Academic (In)equalities in Knowledge Exchange:

The Reasons Students from Around the Globe Study Abroad

Sylvia Mendez, University of Colorado Colorado Springs

Catherine Grandorff, University of Colorado Colorado Springs

Phillip Heasley, University of Colorado Colorado Springs

Abstract

A Likert-type survey was administered to 59 university-level students who had studied in another country, 26 students from the U.S. who had studied abroad and 33 students from other countries who had studied in the U.S. The goal of the survey was to identify differences in motivation between U.S. and international students and to compare these survey results to constructs from previous research. Primary components analysis identified eight factors: (1) Language Learning, (2) Cultural Exploration, (3) Travel & Tourism, (4) Academics, (5) Personal Escape, (6) Social Limitations, (7) Work in Another Country, and (8) Attitude Towards Host Country. While these factors largely align with previous research, this analysis combined interest in language learning into one single factor and divided personal escape from social limitations as separate factors. When compared to U.S. students in a t-test, international students were significantly more likely to be motivated by language learning, by academics, and by social limitations in their home country. Post-hoc Regression analysis supports these results for both language learning and academic motivations.

Academic (In)equalities in Knowledge Exchange:

The Reasons Students from Around the Globe Study Abroad

Background

In an increasingly globalized world, both students and higher education institutions have much to gain from partaking in and offering study abroad programs. Universities and other organizations often seek to encourage students to participate in these experiences, yet the motivations and decision-making processes which lead them to choose to study in another country are complex and in need of further study. Students from across the globe possess distinct drives, opportunities, and constraints which influence their choices regarding if, when, and where to study outside their home country. The purpose of this study was to explore and compare the pre-departure motivations of students in the United States (U.S.) and from other countries who have participated in a study abroad program. Given the recent trends of increasing numbers of American students studying abroad and the growing international student populations at U.S. colleges and universities (The Institute of International Education, 2015), this study can shed light on that which students hope to gain from these experiences. In 2016 alone, the U.S. hosted 821,745 international students (Alkanat, 2011) and sent 325,339 abroad (NAFSA, 2017). A cross-sectional survey constructed from pre-existing instruments investigated their motivations along seven areas of inquiry: (1) language learning self-confidence, (2) attitudes toward language learning/community, (3) personal language use, and (4) international posture/developing international social ties, (5) escape motivations, (6) academic motivations, and (7) tourism motivations.

By deepening an understanding of the study abroad motivations of students, higher education institutions can better plan, promote, and improve the quality of international experiences across the globe. Additionally, by engaging in a comparison of the motivations of individuals from different countries, higher education institutions can become more effective in promoting international education to students in those countries and begin to identify ways to stimulate educational opportunities in areas of the globe where they are less likely to leave their home country. Gaining further insights into these reasons may allow local stakeholders to better advocate for institutions in less popular locations as a destination for study abroad and, thus, "re-map" these patterns to enhance global equity and to increase intercultural awareness that otherwise may be invisible or underserved.

Collegiate study abroad experiences provide students with the opportunity to engage in experiential learning and to grow in their intercultural competence through immersion in other cultures. Higher education institutions promote these transformative programs as an important vehicle for increasing personal and global awareness, as well as for producing an internationally conscious and concerned citizenry (Doyle, 2009; Fischer, 2009; Franklin, 2010; Hamza, 2010; Kim, 2017; Kitsantas, 2004; Lewis & Niesenbaum, 2005; McLaughlin & Johnson, 2006; Slotkin, Durie, & Eisenberg, 2012; Warner, 2009; Zamastil-Vondrova, 2005). Additionally, these experiences offer the opportunity to gain the human, social, and cultural capital needed to participate in a global workforce (Kitsantas, 2004; Lareau & Weininger, 2003; Slotkin et al., 2012; Wasley, 2006). Accordingly, multi-national companies deem study abroad experiences as an asset to the workplace (Crossman & Clark, 2010; Kratz & Netz, 2016; Petzold, 2017; Potts, 2015; Wiers-Jenssen, 2008), due in part to positive effects on learning abilities and linguistic

competence (Hadis, 2005; Luo & Jamieson-Drake, 2015), as well as on intercultural openness and personality development (Van Hoof & Verbeeten, 2005; Zimmermann & Neyer, 2013).

Traditionally, study abroad was associated with language learning and cultural experience for credit toward a U.S. degree; however, it now encompasses more opportunities, including but not limited to internships, volunteering, field work, and service learning (Edwards, Hoffa, & Kanach, 2005). This expanded understanding sheds light on potential motivations for study abroad, higher education, and globalized citizenry (de Wit, 2002). The Council on International Education (2006) in their proposed research agenda for study abroad notes, "there is a good deal of folk wisdom about what motivates students to go abroad, there is very little hard data…. Student decision-making is clearly a rich area for research" (p. 3). While researchers have worked to fill this gap by examining the decision and motivations of students from a wide range of countries, few studies have directly compared the differences between those hailing from different countries.

Prior research has framed decisions about study abroad as analogous to both travel and tourism (He & Chen, 2010; Salyers, Carston, Dean, & London, 2015) and as equivalent to choosing one's first university (Salisbury, Umbach, Paulsen, & Pascarella, 2009; Stroud, 2010). Research into motivations and predictors has shown demographic variables often influence intent to study abroad. Stroud (2010) found gender, major, and living status (with parents or on campus) significantly predicted these decisions to study abroad. Similarly, Salisbury et al. (2009) found gender and major also influenced intent, as well as parental education level and income (as measured by grant eligibility).

Research also has shown that student motivations and attitudes can predict intent. Nyaupane, Paris, and Teye (2010) examined students populations at U.S. universities and

identified four key factors that may influence study abroad intentions: international travel, escape, academic, and social. Weger (2013) investigated international students studying in U.S. intensive English programs and identified five potentially motivating factors: developing self-confidence, attitudes toward English language learning/community, personal English use, value of English learning, and international posture. In one of the few studies directly comparing U.S. and international populations, Sanchez, Fornerino, and Zhang (2005) found students from the U.S., France, and China displayed significant differences in that which predicted intent to study abroad. In particular, they found U.S. students were more motivated by the possibility to learn a new language while Chinese students were less likely than other groups to be influenced by the opportunity for new experiences or for "liberty/pleasure." Although the above scholarship is promising, more empirical needs to be conducted to fully understand the motivations of students studying abroad. As noted by Nyaupane et al (2011), "Despite the theoretical relationship between motivations and attitude formation, there is a lack of empirical research to examine what aspects of study abroad motivations influence attitude" (p. 209).

Research Questions

Two research questions were addressed in this study:

1. Do the factors identified in this sample coincide with factors identified through pervious research?
2. Do international and U.S. students differ significantly in their reported motivations and pre-departure beliefs about study-abroad?

Methods

Research Design

A cross-sectional survey design (Fowler, 2013) was utilized to examine and compare the pre-departure motivations of U.S. students and those from other countries who participated in a

study abroad program during their collegiate experience. An electronic survey was constructed (Sue & Ritter, 2012) based on the constructs identified in previous research. When possible, the questions were drawn or adapted from previous studies. The original seven constructs we used to develop the survey were: (1) language learning self-confidence, (2) attitudes toward language learning/community, (3) personal language use, and (4) international posture/developing international social ties, (5) escape motivations, (6) academic motivations, and (7) tourism motivations.

Survey Instrument

The seven survey constructs were explored through 41 Likert-scale response items. Sample items included: I often feel encouraged when I am learning a new language; It is important to me to get a broader understanding of the world; It is important to me to meet people from different countries; and I chose to study abroad to strengthen my resume. A six-point Likert scale was utilized with response options from (1) strongly disagree, (2) mostly disagree, (3) somewhat disagree, (4) somewhat agree, (5) mostly agree, to (6) strongly agree. The survey was adapted from pre-existing instruments by Nyaupane et al., (2011) and Weger (2013). Nayupane et al. (2011) tested their survey of 23 items on a sample of 136 students from American universities. Using a principal components analysis, they identified four motivational factors underlying these 23 items. Nyaupane et al. (2011) also reported Chronbach alpha levels for each factor and scores were strong ranging between .87 and .74. Weger (2013) surveyed 131 international students studying in the U.S. using a 32 point survey. Weger (2013) identified five underlying factors. However, Weger (2013) employed a much lower cut-off for loading items (.20) and, unsurprisingly, the Cronbach's Alpha for several of these factors was quite low. While three factors had high Cronbach's Alpha of .70 or higher (Learning Self-Confidence, Attitudes

Toward English Language Learning/Community, Personal English Use) two other factors had quite low Cronbach Alpha scores of .50 and .48 (Value of English Learning, International Posture). Although Weger's (2013) final two factors showed low internal consistency among items, we chose to include these in our survey as well because they produced Eigen values above 1.0 and because they are consistent with theories of motivation among international students (Yashima & Shimizu, 2004).

The current survey also included demographic questions related to college major, age, gender, race/ethnicity, country of citizenship, and the location of the study abroad experience. The survey allowed for both a descriptive and inferential examination of the distinctions in motivation along various demographic lines, such as country of citizenship.

Data Collection

Upon obtaining Institutional Review Board approval in November 2017, study abroad directors at three higher education institutions in the U.S. Southwest agreed to share the electronic survey link with their U.S. students who had studied abroad and international students studying at their instiution. The completion window was three months. The purpose, instructions, and consent form were provided at the beginning of the survey, which required approximately 20 minutes to complete (varied English proficiency was taken into account for completion). Additionally, students were given the option to enter into a randomized drawing for one of five $20 Amazon gift cards for completing the survey.

Participants

A total of 59 participants submitted a usable response to the survey (33 international students traveling to the U.S. and 26 students from the U.S. who have studied abroad). The participants ranged widely in their age, the age at which they traveled, as well as their academic

standing when they studied abroad. Overall, U.S. based students were older (though this may be due to a few extreme outliers), and studied abroad primarily late in their undergraduate careers. In contrast, international students were younger and studied abroad during many phases of their academic career including before university and for graduate work (see Tables 1 and 2).

Table 1

Demographics of Respondents

	Total	*International*	*U.S.*
Gender	59	33	26
Female	(54%) 32	(42%) 14	(69%) 18
Male	(46%) 27	(58%) 19	(31%) 08
Average Age	27.61	24.38	31.85
Average Age at Study	22.20	19.67	25.42

Table 2

Academic Standing when Studying Abroad

	International		*U.S.*	
Academic Standing	*N*	*Percent*	*N*	*Percent*
Before University	6	17.65%	1	03.85%
University Preparation	3	08.82%	1	03.85%
First year of University (Freshmen)	8	23.53%	0	00.00%
Second year of University (Sophomore)	1	02.94%	4	15.38%
Third year of University (Junior)	2	05.88%	10	38.46%
Fourth year of University or later (Senior)	4	11.76%	5	19.23%
Graduate Level work	7	20.59%	3	11.54%
Other	3	08.82%	2	07.69%

Both students represented a wide range of majors (Table 3) with International students being more likely to study technical majors like Engineering and Computer Science while U.S. students were more likely to be from majors with a social aspect such as Criminal Justice, Political Science, Sociology, and Student Affairs. Table XX displays a distribution by gender and follows global trends with more international students reporting as male compared to more female students from the U.S.

Table 3

Locations and Majors for International and U.S. Students

International Students				*U.S. Students*			
Countries of Origin		*Majors*		*Destination Countries*		*Majors*	
China	8	Engineering	7	United Kingdom	4	Business	5
India	5	Comp. Science	6	Netherlands	3	Criminal Justice	2
Spain	3	Business	3	Germany	3	Finance	2
Saudi Arabia	3	Economics	2	China	2	Foreign Lang	2
Kuwait	2	Finance	2	Czech Republic	2	Political Science	2
Netherlands	2	Accounting	1	Ireland	2	Sociology	2
Brazil	1	Communication	1	Japan	2	Student Affairs	2
Botswana	1	Env. Science	1	Peru	2	Economics	1
Bulgaria	1	Gender Studies	1	Belgium	1	Education	1
Canada	1	Anthropology	1	Canada	1	Env. Science	1
Germany	1	History	1	Costa Rica	1	Exercise Science	1
Guatemala	1	Studio Art	1	Italy	1	Art History	1
Norway	1	Taekwondo	1	Nicaragua	1	Communication	1
Poland	1			Norway	1	History	1
Vietnam	1			Singapore	1	Public Affairs	1
				Spain	1		

Factor Analysis

After initial screening for missing data, the data was analyzed using a Primary Components Analysis. After this initial screening four items were eliminated. Three of the items were phrased in the negative to be deliberately reverse coded. However, these items formed their own unique factor under initial factor analysis. These items were eliminated on the assumption that their odd behavior in factor analysis was due to participants misinterpreting them when reading, possibly due to the limited language proficiency of some international students.

- I generally feel uneasy when I have to speak a second language outside of class.
- I feel the other second language students speak the target language better than I do.
- I think learning a second language is more difficult for me than for most learners.

An additional item also behaved quite poorly on the initial factor analysis. Upon closer review, this item was assessing beliefs that would develop *during* a student's study abroad experience rather than pre-departure. This item was also eliminated.

- The more I learn about the people in my host country, the more I like them.

Eliminating these items reduced the number of factors identified from ten to eight and resulted in stronger factors more closely aligned with previous theory and a more rational series of factor loadings.

The final factor analysis revealed eight factors with Eigen values above 1.0. Table 4 presents the Eigen value and percentage of variance added by each factor based on and eight-factor solution with varimax rotation. Appendix A includes the individual items associated with each factor and their factor loadings. A cut off of 3.0 was used to identify factor loadings. When an item loaded on more than one factor, it was assigned to the factor where it had the highest loading. Although

a sample of 59 is not ideal for a robust factor analysis, we felt it was worth proceeding based on the logical nature of the factors identified and their alignment with previous research.

Table 4

Factors Identified by Principal Components Analysis with Varimax Rotation

Factor	*Eigen Value*	*Change in Variance Explained*	*Cumulative Variance Explained*	*Cronbach's Alpha*
Language Learning*	9.366	25.933	25.933	.94
Cultural Exploration	4.984	13.846	39.779	.87
Travel & Tourism	3.153	8.758	48.537	.87
Academics*	2.400	6.667	55.204	.73
Personal Escape	1.954	5.428	60.632	.70
Social Limitations*	1.720	4.77	65.402	.73
Work in Another Country*	1.467	4.076	69.478	.73
Attitude Towards Host Country	1.219	3.385	72.863	.71

Data Analysis

Based on the results of the factor analysis, an unweighted mean for each student was calculated for each factor by averaging the scores from the individual questions associated with that factor. After initial data screening, these factor means were then analyzed to detect a significant difference between the two student populations (U.S. and International) using an independent samples t-test with a p. value of .05.

As a post-hoc analysis, we investigated each of the factors identified using an OLS regression. In the regression, we included our dependent variable (international or U.S. student). We also included X co-variates: gender, age, age at time of study abroad, and status within

Karchru's (1992) model of Global Englishes, as described in the next paragraph. All variables were assessed for normality. Although age did show the presence of a few strong outliers, we elected to keep these cases in the analysis because of the relatively small sample size. All regressions were assessed for multiticolinearity, and all variables were found to be within the traditionally accepted range on both Tolerance (greater than .10) and VIF (less than 10) (CITE).

In reviewing the data, it became clear that not all our participants were studying in a country that required them to use a new language, for instance, U.S. students traveling to Canada or Irish students studying in the U.S. Similarly, some students likely had used English since early in life as it served as a second or official language in their country (for instance Indian students studying in the U.S.). We suspected this might influence answers on the language related questions in our survey. Following Kachru's (1992) model of Global Englishes we established three codes to distinguish the role of English in their study abroad experience; a) students traveling within the inner circle (countries where English is the sole or dominant language), b) students moving from the expanding circle (where English is primarily taught as a foreign language) to the inner circle, and c) students moving from inner circle to expanding circle (where English is an official language or widely used as a lingua franca. In our sample the three countries identified as expanding circle were the Netherlands, India, and Botswana. Because the number of inner and outer circle cases were relatively small, we reduced these initial three codes a binary measure of expanding circle compared to inner/outer circle for the regression analysis.

Results

After identifying the items loading on each factor, a mean score for each factor was calculated for each student. Table 5 displays the mean scores and standard deviations for each factor for students in full sample, for international students, and for U.S. students.

Table 5

Mean Scores for each Component by Population

	Total		*International*		*U.S.*	
Factor	*m*	*s.d.*	*m*	*s.d.*	*m*	*s.d.*
Language Learning*	4.37	1.20	4.81	0.95	3.86	1.15
Cultural Exploration	5.36	0.79	5.24	0.87	5.55	0.50
Travel & Tourism	3.79	1.21	3.59	1.17	4.17	1.24
Academics*	4.14	1.10	4.41	0.99	3.85	1.21
Personal Escape	2.85	1.14	2.94	1.19	2.84	1.15
Social Limitations*	3.38	1.59	3.89	1.31	2.78	1.73
Work in Another Country*	4.06	1.35	4.40	0.99	3.72	1.52
Attitude Towards Host Country	4.53	0.96	4.45	1.13	4.54	0.66

Table 6 displays the results of the independent samples t-test on the eight factors identified in the survey. International students and U.S. students do not differ significantly in their desire for cultural exploration, their desire for travel and tourism, their motivation to escape their daily life, or their attitude towards their host country. However, international students are significantly more motivated by their confidence and interest in language learning $t(55) = 3.572$, $p < .001$; by academic factors $t(58) = 2.437$, $p = .018$; by a desire to escape social limitations in their home country $t(57) = 2.618$, $p = .011$; and by their desire to work in outside of their home country $t(57) = 2.408$, $p = .021$.

Table 6

Independent Samples t-test of International compared to U.S. students

Factor	*df*	*t*	*p*
Language Learning*	55	3.572	.000
Cultural Exploration	58	0.932	.360
Travel & Tourism	57	1.496	.140
Academics*	58	2.427	.018
Personal Escape	57	0.632	.530
Social Limitations*	57	2.618	.011
Work in Another Country*	57	2.408	.021
Attitude Towards Host Country	57	0.254	.814

Post Hoc Regression Analysis

Regression on answers to most of the factors did not yield a statistically significant model. However, regression on two of the factors (Language Learning and Desire to Work) did yield a significant model and significant individual variables. Regression on Language Learning showed a significant model (R^2 =.28, F(5,49)=3.801, p=.005) accounting for 28% of the total variance in responses. Within this model, the dependent variable (international or U.S. status) was a significant variable (B =-.962, p =.007). This suggests that when accounting for other factors International students answered nearly a full point higher (.96 points) than their U.S. counterparts on questions related to language learning.

Table 7

OLS Regression on Language Learning

Variable	Unstandardized Regression Coefficient	Standard Error	Standardized Regression Coefficient	t	p
U.S. or International	-.962	.339	-.398	-2.839	.007
Gender	-.085	.329	-.035	-.0258	.797
Age	.020	.023	.165	0.884	.381
Age at Study Abroad	-.326	.335	-.121	-0.971	.336
Global English Circle	-.047	.027	-.331	-1.736	.089

(R2 =.28, F(5,49)=3.801, p=.005)

Similarly, a regression on the Desire to Work factor indicated a significant model (R^2 =.251, F(5,51)=3.426, p=.010) that explains 25% of the overall variance in the factor. Within this model, age when a student began to study abroad was revealed as a significant variable (B = -.086, p = .003). This suggests that students who study abroad at younger ages are more likely to be interested in working in that country or a country that speaks that language. Although this difference is statistically significant, the practical significance is limited; for every year older a student travels abroad, the model suggests their answer to work related questions would be .08 lower (less than one tenth of a point). Perhaps of greater significance is the influence of the dependent variable (U.S. or International). Though the result is not statistically significant, the model suggests that international students are more likely to desire to work in the host country (B = -.709, p = .072).

Table 8

OLS Regression on Desire to Work

Variable	Unstandardized Regression Coefficient	Standard Error	Standardized Regression Coefficient	t	p
U.S. or International	-.709	.386	-.260	-1.838	.072
Gender	.123	.368	-.045	.334	.740
Age	.040	.022	.320	1.777	.081
Age at Study Abroad	.314	.384	.102	.817	.418
Global English Circle	-.086	.027	-.551	-3.144	.003

(R2 =.251, F(5,51)=3.426, p=.010)

Relevance to PIE and Second Language Learning

These results shed light on the motivations of U.S. and international students studying abroad. This can be useful to the PIE and to language learning broadly in two ways. First, institutions can use these results to refine their methods of advertising and attracting new students. Second, teachers and programs can use these findings to better motivate their own students in the classroom and to raise the level of satisfaction students feel when finishing language education or study abroad experiences.

While many of the findings here follow conventional wisdom, they do suggest changes to traditional practice. This study suggests international students are more interested in working in their host country than U.S. students. In a highly competitive market for language learning students, institutions like the PIE may be able to gain a marketing advantage and improve student

satisfaction by offering engagement with the workplace through internships programs and optional courses in industry specific ESP courses. This analysis also suggests that international students are equally motivated by travel and tourism opportunities. Similarly, this suggests that programs like the PIE could attract students by offering a range of tourism opportunities and that marketing should emphasize the travel and tourism opportunities available in the area and through the program. “Field trips” and other learning opportunities outside of the classroom are likely to attract new students and raise the satisfaction level and motivation of current students.

While the sample for the survey remains quite small (59 students), the results of the t-test and regression analysis both support the conclusions that international students differ significantly from U.S. students in several key areas of motivation and programs like the PIE can use these results to more efficiently attract new students and raise the satisfaction of students in their program.

References

Alkanat, G. A. (2011). *A study of the impact of changes to international student visa policy and procedures since the 9/11 attacks*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Auburn University, Auburn, AL.

Crossman, J. E., & Clark, M. (2010). International experience and graduate employability: Stakeholder perceptions on the connection. *Higher Education, 59,* 599–613.

Council on International Education Exchange. (2006). *Our view: A research agenda for study abroad*. Portland, ME: Author.

Doyle, D. (2009). Holistic assessment and the study abroad experience. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 18,* 143-155.

Edwards, J., Hoffa, W., & Kanach, N. (2005). Education abroad at the beginning of the twenty-first century. In W. Hoffa (Ed.), *NAFSA's guide to education abroad for advisers and administrators* (3rd ed.). Washington, D.C.: NAFSA, Association of International Educators.

Fischer, K. (2009, February 20). Short study-abroad trips can have lasting effect, research suggests. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/Short-Study-Abroad-Trips-Can/1541

Franklin, K. (2010). Long-term career impact and professional applicability of the study abroad experience. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, *19*, 169-190.

Hadis, B. F. (2005). Why are they better students when they come back? Determinants of academic focusing gains in the study abroad experience. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal to Study Abroad, 11*, 57–70.

Hamza, A. (2010). International experience: An opportunity for professional development in higher education. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 14*(1), 50-69.

Fowler, F. J. (2013). *Survey research methods* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

He, N., & Chen, R. J. C. (2010). College students' perceptions and attitudes toward the selection of study abroad programs. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration, 11*, 347-359. doi:10.1080/15256480.2010.518525

Institute of International Education. (2015). *Open doors report on international educational exchange*. Retrieved from http://www.iie.org/opendoors

Kratz, F., & Netz, N. (2016). Which mechanisms explain monetary returns to international student mobility? *Studies in Higher Education, 43*, 375-400. doi: 10.1080/03075079.2016.1172307

Kachru, B. (1992). World Englishes: approaches, issues and resources. *Language Teaching*, *25*: 1-14. Cambridge UP.

Kitsantas, A. (2004). Studying abroad: The role of college students' goals on the development of cross-cultural skills and global understanding. *College Student Journal*, *38*, 441-452.

Lareau, A., & Weininger, E. B. (2003). Cultural capital in educational research: A critical assessment. *Theory and Society*, *32*, 567-606.

Lewis, T. L., & Niesenbaum, R. A. (2005). The benefits of short-term study abroad. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 51*(39), B20.

Luo, J., & Jamieson-Drake, D. (2015). Predictors of study abroad intent, participation, and college outcomes. *Research in Higher Education, 56*(1), 29–56.

McLaughlin, J. S., & Johnson, D. K. (2006). Assessing the field course experiential learning

model: Transforming collegiate short-term study abroad experiences into rich learning environments. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 13*, 65-85.

Nyaupane, G. P., Paris, C. M., & Teye, V. (2011). Study abroad motivations, destination selection and pre-trip attitude formation. *International Journal of Tourism Research, 13*, 205-217. doi:10.1002/jtr.811

Petzold, K. (2017). Studying abroad as a sorting criterion in the recruitment process. A field experiment among German employers. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 2*, 412-430. Doi:10.1177/1028315317697543

Potts, D. (2015). Understanding the early career benefits of learning abroad programs. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 19*, 441–459.

Salisbury, M. H., Umbach, P. D., Paulsen, M. B., & Pascarella, E. T. (2009). Going global: Understanding the choice process of the intent to study abroad. *Research in Higher Education, 50*, 119-143.

Salyers, V., Carston, C. S., Dean, Y., & London, C. (2015). Exploring the motivations, expectations, and experiences of students who study in global settings. *Journal of International Students, 5*, 368-382.

Slotkin, M. H., Durie, C. J., & Eisenberg, J. R. (2012). The benefits of short-term study abroad as a blended learning experience. *Journal of International Education in Business, 5*, 163-173.

Stroud, A. H. (2010). Who plans (not) to study abroad? An examination of U.S. student intent. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 14*, 491-507. doi:10.1177/1028315309357942

Sue, V. M., & Ritter, L. A. (2012). *Conducting online surveys* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA:

Sage.

Van Hoof, H. B., & Verbeeten, M. J. (2005). Wine is for drinking, water is for washing: Student opinions about international exchange programs. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 9*(1), 42–61.

Warner, C. (2009). *A phenomenological approach to understanding the transformative experience of adult learners in short term study abroad programs*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Central Michigan University, Mount Pleasant, MI.

Wasley, P. (2006). Underrepresented students benefit most from "engagement." *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 53*, A39-A40.

Weger, H. D. (2013). Examining English language learning motivation of adult international learners studying abroad in the US. *RELC Journal, 44*(1), 87-101. doi:10.1177/0033688212473272

Wiers-Jenssen, J. (2008). Does higher education attained abroad lead to international jobs? *Journal of Studies in International Education, 12*(2), 101–130.

Yashima T, Zenuk-Nishide L and Shimizu K (2004) The influence of attitudes and affect on willingness to communicate and second language communication. *Language Learning 54*: 119–52.

Zamastil-Vondrova, K. (2005). Good faith or hard data? Justifying short-term programs. *International Educator, 14*(1), 44-49.

Zimmermann, J., & Neyer, F. J. (2013). Do we become a different person when hitting the road? Personality development of sojourners. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 105*, 515–530.

Appendix A

Factor Loadings

Factor One. Language Learning. *Eigen Value = 9.366. Percent Increase in Variance Explained = 25.933*	
I enjoy learning new language(s).	0.87
I am very good at learning language(s).	0.83
Learning a new language is important to me so that I can read books, magazines, or newspapers in the target language.	0.82
Learning a new language is important to me because it will help me to better understand movies, TV shows, and popular culture.	0.75
Learning a new language is important to me in order to be able to get to better know the life of people who speak the target language.	0.75
I feel confident when I am speaking in my second language class.	0.74
I often feel encouraged when I am learning a new language.	0.72
Learning a new language is important to me because I would like to travel to countries where that language is spoken.	0.72
Learning a new language is important to me because it will help understand the culture and art of its speakers.	0.72
I would like to learn as many new languages as possible.	0.70
Factor Two. Cultural Exploration. *Eigen Value = 4.984. Percent Increase in Variance Explained = 13.846*	
I love learning about other cultures.	0.85
It is important to me to have an authentic experience with other cultures.	0.85
It is important to me to meet people from different countries.	0.76
It is important to me to get a broader understanding of the world.	0.74
It is important to me to develop close relationships with locals in my host country.	0.74
Factor Three. Travel and Tourism. *Eigen Value = 3.153. Percent Increase in Variance Explained = 8.758*	
I chose to study abroad to go to famous geographical sites.	0.89
I chose to study abroad to go to famous cultural sites.	0.88
I chose to study abroad to go to famous historical sites.	0.85
I chose to study abroad to buy goods and gifts from host country.	0.63
I chose to study abroad to travel with friends.	0.58
I chose to study abroad to travel independently without family.	0.51
Factor Four. Academics. *Eigen Value = 2.400. Percent Increase in Variance Explained = 6.667*	
I chose to study abroad to learn at a prestigious/famous school.	0.77
I chose to study abroad to strengthen my resume.	0.73
I chose to study abroad primarily to earn academic credits.	0.66
I chose to study abroad to learn from experts.	0.56
I chose to study abroad to learn more about my major	0.48
Factor Five. Personal Escape. *Eigen Value = 1.954. Percent Increase in Variance Explained = 5.428*	
I chose to study abroad to escape day-to-day life.	0.79
I chose to study abroad to get away from stressful situation in my home country.	0.69
I chose to study abroad to escape legal restrictions.	0.45
I chose to study abroad to show friends/family that I have been to the host country.	0.45
Factor Six. Social Limitations. *Eigen Value = 1.720. Percent Increase in Variance Explained = 4.77*	
I chose to study abroad to escape social boundaries.	0.84
I chose to study abroad to escape limitations on my education in my home country.	0.74
Factor Seven. Work in Target Country. *Eigen Value = 1.467. Percent Increase in Variance Explained = 4.076*	
I want to learn another language so that I can work in another country.	0.74
Learning a new language is important to me because I would like to work in a country where that language is spoken.	0.65
Factor Eight. Host Country Attitude. *Eigen Value = 1.219. Percent Increase in Variance Explained = 3.385*	
Before I left my home country, I believed that most people in my host country are honest.	0.85
Before I left, I believed most people in my host country are friendly.	0.64

Appendix B

Survey Instrument

1. For each of the statements below, please tell us about your beliefs and attitudes BEFORE you left your home country.

	Strongly Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Mostly Agree	Strongly Agree
I always feel that the other second langague students speak the target language better than I do.	○	○	○	○	○	○
I feel confident when I am speaking in my second language class.	○	○	○	○	○	○
I generally feel uneasy when I have to speak a second outside of class.	○	○	○	○	○	○
I think learning a second language is more difficult for me than for most learners.	○	○	○	○	○	○
I am very good at learning language(s).	○	○	○	○	○	○
I often feel encouraged when I am learning a newlanguage.	○	○	○	○	○	○
Before I left, I believed that most people in my host country are honest.	○	○	○	○	○	○
I love learning about other cultures.	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy learning new language(s).	○	○	○	○	○	○
Before I left, I believed most people in my host country are friendly.	○	○	○	○	○	○
For me, learning language is not a central part of my education.	○	○	○	○	○	○
The more I learn about the people in my host country, the more I like them.	○	○	○	○	○	○

	Strongly Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Mostly Agree	Strongly Agree
Learning language is important to me because it will help me to better understand the host culture's movies, TV shows, or songs.	○	○	○	○	○	○
Learning language is important to me because I would like to get to know the culture and art of its speakers.	○	○	○	○	○	○
Learning language is important to me because I would like to travel to countries where that language is spoken.	○	○	○	○	○	○
Learning language is important to me in order to be able to get to better know the life of people who speak the target language.	○	○	○	○	○	○
Learning language is important to me so that I can read books, magazines, or newspapers in the target language.	○	○	○	○	○	○
It is important to me to have an authentic experience with past cultures.	○	○	○	○	○	○
I would like to learn as many foreign languages as possible.	○	○	○	○	○	○
Learning a second language is important to me because I would like to work in a country where that language is spoken.	○	○	○	○	○	○
I want to learn another language so that I can work in another country.	○	○	○	○	○	○
It is important to me to meet people from different countries.	○	○	○	○	○	○

	Strongly Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Mostly Agree	Strongly Agree
It is important to me to get a broader understanding of the world.	○	○	○	○	○	○
It is important to me to develop close relationships with locals in my host country.	○	○	○	○	○	○
I studied abroad to get away from stressful situation in my home country.	○	○	○	○	○	○
I studied abroad to escape social boundaries.	○	○	○	○	○	○
I studied abroad to travel independently without family.	○	○	○	○	○	○
I studied abroad to escape day-to-day life.	○	○	○	○	○	○
I studied abroad to escape legal restrictions.	○	○	○	○	○	○
I studied abroad to escape limitations on my education in my home country.	○	○	○	○	○	○
I studied abroad primarily to earn academic credits.	○	○	○	○	○	○
I studied abroad to learn at a prestigious/famous school.	○	○	○	○	○	○
I studied abroad to learn more about my major	○	○	○	○	○	○
I studied abroad to strengthen my resume.	○	○	○	○	○	○
I studied abroad to learn from experts.	○	○	○	○	○	○
I studied abroad to show friends/family that I have been to the host country.	○	○	○	○	○	○
I studied abroad to travel with friends.	○	○	○	○	○	○

	Strongly Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Mostly Agree	Strongly Agree
I studied abroad to buy goods and gifts from host country.	○	○	○	○	○	○
I studied abroad to go to famous geographical sites.	○	○	○	○	○	○
I studied abroad to go to famous historical sites.	○	○	○	○	○	○
I studied abroad to go to famous cultural sites.	○	○	○	○	○	○