major initiatives, and he
mentions specifically study abroad and education abroad programs. (A-1-p6)

With strong institutional support, University Apple is one of the top ranked senders of study abroad students in the US in terms of the total number of participating students in 2004 (Open Doors, 2006).

University Apple has several offices which organize and/or offer services for study abroad opportunities. The university’s summer sessions organize short-term travel study programs open to students from anywhere on a first-come, first-served basis. These are basically the university’s summer courses operated abroad and they are usually led by faculty members from the university. The office of internship and study abroad service under the university’s Career Center works as a consulting center which helps students pursue independent work experiences and participate in study abroad programs offered by other institutions and organizations. As to the study abroad services offered by this office, students take leave from University Apple and participate in programs organized by other institutions. Credits may be transferred for approved courses. The business school of University Apple also offers study abroad opportunities for its own students. These opportunities are embedded in its curricula as part of the school’s requirements for certain degree programs. For example, the business school cooperates with an Asian university and has established a double degree executive MBA program.

However, it is the education abroad office at University Apple, Office AA, which offers the major institutional study abroad programs to students. This office’s study abroad programs organization is reviewed in this study. Programs in this office are system-wide programs organized by the Universitywide Office of Education Abroad Program (UOEAP). The UOEAP offers short-term to full-year overseas programs in a
wide range of academic disciplines for sophomore through graduate students. University Apple’s students can participate in all these programs through the education abroad program (EAP) at University Apple’s office. The summer sessions office, the internship and study abroad service office and the EAP office at University Apple are not administratively connected to each other. They work cooperatively on an unofficial basis as mentioned by one interviewee:

...we’ve been working hard to try to show that... rather than competition, it’s more of a collaborated model where each program has chosen a different need for students...And I think there is a greater feeling of collaboration. (A-2-p12)

**Study Abroad Programs at University Bear**

University Bear, located in the United States, is a large-size private religious university sponsored by an international church. Approximately 98 percent of University Bear’s students are members of this church.⁵

Although there is no formal institutional policy or statements directly referring to the concepts of internationalization and globalization, interviewees see these as important because of the nature of the university:

We don’t have a document. It’s always been assumed that we would have interested in international interests, because *University Bear* is a private institution. It’s owned by the [name] Church, the Church of [name], which is an international church. Because of that, ... it’s kind of understood that we have an international, [and] we need to have international viewpoint. (B-1-p2)

Secondly, many students and faculty members have served as missionaries overseas and come to University Bear already having various international experiences:

---

⁵ The number was mentioned by one of the interviewees.
... But it's also a very international campus, because unlike most of the campuses, where you may have a thousand students a year that go on study abroad, but we have that a thousand, plus we have another several thousands who are living abroad right now, who will end up coming back to our campus. And so as you walk around here, and you see these people walking by, my guess is ... 50% of them probably lived overseas for two years or a half to two years. And so you've got a real international-oriented student body that way. (B-l-p3)

...we also have a very internationally oriented faculty. Because so many of them either have served missions, or have interests... (B-l-p3)

Further, the previous president of the university was a major champion and made the globalization of the university a major issue during his term. Under his leadership, the position of Vice President International was created.

University Bear's major study abroad programs are organized by Office BB, which is housed under an international studies center. This center is both an academic unit, which offers several degree programs in the area of international studies, and also serves as the central location for international activities at University Bear. Cooperating with departments and colleges, Office BB organizes both short-term and semester-long study abroad programs, internship programs, volunteer programs, and field study programs.

In addition to programs from this office, University Bear has another center which previously offered two to five months' overseas programs in a city in the Middle East focusing on Old and New Testament as well as ancient and modern Near Eastern studies. The programs have been unavailable since 2002 due to security issues. This center is the only section at University Bear which offers international programs that do not have an administrative tie with Office BB.
Study Abroad Programs at University Cherry

University Cherry is one of the leading public research universities in Canada. Internationalization has been a very important concept to University Cherry in recent years. The institution’s strategic planning documents, Cherry Document 1 and Cherry Document 2, identify internationalization as one of the five pillars directing university development in the new millennium. Offering study abroad opportunities is one of the strategies identified under the pillar of internationalization. As clearly stated in Cherry Document 2, University Cherry is dedicated to “expand student mobility and study abroad programs, and develop sustaining funding to encourage greater involvement by University Cherry students,” and the target is to “increase participation in student mobility programs by 15%” (University Cherry, 2005).

University Cherry offers various study abroad opportunities to students in different units on campus. Similar to University Apple, some of these opportunities are embedded in degree programs in certain departments, colleges, and schools. Some are organized in the individual faculties or schools, e.g. in the business school and the law school, while others are like travel study programs, organized at the department or faculty level as with regular University Cherry’s courses.

The major institutional study abroad opportunities are mainly in the format of student exchange through University Cherry’s Office CC under the vice president students’ leadership. Office CC establishes partnerships with partner institutions around the world in relation to student mobility activities. Serving as a central office, Office CC sends University Cherry students to partner institutions and accepts exchange students from partner institutions under reciprocal agreements. In recent years, Office CC’s programs have been expanding to other areas such as international internship and volunteer
opportunities. Students applying for individual faculty’s or school’s study abroad programs are also required to apply through Office CC.

**Study Abroad Programs at University Dew**

Compared with the other universities, University Dew is a rather small and only recently began organizing study abroad programs. Initially established as a private Christian junior college by an international church, University Dew later became one of Canada's major accredited church universities.

As a church-sponsored university, similar to University Bear, University Dew sees itself with built-in international features. The mission of the university states that University Dew is to:

...develop godly Christian leaders: positive, goal-oriented university graduates with thoroughly Christian minds; growing disciples of Christ who glorify God through fulfilling the Great Commission, serving God and people in the various marketplaces of life. *(University Dew, 2006a)*

Even though the interviewees see study abroad opportunities as very important educational experiences and such programs are offered at University Dew in a number of ways, the central administrative level does not seem to regard study abroad programs as an important part of the university’s overall development.

University Dew belongs to the Council of Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU) and, as a member of CCCU, University Dew students are eligible to participate in the 12 study abroad programs offered by CCCU. The university pays an annual membership fee to CCCU and, as a member institution, the university enjoys certain benefits. These benefits enable students to apply independently to CCCU programs, and CCCU program credits are transferable and recognized as University Dew’s credits.
University Dew's major institutional study abroad programs are offered as travel study programs from Office DD, under the supervision of vice president academic when the interviewing data were collected in May 2005. These programs are mainly summer programs proposed and led by faculty members. When the interviews were conducted in May 2005, Office DD was experiencing major changes. A major decision was whether the office should be transferred to the non-traditional learning section of the university.\textsuperscript{6} Travel study programs are still offered during the time of writing; however, these programs' administrative responsibilities have been handed to the non-traditional learning section of the university as shown on University Dew's website.

In summary, internationalization and globalization are regarded as important concepts, but their importance does not carry the same weight in each university. As public universities, University Cherry and University Apple have attempted to interpret these concepts at policy and central administrative level, while the private religious universities, University Bear and University Dew, regard these concepts as a built-in component because of their attachment to an international church. Focusing specifically upon study abroad programs, we see these programs offered in various forms, which are recognized as an important part of international happenings on campus. Again, their importance varies depending on the university, effectively revealing the broader scale of these programs within universities emphasizing internationalization and/or globalization.

\textsuperscript{6} For example, online courses are housed in this non-traditional learning section.
How Are the Programs Organized?

*University Apple’s Programs from Office AA*

Study abroad programs from University Apple’s Office AA is part of University Apple-Pie’s system-wide programs in the US. University Apple-Pie’s Regents authorize all agreements with host institutions abroad. UOEAP is the office responsible for the overall management of study abroad programs and the collaboration with foreign universities, University Apple-Pie Study Centers, and campus EAP offices. Specifically, UOEAP coordinates policy development and planning, and develops and maintains all of EAP academic programs. It also provides financial oversight and budgetary control. The Senate, through the University Committee on International Education (UCIE), oversees program quality, reviews existing programs, grants preliminary approval for new programs, recommends the appointment of Study Center Directors to the President, establishes advisory committees, and sets standards for student participation (*University Apple-Pie*, 2006a).

UOEAP is connected to each campus by an EAP office on that campus. At University Apple, it is the Office AA. The EAP offices at each campus coordinate student recruitment, selection, pre-departure orientation, and re-entry programs. Campus EAP offices do not develop and run programs, and they do not have on-site responsibilities. Therefore, once students are sent out on these programs, campus EAP offices do not have an active day-to-day role until these students return. Each campus has an EAP faculty director. These directors comprise a Council of Campus Directors, which facilitates collaboration among campus programs and advises the EAP Director on programmatic issues. Each campus office also has an administrative director, and these directors form a
Council of Administrative Directors, which coordinates operational activities among the campus and with the UOEAP (University Apple-Pie, 2006a).

When students are in the foreign host countries, they are supported by University Apple-Pie’s Overseas Study Centers and the host institutions. A Study Center is located in most host countries. With the recommendation of the UCIE, University Apple-Pie’s president appoints faculty members to serve as directors of these Study Centers. Typically a Study Center Director administers the program on site and is responsible for the academic and personal well-being of EAP students at one or more host universities in that particular area. The first Study Center was opened at a French university in the early 1960s and has established programs in more than 150 universities in nearly 50 countries (University Apple-Pie, 2006a).

Traditionally, education abroad programs are committed to an immersion experience. Students are enrolled as regular students in a foreign university. They participate as regular international students for a dedicated period. However, this process has been changing. Some Study Centers have started to conduct University Apple-Pie’s own programs in host countries. Through reciprocal agreements, students from University Apple-Pie’s partner universities abroad also attend the main campuses of University Apple-Pie.

A strong belief in the total immersion experience can be sensed from the interviewees. One of the interviewees offered such an idealist perspective:

I still think the very best experience is the year-long study abroad experience. ... I would hope that we should at least maintain our year-long immersion commitment. (A-1-p24)
University Bear’s Programs from Office BB

University Bear’s study abroad programs have a centralized service format from Office BB. Programs are administrated by departments through this office. Office BB is a service-only center offering departments and their faculty members with professional logistic support for study abroad programs. Faculty members initiate programs. Office BB works with the faculty members and their departments and offers security, health, and logistical assistance and advice. University Bear also owns several overseas properties administrated by its overseas staff. These are used for study abroad programs.

Four types of international programs are organized by Office BB, namely study abroad, volunteers, internships, and field studies. Study abroad programs are faculty-led programs with classroom instruction comprising an integral part. The international volunteer programs are faculty-led programs in which 50 percent or more of the learning experience is based on volunteer work with local organizations. International internship programs are for individuals or small groups of students to work for companies or organizations abroad with faculty supervision limited to a single visit and regular communication by e-mail. Finally, the international field studies programs offer students to conduct field research on a subject of their choice, and faculty are sometimes in the field with students while at other times limit their supervision to a single visit and communication through e-mail (University Bear, 2006a).

Specifically, when faculty members initiate a program in their area of expertise, they must first obtain their department head’s approval. They then take their proposal to Office BB. The office manages the logistics and is responsible for recruiting students,
arranging the pre-departure course, and taking care of budget issues. Once students are abroad, faculty members supervise them. Program length ranges from a two-week to semester long period. Most programs, categorized by University Bear as study abroad programs, are basically island programs. These are protected study experiences in which students mainly stay with leading faculty members and their peers for classes, and use on-site opportunities as a laboratory. In a few instances, for example in field studies, programs could be total immersion experiences in which students are immersed in the local community. Faculty members and their departments control the programs’ academic quality and the Office BB controls administrative aspects. The interviewees call this a co-operative effort.

The educational philosophy of these programs is to immerse students in the local environment to enhance classroom learning. As one interviewee mentioned:

We want the courses that are taught there, on site, to take advantage of ...being on site is kind of a laboratory...So our educational philosophy is immerging in the local environment to enhance what’s happening in the classroom. Now the different kinds of programs will have different levels of that different expectation. (B-2-p12)

Another guiding principle of University Bear’s programs is that all programs include a meaningful relationship between students and faculty mentors (University Bear, 2006b). These programs are not only study abroad opportunities for students; they also offer opportunities to provide professional development for faculty directors. Further, programs reflect a strong connection with the international church that sponsors the university as participants are mainly active church members.
University Cherry’s Program from Office CC

At University Cherry, student mobility programs are organized by Office CC under the supervision of the vice president in charge of student issues. With the support of the university’s international office, Office CC has developed different kinds of partner relationships (e.g. benign reciprocal partners, study abroad partners, and non university partners) with over 100 institutions across the world. The office’s main function includes negotiating student mobility agreements, developing and implementing programs, recruiting and preparing students for study abroad, and helping re-entry programs. Office CC also takes care of incoming exchange students at University Cherry.

The main program format is to offer a total immersion student exchange experience. University Cherry’s students, typically second year or higher, apply through Office CC to enroll in partner institutions. They pay regular University Cherry’s tuition fees to study at host institutions as international students. These programs are usually reciprocal, which means host institutions also send a balanced number of students over 5 years to study at University Cherry. Office CC currently works with a range of negotiated reciprocity issues to develop volunteer placements, international co-op placements, University Cherry’s terms abroad, and study abroad at institutions without reciprocal agreements. University Cherry’s various student mobility programs are all based on partnerships. As one of the interviewees explained:

We always work through partners, where there are reciprocal partnerships, the most benign reciprocal, that means they get something we get something in terms of students back and forth; some of them are study abroad partnerships, where we are just sending students; some of them are... in this up-coming year, will be non university partners, but that will
be like NGOs, or community-based organizations around the world. (C-1-p7)

Except for the “University Cherry’s terms abroad” program in which, for example, University Cherry may ask a partner institution to set up a summer program for a group of University Cherry’s students only, students abroad are basically as international students in host universities on their own.

Programs from Office CC aim to provide individual students every opportunity to live and study in the foreign place. As mentioned by one interviewee:

The purpose of the program is for them to experience life as a student at the partner university. So we don’t do the kind of junior year abroad to send 25 students to the University of Cape Town with a faculty member for a term, and they all live together, and they are all taking similar courses. We don’t do that. (C-1-p11)

Thus, it seems safe to speculate that life experience is one of the reasons the total immersion model is the basic program format.

**University Dew’s Programs from Office DD**

At the time when the interviews were conducted, University Dew’s Office DD was in a process of major changes. The office was comparatively small with one coordinator and one director, and organizing study abroad programs was only part of their job responsibilities. Similar to University Bear’s programs, University Dew’s programs are faculty-led programs, except that University Dew’s programs are all short-term summer programs. The overall function of Office DD is coordination, supervision, and liaison. The office oversees the administrative aspects of these programs while the academic components are controlled by faculty members. Specifically, Office DD ensures that
professors leading these programs receive all the permission they need from specific academic departments. Office DD coordinates with faculty members to ensure pre-departure programs are conducted, assesses safety issues, approves budget, maintains liaison between enrolment services and the financial department to recruit students while also helping professors deal with the specific itinerary of the study tour.

The program’s basic format is short-term overseas travel study programs that usually last about two to three weeks. These programs are led by University Dew’s faculty members, and sometimes with facilitators besides faculty members. The on-site experience remains under the leading faculty members’ design. Like any other travel study program, it includes classes and excursions amongst other activities.

Comparing the Four University Study Abroad Programs

Comparing the four study abroad offices and their programs clearly reveals that institutions may choose different program formats—be it island travel studies or total immersion programs like student exchange. Although the basic functions of the organizing offices remain similar in that they are, to a certain extent, like professional service and coordination centers, because of the different program formats that these institutions have adopted, each organizing office’s specific functions may differ. Further, while locating direct data to explain why different program formats are adopted remains difficult, educational philosophy partly reflects the choice of particular program formats and the organizing processes. However, such explanation does not sufficiently answer the question of why these programs are set up in certain ways, since there is always more than one way to achieve certain educational goals. Comparing the four reviewed
programs and their organizing offices, I suggest that local resources limit how and why institutions choose certain kind of program models and organizing processes.

Organizational Status

Specialized Outreach with Service and Cooperation as Main Functions

One common characteristic of the organizational status of the reviewed four study abroad offices is that they were all specialized outreach offices that provide professional services in study abroad fields as one of their main functions. Coordinating with other units on campus plays a very important role in the process. Each reviewed office has some common service functions, such as managing pre-departure programs and offering security management. University Apple’s Office AA is part of a State system-wide EAP office that reports to University Apple’s international institute and UOEAP jointly. The service nature of this office is reflected through its functions to “publicize, recruit, select, and prepare students to go abroad” (A-1-p8). Office BB at University Bear is also a specialized section that has administrative responsibilities to all study abroad programs on campus. As pointed out by one of the interviewees:

We see ourselves, when it comes to study abroad, a service organization. We have in that office professional study abroad administrators. They know how to run a program. (B-2-P9)

University Cherry’s Office CC reports through a vice president in charge of student issues while also working with an associate vice president in charge of international issues. Its service features can be observed from some of its functions such as recruiting students as well as risk and responsibility management. Office DD at University Dew is also a specialized unit reporting through the academic vice president. Providing professional support to faculty members as to travel study programs is one of its main
responsibilities. As a service unit, coordinating with other units becomes important to these offices. University Apple’s Office AA is a coordinating center between UOEAP and University Apple. At University Bear and University Dew, because all programs are joint efforts of the study abroad offices and faculty members, coordinating with faculty members and their departments remains crucial. Office CC works with University Cherry’s office of international issues in relation to student mobility agreements while also working with academic advisers—designated faculty members from different departments and colleges—regarding students’ academic issues.

The reviewed offices retain unique functions due to individual program models. One of the important roles of University Cherry’s Office CC is to negotiate, maintain, and renew partnership agreements with partner institutions. This mandate derives from the basic program model the university has adopted—student exchange. Likewise, University Bear’s and University Dew’s study abroad offices are sometimes involved in facilitating faculty members to arrange itineraries. This function is connected with the faculty-member-led program model both institutions have chosen.

**Characteristics of the Development of Study Abroad Offices**

The development process of these offices demonstrates common characteristics. Study abroad programs were often started with sporadic efforts on campus. Moreover, the development of specialized study abroad offices has experienced a certain expansion at each institution, particularly in more recent years. At University Apple, one of the interviewees pointed out:
We had almost no organizational structure, no institutionalized [structure]... I think one person had made the whole education abroad program at University Apple for many years. (A-1-p12)

University Cherry’s student exchange programs were piloted in 1989, as mentioned by one interviewee:

Student exchange was piloted I think in 89 at University Cherry, and this Office CC was created last year [2004]. Student exchange program became an independent unit with a director probably three or four years ago... four years ago [2001]. (C-1-p14)

At University Bear, study abroad programs started with faculty members’ individual efforts:

...That was in the 50s, and ...one summer he [a faculty member] said: I would like to take some students. And he got a group of about 20 to 25 students and they went to Europe. They had to take a boat from New York... and then they were in Europe for about 3 months. They went all over in Europe. He did that several years in a row. (B-1-p25)

The travel study office at University Dew was established around 2000. As one interviewee mentioned:

..It was eight or nine years ago that (this office) particularly developed. ... Prior to the Office DD being established, programs like, for example, the marine biology program, has been in place for even longer than that. That was done just in conjunction with the departments themselves before travel studies became centralized. (D-2-p16)

Study abroad programs might have existed in some institutions for a long time. However, these offices only started expanding or existing very recently. At University Apple for instance, programs only started rapidly expanding within the past 15 years. As stated, at University Bear:

It’s really only been the last 25 years that institutionally University Bear has embraced the notion of study abroad... They [programs] were much
smaller, many fewer students and many fewer programs. It’s grown
tremendously even in the last 10 years. (B-2-p15-p16)

For University Cherry and University Dew, the independent study abroad offices
were established in the past 10 to 15 years; thus, the expansion of these offices is
even more recent.

The use of technology, specifically the internet, plays an important role in all of these
offices. Each office has a website publicizing their programs, services, policy issues, and
information related to their offices. As one of the interviewees offered:

I think mainly these days, like every other campus, it becomes less
important to look at the documents and more important to look at the
websites... (A-2-p25)

In all selected universities, students can search detailed program information directly
through their online data base. University Bear has an online application system through
which students can directly apply for Office BB’s programs. Both University Apple and
University Cherry have a students’ online message board where previous participants can
provide comments, articles, and photos regarding their experience for students interested
in such experience. All this does include the tremendous email communication used
everyday.

Financial Aspects of the Selected Offices

While questions about the budget and the financial situation of these offices were not
included in the interviews, interviewees all mentioned certain aspects related to the
financial status of their offices. Similarities can be observed. The UOEAP provides
financial oversight and budgetary control to its system-wide programs. Office CC at
University Cherry works partly on base funding from the university and partly on student fees. The non-salary budget and two of the seven staff positions are funded through fees for services. While University Bear pays the faculty members’ salary when on study abroad, University Dew’s leading faculty members’ stipends on study abroad programs follow the part-time faculty stipend rate. A common issue in all offices is the efforts to lower program costs in order to make programs affordable to students. As mentioned by the director of Office CC at University Cherry:

One of the things that I spend more and more time on is developing with the University Cherry’s [name] Unit— that’s a fundraising body—building scholarships and mobility awards for University Cherry’s students. (C-l-p6)

At University Bear, Office BB’s mission statement states, “We will continually look for ways to provide high-quality programs for less cost” (University Bear, 2006a). At University Dew, such an effort can be observed from the interviewee’s desire for change at the curriculum level:

I have been recommending for years... that we move to a system where a portion of the tuition fee is credited to the students’ account and they be required to take a travel study... I have also worked with the development office, who deals with getting donors, [to offer scholarship for travel studies]... (D-1-p32-p33)

While making programs affordable to students remains a challenge to these offices, interviewees also mentioned different levels of financial challenges as a difficulty facing their offices. Such a difficulty is reflected in the concerns about the desire to develop the programs’ participation rate and the paucity of available resources at University Apple and University Cherry:
The biggest difficulty is [that] we don’t have any money... We could probably send, if we had the resources next year, we could send twice as many students as we are sending this year... We haven’t marketed education abroad for two years. We spend no money on publicizing go abroad. –University Apple (A-1-p22-p23)

There is the tension between the idea that it would be good to grow and the desire to have more resources. –University Apple (A-2-p23)

My concern is that there is going to ... need additional resources for [the fact that if we are] going to increase the number of students we send abroad up to 15%. –University Cherry (C-2-p18)

Administratively, these offices also seek more resources:

I mean like anything; basically, any administrator you talk to in terms of growth wants more resources, wants more staff. –University Apple (A-2-p21)

...like everywhere else, we don’t have enough money all the time. And I mean, we wish we had more money. –University Bear (B-1-p31)

...the university doesn’t stand behind the travel studies yet in any financial or staffing way, and I don’t see that happening for a while yet. –University Dew (D-1-p37)

Such a challenge is also reflected in ways to enhance support for students through funding other than scholarships:

We need to increase the amount of funding that’s available to students not on a scholarship basis but on a nomination to mobility basis. –University Cherry (C-1-p29)

The Importance of Champions for the Study Abroad Program Offices

Interviewees were asked about their programs’ strengths and weaknesses. One of the common issues mentioned was the importance of champions. Such champion efforts can be from the policy level. For example, University Cherry’s institutional policy strongly supports study abroad programs:
Cherry Document 1 and Cherry Document 2 clearly identify student mobility as a strong initiative of the university. So that has basically meant that for Office CC, we haven’t had to struggle like many other universities to raise that awareness of the program and the importance of the program to the university. (C-1-p27)

This policy support may be the direct result of the institutional leader, as is the case at University Cherry:

Internationalization starts with your CEO...From the stand point of this institution, our president has been extremely strong and vocal about how internationalization is key development of this institution. That’s why it’s one of the strategic pillars of the institution. The issue of study abroad or student mobility... is critical activity for this institution in order to try to promote that [internationalization]. (C-2-p5)

So in a sense, the whole institution is kind of mobilized to look for opportunities in which we can promote greater student mobility here on campus. So it’s a very reassuring partnership that goes on in terms of both executive level of the institution as well as the operational level of the institution. However, you cannot have one without the other... Good internationalization is usually only successful in those institutions where the executive is absolutely committed to the concept, and particularly your president. In this case, with [name of the university’s president], we have a tremendous champion in the issues of internationalization and globalization, particularly global citizenship. So with his/her vision and his/her urging the institution to get on with the job of doing this, the trickle down is so much easier. (C-2-p17)

At University Apple, such champion effects have not been spelled out in the institutional policy. However, the institutional leader’s efforts are obvious:

In fact, the chancellor, just in the last month, has issued a statement, saying that internationalization is one of his three major initiatives, and he mentions specifically study abroad and education abroad programs. (A-1-p6)

At an institution like University Bear, the individual faculty members’ efforts play a very important role:
...I have to say that we are very fortunate to have excellent institutional support, both from the central administration and from the colleges... and most importantly, we have faculty who are committed to the idea of study abroad. That’s the key element in my mind. Students can be taught and made excited about study abroad, and end up having a bit of experience, but that needs to begin with the committed faculty, and we have that! (B-2-p26)

With such strong support from individual faculty, the program director offers positive comments on the success of University Bear’s study abroad programs:

Our biggest strength at University Bear is that there are so many people that are interested in international things, willing to put time and effort and resources and to make international programs success...It’s a great place to do study abroad, because there are such strong supports for it. (B-1-p32)

At University Dew, programs have strong support from the faculty level. However, the lack of central administrative level support limits the office’s ability to organize study abroad programs:

The strengths for sure are the professors and their commitment. When I see how much ... extra time that many professors put into making the experience perfect, I could name a few who go way beyond what they need to do...Our weaknesses are that the university doesn’t stand behind the travel studies yet in any financial or staffing way, and I don’t see that happening for a while yet. Again, Champion business. Until it is turned into something that ... integrates with departments, and academic departments... especially, I think that we are just always going to be the icing on the cake. And you know, that’s often [scraped] out first, because it’s too rich. Whereas if you put that sugar and the cream stuff inside the cake, it just makes the cake all that much better, and so that’s what I think University Dew really really have to do. (D-1-p37)

Whether it is from the central administrative level or from the faculty level, the effect of champions on study abroad programs plays an important role in relation to these offices’ program organizing ability.
Some Unique Characteristics of these Offices

The strengths and weaknesses of these programs and offices mentioned by interviewees also reflect individual office’s uniqueness as well as the problems they face. University Apple’s Office AA is unique in that its programs are offered from University Apple-Pie’s system level and all ten campuses share the resources. This emphasizes their programs’ strengths:

Without question, the big strength is we can send students to so many places... (A-1-p20)

I think by being able to share resources with all the University Apple-Pie campuses in terms of program administration, you have a strong, very strong, probably the strongest infrastructure in the field. (A-2-p22)

But this also creates problems:

The great weakness, of course, of this kind of program is that University Apple has certain interests that may not be satisfied by the system wide (office). (A-1-p21)

Office BB operated about 90 study abroad programs in the academic year 2005 and these programs were all led by University Bear’s faculty members. This is uncommon in the field:

...we have kind of a unique phenomenon: there are maybe other institutions to do it this way, but ours is the only one that I know of, where for instance, all of study abroad programs are faculty led. We don't contract with anyone else to send our students on other programs, because we don't NEED to. We have so many faculty [members] who want to take students abroad that we can do... this year we will do 90 programs. Well, we have 90 plus faculty who are willing to take students abroad. (B-1-p3)

As previously mentioned, because University Cherry’s programs are based on cooperation with partner institutions, Office CC not only performs common
administrative routines such as the other three offices but is also involved in negotiating, maintaining, and renewing partnership agreements.

In conclusion, all four reviewed offices are specialized outreach units. They have experienced or are experiencing a process of centralization in organizing study abroad programs. Study abroad programs in these universities began with sporadic individual efforts on campus at their early stage. With program expansion, the specialized outreach offices were established to provide “coherence” to these programs. The development and expansion of these offices occurred in the past two to three decades, and champion efforts, such as related policy support, institutional leaders’ support, and/or faculty members’ support, play important roles in this process. The two private religious universities chose to conduct faculty led programs as their main program format, and two public research institutions basically work with their foreign partners.

Office AA at University Apple is the only office among the four offices that does not administrate all the study abroad programs on campus (there are summer session’s travel study programs and other professional school’s own programs). One of the directors interviewed at University Apple expressed the desire to have a central office that would supervise all study abroad programs on campus rather than having different offices reporting through different systems. Interviewees expected changes to happen wherein all study abroad programs at University Apple would be housed in the same office which reports to the UCIE.
Program Contents

General Emphasis on Cross-cultural Communication

University emphasis on internationalization makes study abroad an important element for some universities. As one of the interviewees mentioned:

People who are thinking about internationalizing the university, one of the first things that come to mind is study abroad. (A-1-p6)

All four reviewed offices recognize the importance of knowing foreign cultures and foreign languages in a global world, and increasing graduates’ competency in a global world:

Study abroad is probably one of the best, if not THE best ways for college and university students to learn about the rest of the world...by being there. (A-2-p17)

It’s a tremendous opportunity for students to grow in so many ways. But from the stand point of one’s CV, from the stand point of one’s ability to convince others that you are good at that for a particular job that has an international component to it, as an employer, I would always hire a student that has international experience versus the one who does not. (C-2-p19)

The design of these programs attempts to use opportunities abroad to obtain these necessary skills. As one interviewee at University Apple mentioned:

The general philosophy is if you can get there,... and you have the equivalent level of teaching and support, because of the additional non-class time that you are spending inside the local culture, using the language, getting there to know people, getting to understand what’s going on locally, reading local newspapers, watching TV, and cultural things like museums, or plays, or showing up to the local parliament, you can get a much better understanding of what differences are, as long as learning more about the U.S. by getting a new perspective from abroad. (A-2-p18)
Therefore, in relation to program contents, pre-departure orientation is emphasized and organized in every institution so that students will be well-prepared for the foreign learning experience.

From a disciplinary perspective, students from social sciences and humanities make up about 50% of all program participants. For EAP programs from its system level, in the academic year of 2004 to 2005, 33.1% of participants are from social sciences, 20.2% are from fine and applied arts, letters, and foreign language and literature, 8.4% from psychology, 7.4% from the interdisciplinary studies, 5% from business and management, and the ratio of participants from engineering only 2.3% (University Apple-Pie, 2006b). For University Bear, the major participants are also from humanities and social sciences:

The biggest chunk of our students comes from humanities or the social sciences, which is fairly common everywhere else. Our next biggest college after that is the visual arts, communication and visual arts, which is really kind of humanities anyway. So you have those three, that’s where probably 65% of our students come from one of those areas. (B-1-p21)

University Cherry shares similar stories:

About 45% of the students that go out are in the Faculty of Arts, varying [from] 45% to 55% depending on the year. 10% to 15% are commerce, and then it sort...science, forestry, education because of human kinetics, and then engineering would be a very small group of students. (C-1-p12)

For University Dew, out of eight travel study programs offered in the academic year of 2004 to 2005, four are from social sciences and humanities, and one from business school (University Dew, 2006b). The relatively high participation percentage from social sciences and humanities shows that the contents of study abroad programs emphasize students’ social and cultural skills.
Program contents are basically influenced by program models chosen and these models reflect characteristics of each particular institution. At University Apple, programs are developed at the system-wide level, where University Apple has its faculty representatives in the Academic Senate Committee. The committee’s basic functions, for example, are to manage the academic side of these programs, ensure program quality, and evaluate programs. University Apple’s campus EAP office may also provide student feedback. In most cases, students are enrolled as international students within host institutions. Therefore, program contents vary to a certain extent depending upon what the host institutions offer. University Apple-Pie’s system-wide office also established oversea centers where they occasionally offer their own programs for University Apple-Pie’s students only. These programs’ contents occur through the Academic Senate Committee.

University Cherry’s students are mainly enrolled as international students at partner institutions. Thus, program content also depends upon what is offered at the host institutions. The process and criteria of selecting partner institutions becomes critical in relation to the programs’ contents. The reciprocal student mobility agreement is the basic document that University Cherry uses to establish partnerships for student mobility activities. The premises of establishing such agreements is that potential partner institutions must provide a complementary or value-added academic component to University Cherry’s programs of study. Furthermore, partner institutions must be peer institutions supporting international student experience and meeting academic scrutiny of the participating faculty and the university senate (University Cherry, 2006). With
support letters from the participating dean(s) of faculty(ties) or designate(s), and director of University Cherry’s international office, Office CC completes the agreement proposal and sends it to Senate Admissions Committee at University Cherry for review.

University Bear’s programs’ content is decided by faculty members with their department chair’s approval. These programs are part of University Bear’s academic programs taught overseas. Because of the nature of the university, service has been an important component of University Bear’s study abroad programs. Students are not only involved in the academic and cultural learning in their study abroad experience, their spiritual growth is also emphasized in the programs through regular attendance at local church services while also remaining active church members and within other service opportunities. As stated in Office BB’s guiding principles: all programs will feature one or more meaningful service opportunities (University Bear, 2006b). The student handbook also states:

Study abroad programs are designed to immerse students in local wards and branches of the Church... Through participation in church activities, you will see the gospel in action in your host culture and grow in your own understanding by seeing what the gospel means to other people in their cultural settings. (University Bear, 2006b, p. 1)

University Dew’s program content is decided by faculty members with their department chair’s support and the Academic Council’s approval; they are part of the university’s academic programs taught overseas. Therefore, similar to University Bear, faculty members leading these programs have ultimate control over program content.

Interviewees expressed their desire to integrate study abroad programs into curriculum development in the home institutions. This is reflected in the desire to
convince some non-traditional study abroad disciplines, e.g. engineering, of the value of these programs:

I think there are still some colleges who need convincing about the worth of study abroad. (B-2-p27)

This hope was likewise reflected in the desire to develop interdisciplinary programs:

I like also to add an interdisciplinary focus to University Dew. Today an interdisciplinary class has been a requirement for students and, as I say, it’s hard to teach that on campus, really hard. But it’s a natural thing off campus where you are working with two professors from very different disciplines. (D-1-p16)

Discussions concerning how to integrate EAP programs into the home curriculum are also going on at the University Apple-Pie’s system level (Cooper, 2004):

An ultimate goal of academic integration is to have academic units on the campuses view EAP courses as similar to their own, fulfilling breadth and major requirements and becoming part of course sequences or integral building blocks in academic programs, as well as being included in outreach, promotional, and advising activities… Academic integration has become one of the highest priorities for EAP and increasingly pervades EAP’s planning, research, development, academic oversight, and management efforts. (p. 1)

The program models these universities chose also limit their program content. For example, at University Cherry, faculty members are involved in limited ways in student exchange programs; thus, it is hard to build participants’ overseas experiences to University Cherry’s home curriculum. This might be one of the reasons that the university is currently developing many new program models. University Apple has a similar problem as University Cherry; thus, University Apple-Pie’s system level emphasizes the integration of EAP programs into home curriculum. Because EAP programs are organized at the system level, they cannot always satisfy local campuses’
needs. At University Bear and University Dew, programs are based on faculty members’ initiatives; thus, what faculty members could offer restrains students’ choices.

Selected offices share the general belief about study abroad programs’ effects on participants’ language and cross-cultural communication abilities. This belief potentially explains why pre-departure programs are emphasized in every office. More than half of the participants come from social sciences and humanities, yet participants from disciplines like engineering remain a minority in all selected institutions. Besides these common characteristics, the local factor—the specific selected program formats actually determine program content.

Faculty Members’ and Students’ Roles in Study Abroad Programs

Different Formats of Faculty Members’ Involvement

Faculty members play significant roles in all four reviewed study abroad programs. At University Bear and University Dew, faculty members are directly involved in course planning, teaching on-site, and leading and mentoring students on-site:

It never gets to our level unless there is faculty support. It will never even show up on my desk unless a group of faculty [members] want to do this program. – University Bear (B-2-p21)

So they can decide where they want to go, what they want to teach, to an extent, they can decide how they are going to do about those things. – University Bear (B-1-p27)

They are the primary individuals who establish the course requirements. – University Dew (D-2-p25)
As clearly demonstrated in both institutions, faculty members’ research and teaching interests directly shape what kind of academic programs the universities can offer and where. Gaps between faculty members’ interests and students’ interests inevitably exist and, in such a primary model, certain students’ interests may not be able to satisfy.

At University Apple, the UOEAP office operates study centers inside host countries and sometimes host institutions. Within this context, faculty members from all University Apple-Pie’s campuses have the opportunity to work as directors of these overseas study centers and to work on-site:

...faculty to be study center directors. So there is a two-year rotating cycle for all the countries where University Apple-Pie has programs, except for where there is really a small number, where there will be a [the name of the State university] professor from one of the university campuses, [who] will be there for two years to support program administration and implementation. ... (A-2-p14)

Interested faculty members can also be involved in related committees:

They can also be involved in the Academic Senate Committee, and there are other committees, like UCIE committee, and like with ..., they could also be the campus director, faculty director for EAP as well. So there is regular faculty input. (A-2-p14)

University Cherry basically works through partners to conduct study abroad programs, and faculty members are involved in initiating programs and academic advising:

Faculty members are involved from the stand point of two things: One is from the point of...first contact with an institution that’s interested in having a relationship with University Cherry because of faculty involvement with that institution... The other way that we would do it is that we need course evaluations done by faculty members for courses that are completed at other universities. (C-2-p15)
Any time we propose a new program, it's in partnership with a faculty, and there are faculty members who are identified on the partnership proposal who are supporting the initiative, and there are letters of support usually from a chair or a head of a department and an associate dean with responsibility for international within faculties. ... In terms of students' going, faculty members write letters of support for students' participation in the program. Faculty members are involved in advising students around academically what makes good sense at a partner institution, and they are involved at least to an assessment of transfer of credit. I found faculty members are involved in international agreements that also have funding. (C-1-p23)

In order to encourage faculty members' participation in study abroad programs, University Bear, University Dew, and University Apple all have specific policies about financial supplements for involved faculty members and their family members.

How are Faculty Members Involved?

Faculty members' involvement in study abroad programs is usually voluntary, and thus includes certain limitations. For example, at University Bear and University Dew, faculty members' involvement is usually influenced by their personal interests and their disciplines:

As for the disciplinary focuses, it depends obviously on the professors—what their strengths are. – University Dew (D-1-p16)

We try to build on strength that we have here at the university. Frankly we are not everywhere that I wish we would be. But we don't feel like we can be in certain places without the faculty to support it.... I'll just give you an example: we have a lot of students interested in Philippines. Many of our students have been missionaries in the Philippines or traveled to the Philippines. But as for now, we don't have enough faculty expertise to have intensive programs there. So that would be an example. So we build on what faculty's expertise is here on campus and let that drive the process, and often, there is a bit of lag between what the students want and what the faculty can deliver. – University Bear (B-2-p21)
Program models that these institutions have chosen also influence faculty members' participation in these programs. For example, under the travel study program model, a program could be canceled because of a faculty member's personal situation:

...As I told you, it's one of those championed [causes]. Now he's retired, and we don't know what's going to happen with that program. - University Dew (D-1-p11)

But [program name 1] to [program name 2], which we run with great success for two years, one of the professors has gone, and the other person is just... So it is a wonderful program that is dying. - University Dew (D-1-p12)

Under the exchange model at University Cherry, faculty members' attitudes towards study abroad programs sometimes directly hinder students' participation:

Students withdraw every year because they cannot get undergraduate advisors to sign off on applicability of courses that they are doing in a partner university which will be University Cherry's course work to their degree requirement. (C-1-p29)

*How are Students Involved?*

Students' roles in these programs can be summarized to two questions that similarly influence these programs: where students are interested in going and how they feel about their experience. These two questions could influence where these programs' destinations will be. The first question is handled at University Apple by marketing survey from the central UOEAP office:

The kind of thing that students are involved in is mainly in our marketing surveys, that is we would not send a student or we would not establish a program if ...students are not interested in going there. So we have to ... ask students' input to tell us whether they would go to these places or not. (A-1-p18)
At University Cherry, students’ collective opinions could determine where partnerships will be built:

Students can be involved in the determination of partnerships. Basically we will look to faculty unit student, not one individual’s opinion, but a [pile] of opinions from students, or to the university’s strategic plan in terms of where we build partnerships. (C-1-p24)

At University Bear and University Dew, students may directly talk to their faculty members about their interests in informal ways. However, it is the answers to the second question that may reach the similar effect: through program evaluation, students help faculty members and the program offices to decide how these programs should be improved and whether they should be canceled:

Our attitude is we create the program, that [if] the students don’t like [it], they don’t go. You know, we create a product, and we sell it to the students…… They give evaluation when they’re on the programs. (B-1-p29)

The programs are continually being re-invented. We may move the students to different living area if that’s not working. The academic department may re-work their curriculum if the students aren’t happy. So it’s a constant re-invention. (B-2-p22)

…and course evaluation...we really do take the course evaluation seriously and try to find ways to make it more interesting to the students, and take their suggestions without ruining any academic integrity in the courses and so on. (D-1-p29)

To conclude, depending on the program models adopted, faculty members are involved in program planning, advising, and teaching on-site. Despite different formats of faculty members’ involvement, be it advising or actually teaching on-site, their involvement in study abroad programs is voluntary, thus limiting these programs in some ways. Students are involved in providing opinions about where they are interested in
going and to evaluate existing programs. Their role reflects a consumer's approach to a product.

**Impact of Globalization on these Programs**

One of the assumptions of this study is that globalization influences the ways universities organize their study abroad programs. Therefore, this section explores the impact of globalization on study abroad programs.

**Globalization and Study Abroad Programs**

One of the direct connections of globalization to institutional study abroad programs is reflected in these universities' emphasis on improving students' cross-cultural and language abilities. Studying abroad is seen as a way to enhance students' cross-cultural and language abilities and the emphasis on these skills is regarded as a direct result of globalization. The logic put forward is this: globalization requires citizens who function well in their own cultural context as well as in an increasingly globalized world. Cross-cultural and language skills are regarded as important parts in the latter context. The pressures of being international and cultivating global citizens are interpreted at internationalization policy levels as is the case at University Cherry and from university leader's emphasis on internationalization as is the case of University Apple. For public universities like University Apple and University Cherry, which aim at being world leading universities, study abroad programs are included as a strategy of internationalization to fulfill such mandate. To University Bear and University Dew though, these aims are not written in its policy. Notwithstanding, there is the general
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agreement among interviewees that these skills are important under the current global context.

**Business Terms and Concepts in Organizing Study Abroad**

Vocabulary and concepts from the business world in organizing study abroad programs in three of the selected universities reveals the varied ways in which globalization impacts universities. Universities use business concepts. Administrators see the organization of study abroad programs as creating a “product” and selling it to students in the case of University Bear; “marketing” and “advertising” EAP programs to students in the case of University Apple; and “fee for service” practice in the case of University Cherry. The business-like practices in study abroad programs of these three universities reflect the influence of the economic facet of globalization on universities: educational programs are treated as commodities to satisfy its target market.

**Special Mission of Religious Universities**

With the development of technology, the cultural facet of globalization encourages the flow of people and ideas and therefore enables the local university to broaden its specific cultural influence. To University Bear, one of the religious universities, this side of globalization is reflected in its mission statement. Thus, in its mission statement, faculty, staff, students, and administrators are encouraged to make their service and scholarship available to the affiliated church in furthering its work worldwide. The mission of the university has a strong effect on its courses, and it is expected that its fulfillment will greatly enlarge the university’s influence in a world it wishes to improve (*University Bear*, 2006c). Study abroad programs at University Bear thus “feature one or
more meaningful service opportunities” (University Bear, 2006a). Here we can observe the university’s intention of expanding its cultural influence through study abroad programs.
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

In this final chapter, I start by reviewing the research questions and the purpose of this study. Secondly, I reflect on the main findings and discuss these findings within the theoretical framework I adopted in this study. I also connect my explanation with the general literature and identify some major conclusions. At the end of the chapter, I offer some recommendations for future research in this area.

Review of the Study

Globalization has become one of the most important concepts in today’s world and profoundly influences our political, economic, and cultural life. Some scholars see globalization as a converging force that makes institutions increasingly similar. Others see globalization as a powerful force that inspires diverse local characteristics (Newson, 1998). Higher education institutions, as one of the important social components in modern society and bound in specific local contexts, have been forced to respond to the new global context. How are universities in different local contexts influenced by globalization? How do they confront such global influence? How do local and global dynamics shape universities?

Attempting to explore these questions from one particular aspect—studying abroad—this study started with two major research questions: how do universities organize their study abroad programs? And, why are these programs set up the way they are. The aim of this study was to explore the factors that shape the structure, content, and organizational status of study abroad programs in the context of globalization. Four universities and their major institutional study abroad program offices were selected. University Apple’s Office AA offers programs developed by system wide EAP office. Further, Office AA
works as UCEAP’s branch unit at University Apple to provide related services such as preparing students for their international experience. University Bear’s Office BB works with individual faculty members to offer logistic support for faculty-initiated international study programs. Office CC at University Cherry organizes student exchange and other study abroad opportunities through the university’s partner institutions around the world. For University Dew, Office DD provides support for the faculty led travel study programs. The four reviewed offices reflect some similarities and some differences which help us to see how globalization and universities’ local contexts have inter-played to shape institutional study abroad programs.

Major Findings

Data were analyzed according to four themes: the organizing process of these programs, the organizational status of the program offices, program content, and faculty members’ and students’ involvement in these programs beyond instruction, and supposed program beneficiaries. The impact of globalization is also analyzed to explore the research questions. Detailed findings are offered in Chapter Four and can be summarized as follows:

1. The influence of globalization on study abroad programs is reflected in the following major conclusions:

   a. Globalization forces some universities to be strategic players with specific emphasis on internationalization as a response;

   b. Having an internationalization policy helps enhance the development of study abroad programs in some universities.
c. Helping students develop cross-cultural communication skills and foreign language skills—a set of desirable skills in the global economy—also encourages individual faculty members, departments and faculties, and universities to rationalize their study abroad programs;

d. The converging force of globalization can be observed in the development process of the offices. This is specifically reflected in the fact that they have all become professional service units.

e. One of globalization's direct influences, the market ideology, defines students' involvement in these programs as consumers.

2. The local institutional context plays an important role in defining which specific program formats are ultimately adopted:

a. Study abroad programs started with specific program formats with sporadic individual efforts bound to the history of the university;

b. Faculty members' involvement in study abroad programs is mainly voluntary, depending on what kind of program format is adopted;

c. Available institutional resources continue to either strengthen the adopted program formats or set specific limitations regarding the kind of programs that can be offered.

Together, we see that different facets of globalization, working with universities' specific local contexts, influence the organizing of institutional study abroad programs. We may predict the direction of study abroad programs' development at the university level: the local context will continue to encourage innovations in study abroad programs at a deeper level—as one of the important components to internationalize the curriculum. This may lead to even more diversified program formats. However, the major functions of these
organizing offices may become increasingly similar—leaving the academic part of the programs to academic units while these offices become increasingly professionalized as service centers for the programs’ administration.

Discussion

Globalization, Internationalization, and University Study Abroad Programs

Globalization and internationalization are closely related concepts and are sometimes used interchangeably in the context of higher education. However, these two concepts are different. As Altbach and Teichler put it, “Internationalization in higher education is an inevitable result of the globalized and knowledge-based economy of the 21st century” (2001, p. 5). In other words, internationalization of higher education can be viewed as a strategic response to challenges brought by globalization. In this study, interviewees were asked about institutional policies in relation to the status of internationalization at their universities in order to observe the level of each institution’s strategic response to globalization as well as to map the role and importance of study abroad programs within the particular institutional context.

Internationalization and University Study Abroad Programs

This study demonstrates that the institutional emphasis of internationalization has a positive influence on the development of study abroad programs. The public universities, University Cherry and University Apple, tend to interpret internationalization from policy and central administrative levels and view study abroad programs as an important component of these institutions’ internationalization process. In the university’s strategic planning document, University Cherry sees internationalization as one of five pillars supporting the university’s development in the 21st century.
Though University Apple does not have a formal document stating the importance of internationalization, the university chancellor has made a formal speech referring to internationalization as one of his three major initiatives. Study abroad programs are regarded as an important component of this internationalizing effort. As one interviewee mentioned, University Apple is one of the top ranked senders of study abroad students in the U.S. in terms of total numbers.

Both University Bear and University Dew, sponsored by international churches, lack formal statements or policies formulated by the central administrative level that attempt to interpret internationalization under their particular institutional contexts. However, internationalization is seen as a built-in component: interviewees at University Bear regard study abroad programs as an important part of its education. In contrast, University Dew demonstrates no evidence that internationalization is a major concept for the university’s development nor is the study abroad program considered important at the various decision-makings levels.

Moreover, no evidence shows that where internationalization is adopted as a key concept for university development, study abroad programs are more important to the university. University Bear stands out as an example, where no specific institutional policy is made to emphasize the concept of internationalization, yet study abroad programs are still viewed as an important activity to the university and have been developed well in this institutional context. However, it does look like the strategic emphasis on internationalization positively influences the development of study abroad programs. University Cherry stands out as a case in point. Starting to pilot its student exchange programs in 1989, the growth of participants was not significant until after 2001 when the study abroad program office became an office with an independent
director, almost at the same period that the university started to emphasize
internationalization in its strategic planning document. The goal, set by Cherry Document
2, is to increase the participation rate of study abroad programs by 15% (University
Cherry, 2005). University Dew stands as an opposite example. Internationalization is not
a key concept to the institution’s development direction and, though the value of study
abroad programs is recognized, these are not supported whether at the level of policy-
making or financially. These programs have now been transferred to the non-traditional
programs’ section with some programs being canceled because of lack of leadership from
faculty members. Table 4 summarizes these observed patterns:

Table 4: Emphasis on Internationalization and the Importance of Study Abroad
Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Internationalization Policy</th>
<th>Emphasis on Internationalization</th>
<th>Importance of Study Abroad Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Cherry</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Apple</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Bear</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>In process</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Dew</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not obvious</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a strategic response from HEIs to globalization, internationalization addresses
increased border-crossing activities, and is often discussed in relation to physical mobility,
academic cooperation and academic knowledge transfer as well as international education
(Teichler, 2004). Such a view partially explains why the emphasis on internationalization
leads to an emphasis on the development of study abroad programs. In fact, organized
study abroad programs have become one of the major activities as one of HEIs’
internationalization strategies. They are often rationalized by HEIs’ goal of educating
quality graduates capable of functioning well within the global economy. As is often
argued, the role of education abroad in preparing students to be productive citizens is
becoming more important in a world where national economies are increasingly
interdependent (Loveland & Murphy, 2006). It is assumed that new academic and cultural perspectives acquired through study abroad programs are integrated into the economy by way of employment in the home country (Loveland & Murphy, 2006). Thus, the emphasis on internationalization of HEIs in general and on study abroad programs more specifically reflects the demands of a globalized economy.

In the present study, there is insufficient evidence to suggest that internationalization seems to be of more concern to the central administrators in public universities than for their colleagues in private universities. One possible explanation could be that cutting funds from government directly influences public universities’ financial status. When Slaughter and Leslie (1997) elaborate the concept of academic capitalism, a term developed to describe public research universities’ responses to neoliberal tendencies to treat higher education policy as a subset of economic policy, they identify reduced state resources as the major reason for academic capitalism. This essentially shows that public institutions are more vulnerable to reductions in state funding. Many public universities worldwide now have to raise their tuition to cover routine operational costs and turn to the private sector for further funding. For these universities, international recognition means attracting more research funding and top students. The central strategic emphasis on internationalization from some public universities seems to be a response to the influences of economic globalization. Private HEIs do not depend on public funding to the same level as public universities do, therefore public funding cuts do not affect private HEIs to the same extent.

**Study Abroad as an Increasingly Professionalized Field**

The centralization or decentralization debate presents two opposite poles of the administrative reality of many activities within HEIs. In the case of study abroad
programs, even if program initiatives originate from various sectors within an individual university, further program development depends upon an administrative choice: should these programs be attached to a centralized office or should they be controlled as decentralized efforts by individual faculties? Brockington (2002) argues that at the heart of this decision are factors which include control of resources and curricula as well as perceptions of power and status. He points out that a centralized administrative structure carries a greater risk of cumbersome bureaucracy and of estrangement of international programs. In contrast, a more decentralized structure potentially leads to the perception that there is a fracturing of the college’s international efforts as departments and individual faculty work to protect programs with little regard to the greater institutional good. Brockington’s (2002) recommendation is to move beyond the centralization-decentralization dichotomy in order to consider administrative and financial structures of international programs offices in light of the varying degrees of autonomy, authority, and responsibility represented by these two poles.

The four case studies examined here show only one side of the centralized and decentralized story. The organizational status of the major institutional study abroad program offices and their basic functions exhibit some similarities: they are all professional service centers and have experienced or are experiencing a more centralized development process. Study abroad programs in these universities originated from individual efforts and were quite peripheral activities in the initial stages. Over the past 15 to 25 years, these programs have become managed by independent offices which have expanded. At the time of my interviews, all four offices functioned as a service center where study abroad professionals work with other units on campus to offer related services such as pre-departure orientation, program consulting, and security management.
The academic content of these programs is not determined by these offices. In the case of EAP programs at University Apple and Office CC’s programs at the University Cherry, academic content remains under the control of host institutions. In the case of Office BB at University Bear and Office DD at University Dew, these programs’ academic content is decided by leading faculty members with their departments’ approval. Here the study abroad program office operates more like a coordinating service center with study abroad professionals offering related services to faculties and students.

This may express a new reality: under globalization, the choice of organizing study abroad programs has gone beyond the choices of centralized or decentralized organizing offices. Indeed, the issue concerns how the institution and its different units can work best together. Study abroad offices as centralized service centers may better suit tasks such as negotiating institutional partnerships and emergency control while decentralized efforts from individual faculties and faculty members may contribute best to curriculum aspects of these programs. In fact, the whole education abroad field may cooperate in certain areas to enhance programs in individual institutions. When David Larsen, vice president of Arcadia University and director of its Center for Education Abroad discussed emergency in the education abroad field, he stated:

Two decades ago, the study abroad community took the innovative step of sharing information about what was going on overseas in a time and in an area of crisis in response to the Libyan bombings. We have been doing so, quite routinely, ever since. Despite the fact that everybody has their own programs and their own agenda, there is now a real spirit of working together for the good of the enterprise in a time of crisis. (Quoted in Loveland & Murphy, 2006, p. 34)

Another example is the CCCU’s study abroad programs for its member institutions. It may be quite a challenge for a mid-size university like University Dew as an individual institution to organize semester or year-long study abroad programs in different locations
around the world, but as a member institution of CCCU, University Dew’s students can participate in such programs while earning their own institution’s credits.

**Market Ideology – Provider and Consumer**

From the point of view of students’ involvement in study abroad programs beyond their role as learners, we see clearly that HEIs operate as providers of educational services while students are perceived as customers. In the four cases under study, students’ involvement in study abroad programs focuses mainly on providing feedback about their experiences or opinions relating to the kind of programs they are interested in. The ultimate result of this involvement is to inform the organizing offices about the types of programs suitable for student’s demands. This is quite similar to the customer feedback system in the business world where customer service personnel collect client feedback and send it to the producer so that the producer can improve the product accordingly to make it better suit the market. The positive side of such student involvement is that students’ voices are heard in the process and thus may potentially improve aspects of the program’s organization. However, it may be argued that educational programs are different from commodities. While producing commodities aims mainly to satisfy user needs, the design of educational programs has to consider more than just the students’ immediate needs but rather the long term social impact of education.

Institutions have also created multiple ways to serve students’ needs. All four universities have more than one way to organize study abroad programs. A case in point is University Apple. The Office AA organizes the system-wide EAP programs and the university has a summer sessions office which offers short-term travel study programs. In addition, the internship and study abroad service office helps students participate in
programs from other organizations while professional schools such as business school
offer study abroad opportunities embedded in the curriculum of their degree programs.
Such a multiple-channel system serves different students' needs and looks just like
brands of products seeking different market niches.

The phenomenon of treating students as consumers and universities as purveyors of
educational service discloses one important influence of economic globalization upon the
university: the creeping in of market ideology in the higher education arena (Currie,
1998). The emergence of a global market has created conditions in which less money is
made available for social welfare and education (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). Thus, HEIs
must engage in market or market-like efforts to secure external monies—what Slaughter
and Leslie define as "academic capitalism" (1997). Knowledge and educational
experiences are now packaged as commodities to be sold to targeted student customers.
When it comes to the study abroad field, as Bolen (2001) argues in her article about
consumerism and U.S. study abroad programs, "Institutions increasingly see study abroad
as a way to attract students and realize that it must be well run to serve its market
purpose" (p. 196). Study abroad opportunities, viewed as an important means to obtain
cross-cultural and language skills, which job-seekers must have in the global economy,
are sometimes advertised as one of the selling points of an undergraduate degree. As in
the market place, where a product needs to satisfy the demands of its customers, students' needs are emphasized in the process of organizing study abroad programs. As Bolen (2001) rightly points out, while it is important that these programs consider students' needs, educators, unlike business people, should remain very cautious because while
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attention to market forces may promote responsiveness to customer demands, it may compromise the integrity of the university as the purveyor of knowledge and free inquiry.

**Study Abroad Programs and Economic and Cultural Globalization**

The influences of globalization on university study abroad programs are complex. From the economic perspective, the globalization of economy increasingly requires people who have cross-cultural and language skills, which therefore helps universities rationalize study abroad programs. As this study suggests, public universities’ strategic internationalization through study abroad programs represents one response to globalization. The influence of economic globalization on university study abroad programs could also be observed from the business practices within these offices. And yet, we also see the influence of cultural globalization in the case of the two religious universities studied here. For instance, as a private religious university sponsored by a church, University Bear embraces the notion of providing service and scholarship to the international church it is affiliated with to fulfill its mission worldwide (*University Bear*, 2006c). This is reflected in its design of study abroad programs with an emphasis on service. Here we see study abroad programs used as a means to express the expansion of cultural influence to other parts of the world. Such action will likewise influence globalization in a cultural sense.

**Bound in Local Context—Diversified Program Formats**

Though the organizational status of these offices is quite similar, the basic program models chosen in each institution reflects significant differences. At University Cherry, student exchange programs with partner institutions are the basic program format, which provide students with immersion experiences as international students at host universities.
At University Apple, the EAP programs also offer the total immersion experience to students. University Bear’s and University Dew’s programs are predominantly faculty member-led travel study programs. These basic program formats were adopted when these institutions first started organizing study abroad programs and they are currently expanding to other program formats. For example, University Cherry has now added volunteer placement and ‘University Cherry term abroad’ to their programs. There are also pilot programs for internships and undergraduate research placement. As mentioned by one interviewee, student exchange will account for 60% of all programs over the next five years, and the rest for these newly developed programs. University Apple-Pie’s system-wide EAP office has developed overseas centers where University Apple-Pie’s courses, rather than host institution courses, are offered.

One observable fact is that the basic program formats are affected by the programs’ history and the institutional contexts associated with the availability of resources. For example, the first University Bear’s study abroad program was led by an individual faculty member who was interested in bringing students to Europe. Also, as one of the affiliated international church’s traditions, many young church members aged 19 to 21 serve missions around world. As one interviewee mentioned, 50% or more of faculty members on University Bear’s campus have served missions abroad and they have interest in the countries that they visit. Therefore, the university’s study abroad started with faculty led travel study programs and has a large resource of people willing to take students to study abroad. Thus, faculty-led study abroad programs appear to represent a very “logical” choice as the main program format. University Cherry is one of the high profile universities in Canada and has a renowned reputation worldwide. At the beginning stage of establishing student exchange partnerships, as one interviewee
mentioned, the process was fairly reactive: “people would approach University Cherry; University Cherry would consider it, and may or may not go for with the partnership” (C-1-p. 16). Now the office is trying to be more proactive and partnerships have expanded to over 130 universities around the world. It is reasonable to deduce that University Cherry has used its reputation as a valuable resource to develop its study abroad programs. For University Apple, the rich resources available from University Apple-Pie’s ten campuses make it possible for its students to go to many different locations through EAP programs. In contrast, University Dew is a rather small university with limited available resources for study abroad programs. Joining CCCU, however, has broadened University Dew’s students’ choice of studying abroad.

We see from the above analysis that all these programs’ formats are developed based on each university’s specific historical and current local context, as well as available resources, which are especially key in relation to what program formats are adopted. When discussing their analytical heuristic model to understand comparative higher education under globalization, Marginson and Rhoades (2002) point out that HEIs have long histories shaped through centuries of sedimentation of ideas, structures, resources, and practices, and these won’t be easily dismissed. Indeed, these researchers emphasize the necessity of understanding the current circumstances and the historically embedded structures on which current HEI’s activity and influence are based. When it comes to the format of a particular HEI’s study abroad programs, it is reasonable and necessary to examine the local context and particular history as well as its institutional strengths and resources available.
Is Study Abroad the Only Way?

While internationalization and globalization are regarded as important concepts to universities and study abroad is viewed as an important component to achieve universities' goal of becoming international, study abroad opportunities are still not seen by interviewees as crucial components of these universities. As one interviewee states: “they are valuable but not critical” (B-2-p3). Compared with welcoming international students to a university campus, sending students on institutional study abroad programs remains peripheral.⁸ Discussing long-term developments and challenges of academic mobility and international education, Altbach and Teichler (2001) argue that “exchanges and international activities are not central elements of the academic enterprise in any country” (p. 19). Though benefits of study abroad programs are recognized by many, as Anderson et al. (2006) have argued, at a time of increasing competition for resources, study abroad programs generally lack hard data to justify their worth. Thus, when conflicting interests rise, these programs may be often sacrificed. In University Dew’s case, one interviewee mentioned that University Dew would cut its programs for the following year. The interviewee was told that, other than for financial reasons, the programs are in conflict with the board’s project of sending students to another city within Canada, which is the property that the university owns there. Such a case cautions us to carefully consider the multiple and complex influences of globalization on study abroad programs. Though the emphasis on cultivating graduates to have cross-cultural and foreign language skills—a direct impact of globalization—has enhanced the
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⁸ Comparing table 1 and table 2, the number of international students studying in American universities is much more than the number of American students studying abroad through study abroad programs.
development of study abroad programs in HEIs, other influences of globalization may hinder its development.

Despite attempts to reduce costs, study abroad programs are still quite expensive for many students because of the travel involved. Furthermore, study abroad programs may garner resources that could otherwise be allocated to on-campus programs and activities (Anderson et al, 2006), which may be less expensive than study abroad programs in achieving the educational goals that study abroad programs are meant to accomplish. As Anderson et al point out:

> While there is an almost universal call for greater cultural awareness, the mechanism for achieving this aim has been a subject of considerable discussion. Suggested alternatives range from presentation of materials on different cultures in a domestic classroom environment to actual exposure and direct involvement with different cultures in foreign locations. Although few, if any, authorities argue against travel abroad as a means of improving cultural sensitivity, there is some support for the belief that increases in intercultural sensitivity can be achieved through education and training, without the need for foreign travel. (Anderson et al, 2006, p. 459)

Such doubt may explain the fact that study abroad programs are considered valuable, but not critical to universities in this study. What is left for universities to consider may be what the characteristics of these on-campus international activities are, and how universities should respond to the competing interests under internationalization in order to achieve the educational goals they set.

### Icing on the Cake or Sugar inside the Cake?

---Embedding Study Abroad into the Curriculum---

Champions from both the institutional leaders’ part and interested faculty members’ part play an important role in the development of study abroad programs in the selected universities. In some situations, when program champions have left the university, programs may die as happened in two of University Dew’s travel study programs.
As one of our interviewees mentioned, until study abroad is turned into a component that could be integrated into the curriculum of the academic department, it will remain the icing on the cake. On the other hand, putting sugar and cream inside the cake makes the cake much more palatable. Do study abroad programs stand only as the icing on the top of the good looking cake of these HEIs to attract interested people who want better records on their CVs? Or, should universities, as the interviewee and many others have suggested, integrate study abroad programs into their core curriculum to make them truly international? As one interviewee mentioned, strategies include curriculum innovation and integrating study abroad into the curriculum.

Holland and de Velasco (1998) present an innovative model which contains three distinct components, including study abroad, for adding an international dimension to its Architectural and Construction Science programs at Texas A&M University. The first approach of inserting an international dimension within the syllabus adds a limited international experience to a course, which adapts well to the traditional lecture and seminar courses. For example, students at two universities from US and Mexico make presentations to each other through videoconference infrastructure. The second approach is to integrate an international dimension at the curricular level by adding an integrated international experience to a pure design course by extensive use of the internet and videoconferencing protocols. The third approach, immersion in a foreign instructional environment, is where study abroad plays a significant role. Students travel to Mexico and study at the foreign institution. Course work can be followed by an internship working in a foreign design or construction firm.

Instead of an independent educational program struggling for its survival in competition with many other academic programs in the HEIs, innovative ways of
embedding study abroad programs within the curriculum, and making them an integral part of the whole, will help universities reach these programs' intended educational goals. This should be the possible direction and, in fact, should be encouraged as the direction toward which faculty members and study abroad professionals could work. Such a direction would ensure, for instance, the long-term development of study abroad programs under university's internationalization context.

Major Conclusions: Global and Local

—the Unavoidable Complex Realities for Institutional Study Abroad Programs

The influences of globalization to HEIs are undeniable, and together with the local context that HEIs operate in, these influences have created a complex reality for the development of institutional study abroad programs. There are opportunities as well as challenges. Higher education institutions are facing unprecedented challenges. Consequently, HEIs have become strategic players with initiatives emphasizing specific institutional internationalization while also stressing the connection of having study abroad experiences to develop individual’s cross-cultural and language abilities. For some universities, this could mean new opportunities for further developing study abroad programs. In fact, the rapid development of study abroad programs along the past two decades is one of the important aspects of such institutional internationalization efforts. The results of this study show that such an emphasis on internationalizing universities enhances the development of existing study abroad programs at the university level.

And yet challenges remain. As economic globalization influences the higher education sector, business practices such as regarding study programs as educational products are observable. There is the risk of sacrificing the long-term educational
objectives that these programs are meant to achieve for short-term gains. Furthermore, while study abroad programs are usually a more costly educational practice, offices of these programs face the pressure of competing for limited resources with other more cost-effective international activities on campus. Curriculum innovation points the way for further developing study abroad programs; however, such innovative ways will need to consider the university’s general culture, and seek support from HEIs’ local context: these programs’ history, the available institutional resources, and institutional international education policy.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

This study explored how study abroad programs are organized at the university level and why they are organized in certain ways. Only the major university study abroad programs and their organizing offices were selected and studied in the present research. Yet during the overview of every university’s available study abroad opportunities, it was found that in all the selected universities, there were more than one office that organized such programs, e.g. programs organized by business schools at University Cherry and University Apple in which study abroad opportunities were embedded in their curriculum. Not only that, there were also programs in which though students were not moved physically to another place, their learning contexts were moved to the other end of the world through Internet and Communication Technology (ICT). In one of the selected universities, there were also programs jointly organized by several universities with students coming from all the participating universities in different countries for certain courses. Hence, clearly, this wide variety of programs, which was not included in the present study, means that study abroad programs or student mobility programs can no
longer be easily defined. There are various formats for students to study in different cultural contexts, and for knowledge and ideas to be communicated. Do study abroad programs have to be re-conceptualized as involving students' physical moving to a different learning context? Or will the opposite—the moving of different learning contexts to students done through modern technology—be enough to define what study abroad programs are? In other words, is the concept of study abroad program still a valid concept? Or do we need a new concept that could help us understand all the innovative international programs that are going on in each campus, and that emphasize to varying degrees and in varied ways, the global experiences of students?

Access and equity issues associated with study abroad programs must be researched too. With a variety of international learning opportunities available on campus, study abroad programs, in a sense, are stratified through their packaging. With the influence of economic globalization and under the pressure of cutting funds from public sector to universities, universities need the generated revenues to keep their operational costs. Many educators struggle to keep study abroad programs at low cost. But we also observe some of these programs as one of the "cash cows" on university campus. In fact, in one of the selected universities, one interviewee mentioned another study abroad organizing office on campus which focused on coordinating with departments to develop short-term travel programs for quick money. Without a clear boundary of what study abroad programs are, we see them stratified to fit the different economic capacities of students. In such contexts, access and equity issues become critical, especially with regard to the public role of the university. Will study abroad programs be stratified to a level in which the money students pay will define what kind of experiences they will get from these programs? How can universities keep the access to study abroad programs open to all
those who are interested in participating while at the same time be able to deal with the financial pressures involved?

Study abroad programs are designed to fulfill certain educational goals, mainly increasing students' cross-cultural awareness and enhancing their language skills. These come with a price. With the creeping in of market ideology in all areas of university activities, study abroad programs are not immune to market pressures and ideologies. In this study, we observe the anxiety of these program administrators for more resources, for expanding their programs, and for using limited resources to better serve their students and faculty members. A real challenge appears here: How can program administrators balance the market influence in the field and at the same time keep the educational objectives of these programs fulfilled? More research is needed to explore the influences of the market to study abroad field, and more research is needed to better help these administrators navigate the corporatization of the university and safeguard the educational value of these programs.

This study shows that faculty members' involvement in study abroad programs is still voluntary. Faculty members' lack of interest in such programs may directly hinder student participation. Further research addressing why some faculty members are not interested in getting involved in study abroad programs may clarify how study abroad programs relate to the larger curriculum of the university. More case studies in innovative uses of study abroad programs as part of curricular reforms may encourage participation of professors and students in non-traditional study abroad disciplines such as engineering. In fact, in a context where global and local factors dynamically change HEIs' realities, the fulfillment of study abroad programs' long-term educational objectives may depend on innovative ways of integrating these programs in the overall design of curriculum.
This study also shows a connection between internationalization policy and the development of education abroad programs: institutions emphasizing internationalization are more optimistic about the development of their study abroad programs. Further study of how internationalization policy in HEIs influences the development of study abroad programs will enhance our understanding of related issues. There is an assumption that study abroad programs will contribute to institutional internationalization, and objectives of increasing the participation rate are often made without concrete support. In fact, there is little research exploring how study abroad programs influence universities' internationalization process, especially when compared with other international activities on campus. Further research in such a direction will help program administrators to better fit their programs in the institutional contexts.

Last but not least, I observe a lack of data in the Canadian university’s record of study abroad activities. A better understanding of the development of Canadian universities’ international education depends on reliable, valid and accurate data in this area. Researching for ways to improve data gathering and use on study abroad programs is therefore crucial; and to start with, any such venture depends on the definitions of study abroad programs adopted.

We are in a context in which global influences and local characteristics shape our daily practices. To the study abroad field, ICT and the demand for global understanding have created new opportunities. But there are also difficulties as this study has partly shown. As educators, how we can face these difficulties and pressures in ways which ensure and enhance the public mandate of the university to bring education equitably to all will always be a challenge.
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Appendix A: Letter of Initial Contact

A Comparative Study of Four North American Universities’ Study Abroad Programs

Dear Sir/Madam,

My name is Xuehong Liao, and I am a graduate student pursuing my MA degree in the Department of Educational Studies at the University of British Columbia. I am researching four North American universities’ study-abroad programs. I want to find out why these institutions structure their study abroad programs in certain ways. My assumption is that institutional contexts influence the ways their study-abroad programs are structured. The selected four universities are: a public university in the west coast of Canada, a private university in the west coast of Canada, a public university in the west coast of the United States, and a private university in the mid-west of the United States. Such a selection is to encounter as wide a spectrum of representatives of different universities and their study abroad programs as possible.

Your university is in my study. Your participation in this study would be valuable. Therefore, I am writing to see if you would grant me an interview in the following two weeks. Would you be kind enough to let me know if it is possible for me to conduct a face-to-face interview with you? If so, I shall defer to your schedule and choice of place on campus. There is no remuneration for participating in the research, but results of the study will be available in your request. The interview shall be no longer than two hours, and your personal information shall not be available to anybody other than the principal investigator, who is my supervisor, and myself.

Your contribution would be greatly appreciated. May I hear from you at your earliest convenience? You can contact me by email or mail.

Sincerely yours,

Xuehong Liao

Principal Investigator: Dr. Hans G. Schuetze,
Professor, Adult & Higher Education
Department of Educational Studies
Ponderosa Annex H, Room 131
Tel: (604) 822-4860
E-mail: hans.schuetze@ubc.ca
The data collected will be password-protected. Only the principal investigator and the co-investigator shall have access to the data. You will not be identified by your name in any reports of the completed study. Reports generated from this study shall not reveal details about individuals.

**Remuneration/Compensation:**
You shall not receive remuneration to participate in this study.

**Contact for information about the study:**
If you have questions or desire further information with respect to this study, you may contact Xuehong Liao, the co-investigator.

**Contact for concerns about the rights of research subjects:**
If you have any concerns about your treatment or rights as a research subject, you may contact the Research Subject Information Line in the UBC Office of Research Services at 604-822-8598.

**Consent:**
Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary and you may refuse to participate. You can withdraw from the study at any time.

Your signature below indicates that you have received a copy of this consent form for your own records.

You do not waive any legal rights by signing this consent form.

Your signature indicates that you consent to participate in this study.

---

**Participant’s legal name**

---

**Participant’s Signature**

**Date**

---

**Signature of Witness**

**Date**
Appendix C: Prototype of Interview Questions

- Institutional contexts and general views of study abroad programs in your university:

1. Is internationalization regarded as a marginal or central strategy in your university’s development? If yes, how? Why do you think it is like this?
2. How do you view internationalization activities in your university? Are they in an ordered and systematic manner, or are they just in sporadic or irregular forms?
3. Do you consider having study abroad opportunities for students in your university is important or not? Why? If it is important, what are the evidences?
4. How do you think your university positions study abroad programs in the context of the whole university’s development strategy?

- Study abroad programs’ development in your university and structuring of activities:

5. When was your office established? Why did the university start such practice?
6. How were study abroad programs like at the beginning?
   1) Number of participating students, number of programs, and number of faculty and staff members involved
   2) Major patterns of programs/how are they organized
   3) Geographical focus
   4) Organizational structure built up for its development
7. How is it like today?
   1) The number of participants, number of programs, and number of faculty and staff members involved
   2) Rationales (if there are differences)
   3) Major patterns of programs/how are they organized (If there are differences)
   4) Geographical focus (If there are differences.)
   5) Organizational structure expanded for its development (If applicable)

- Decision making process/authority distribution:

8. What kind of control does your office have in the decision making process of study abroad programs? Why your office is entitled such authority?
9. Whose interests do your think your office serves---students, faculty, university, or all of them? How?
10. Does such a structural arrangement satisfy the overall strategy of university development? Why or why not?
11. What kinds of difficulties are encountered? What are the potential obstacles for the study abroad programs’ development?

- Looking to the future:
12. How do you appraise the status of study abroad programs in your university now?
13. What would be your best vision for study abroad programs?
14. What should be done for such a vision?
Appendix D: List of Online Encrypted Information

*University Apple-Pie* (2006a). Overview of the *University Apple-Pie*’s Education Abroad Program.
This document was retrieved on May 20, 2006. It is an overview of University Apple-Pie’s study abroad programs, including information about the programs’ vision statement and its administrative structure.

This document was retrieved on July 15, 2006. It contains statistics about University Apple-Pie’s study abroad program participation data by field of study.

This document was retrieved on May 20, 2006. It explains the study abroad program office’s mission, vision and its guiding principles of organizing these programs at University Bear.

*University Bear* (2006b) Study abroad: student handbook.
This document was retrieved on May 20, 2006. It is the student handbook for study abroad programs at University Bear. It is the guide to help students understand the goals of University Bear’s study abroad programs and to assist them to determine what they need to prepare for the departure.

*University Bear* (2006c) *University Bear* mission statement.
This document was retrieved on October 15, 2006. It is a document approved by the university’s board of trustees and explains University Bear’s mission.

This is the strategic planning document of the University Cherry published by its president’s office. It is the strategic planning document outlining what this university is about and where it is going in certain period. It is public information and was offered by an interviewee.

This document was retrieved on May 20, 2006. It is the document template that Office CC uses to develop student exchange program agreement. This is public information available online.

*University Dew* (2006a) *The University Dew Way*.
This document was retrieved on May 20, 2006. It outlines University Dew’s mission statement.

*University Dew* (2006b) Special programs and information.
This document was retrieved on July 15, 2006. It is University Dew’s annual document reporting all the academic programs offered in the university.