

THE IMPACT OF MACRO-LEVEL FACTORS ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDY
ABROAD IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

By

Sarah M. Singer

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
In partial fulfillment of the requirements
For the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Higher, Adult, and Lifelong Education

2011

ABSTRACT

THE IMPACT OF MACRO-LEVEL FACTORS ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDY ABROAD IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

By

Sarah M. Singer

The purpose of the current study was to explore the impact of macro-level factors on the development of study abroad in community colleges. In order to investigate the impact of multiple factors, the following research question was explored: What are the macro-level factors that influence the development and deployment of study abroad programs at community colleges? This study used two electronic surveys to answer this question. The first survey was designed to collect data from community colleges regarding background/demographic information, international activities on campus, and their experiences with the development of study abroad programs. In developing this survey, I modified and built upon the American Council of Education survey which has been the basis for much of the work on community college internationalization to date (Green, 2007; Green et al., 2008; Green & Siaya, 2005; Hult & Motz, 2008; Siaya & Hayward, 2003). The survey was then administered electronically to directors of institutional research at 751 community colleges accredited by the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC).

The second survey was designed to better understand the connections community colleges have forged with external constituencies within the community and the ways in which these constituencies have influenced study abroad program development, or the lack thereof. This study was administered to senior administrators, including deans, vice presidents, presidents, and chancellors, at institutions that indicated whether or not they administered study abroad programs in the first survey.

Results suggested that several factors impact the development of study abroad programs, the single largest of which is financial: the wealth of institution, the student body, and the surrounding community all have a major impact on the development of study abroad programs. Beyond wealth, this study indicates that the makeup of the community, its employment base, connections to other countries or regions (such as through immigration), and overall support are all key factors that impact the development of study abroad and the locations where the programs occur. The findings also indicate that institutions that administer study abroad programs have higher levels of internationalization (such as international student enrollments and foreign language offerings), stronger relationships with external stakeholders, and are larger and more urban than their counterparts that do not administer study abroad.

Copyright by
SARAH M. SINGER
2011

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First, I would like to thank and acknowledge my committee members, Reitu Mabokela, Kris Renn, Steve Weiland, and Tomas Hult. Your encouragement and guidance have been invaluable. I would also like to thank the Michigan State University International Business Center for its support of this dissertation and for introducing me to the world of community colleges and Title VI funding. I would especially like to thank Tomas Hult, Irem Kiyak, and Tunga Kiyak for their flexibility, encouragement, advice, patience, and so much more as I have worked toward my PhD while working in the Center. You are wonderful colleagues and I could not have done this without your support.

This research would not have been possible without the advice and support of so many who have dedicated their lives and careers to community colleges. I would particularly like to thank Gretchen Carroll (who inspired this dissertation with her musings of what makes some colleges develop study abroad while others do not). The American Association of Community Colleges and Community Colleges for International Development were also tremendously helpful to me.

I am grateful to my friends, but especially to two women whose friendship I have shared since we were freshmen at the University of Michigan: Elizabeth Kassab, whose careful help and suggestions in editing and proofreading this document is truly priceless, and Polly Robey, who kept me laughing and never let me quit. We've come a long ways from Ann Arbor, ladies. I would also like to thank Royster Harper, who originally encouraged me to consider a PhD in higher education while I was still an undergraduate and without whose encouragement I may well never have undertaken this journey.

To my parents, I offer my thanks for your love and support, for encouraging me to always try hard, work harder, and engage with the world around me, and especially for introducing me to the eye-opening, life-altering experience that is study abroad. Clearly this dissertation has its roots in Back-to-Back. Thank you for reading everything I have ever written and providing the advice, criticism, and encouragement that helped me grow in my writing and thinking, all of which built toward this dissertation.

Finally, to my husband Benjamin: you are wonderful. Thank you for reading countless drafts, for asking thoughtful questions, for encouraging me and supporting me and reminding me I could this.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables	x
Chapter 1.....	1
Background on Community Colleges and Study Abroad.....	1
Statement of the problem and research question.....	2
Evolution of the community college.....	3
Mechanisms for internationalization.....	7
The growth of study abroad.....	9
Significance of the study.....	13
Chapter 2.....	18
Literature Review and Conceptual Framework.....	18
The relationship between the community and the college.....	18
The missions of the community college.....	20
Globalization and higher education.....	22
The internationalization of higher education.....	25
Internationalization in community colleges.....	27
The literature on study abroad.....	34
The benefits of study abroad.....	36
Study abroad in community colleges.....	42
Chapter 3.....	45
Methods and Methodology.....	45
Why use surveys?.....	46
Survey design.....	48
Instrument design.....	51
The sample.....	52
Data analysis.....	53
Chapter 4.....	55
Findings.....	55
Survey of institutional researchers.....	56
Survey of senior administrators.....	57
Profile of community colleges.....	58
Profile of communities.....	64
International activities and internationalization efforts.....	68
Study abroad programs.....	76
Relationship with the community and stakeholders.....	86
Conclusion.....	94

Chapter 5.....	96
Discussion, Limitations, and Recommendations.....	96
Implications for practice and recommendations.....	97
Institutional factors impacting study abroad development.....	105
Impact of the community on study abroad development.....	108
Limitations and future research.....	112
Conclusions.....	115
Appendices.....	118
Appendix A.....	118
Appendix B.....	126
Appendix C.....	128
Appendix D.....	130
References.....	133

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Distribution of community or district served.....	65
Table 2 Administrative structure of international programs.....	73
Table 3 Internationalization activities at community colleges.....	75
Table 4 Extent to which study abroad is beneficial for selected activities.....	84
Table 5 Survey 1: Strength of relationship with external stakeholders.....	87
Table 6 Survey 2: Strength of relationship with external stakeholders.....	88
Table 7 Extent to which stakeholders influenced decision not to develop study abroad programs.....	90
Table 8 Extent to which stakeholder support would be necessary to develop study abroad programs.....	91
Table 9 Extent to which stakeholders negatively impacted the development of study abroad programs.....	92
Table 10 Forms of internationalization at community colleges.....	98

Chapter 1

Background on Community Colleges and Study Abroad

Many facets of U.S. higher education, from the early use of Latin to the development of research universities, were imported from Europe. The community college, however, is a uniquely American idea, born of the desire to free universities from providing general education and fueled by a burgeoning American population with the hunger for knowledge. According to Joliet Junior College's website, when Joliet Junior College in Joliet, Illinois, opened its doors in 1901, it was as "an experimental postgraduate high school program" (Joliet Junior College, n.d.).

Similarly, study abroad is an American invention, having been born at the University of Delaware in 1923. According to the University of Delaware, the impetus for that first trip was not unlike the reasons many students today continue to study abroad: having witnessed the ravages of World War I first-hand, Professor Raymond W. Kirkbride wished to promote cross-cultural understanding among his students (Kochanek, 1998). Through the decades, study abroad has earned powerful friends. Senator William Fulbright remarked that study abroad is, "from the standpoint of future world peace and order, probably the most important and potentially rewarding of our foreign policy activities" and the first President Bush stated "international exchanges are not a great tide to sweep away all differences, but they will slowly wear away obstacles to peace as surely as water wears away a hard stone" (De Wit, 2000, p. 14). As Mark Twain said, "travel is fatal to prejudice, bigotry, and narrow mindedness."

Today we can state unequivocally that both community colleges and study abroad have been rousing successes. Some 1,200 community colleges lie scattered across the American landscape, ensuring access to all who desire a college education, job training, or continuing education. Hundreds of thousands of American students study abroad annually, traveling to

every continent on earth. Yet, with all the growth and success that both community colleges and study abroad have experienced, they have developed very little shared history. Community college students continue to represent a negligible percentage of the students who study abroad (Connell, 2010).

Statement of the problem and research question

This study is intended to shed light on factors that may inhibit the development of study abroad at community colleges. Specifically, this is an analysis of macro-level factors that influence the development and success of study abroad programs at community colleges. The primary research question, then, is: What are the macro-level factors that influence the development and deployment of study abroad programs at community colleges?

Increasingly scholars, policymakers, and practitioners are adamant about the importance of community colleges and study abroad, as well as the need to bring community colleges further into the study abroad fold. For example, while community colleges enroll roughly half of all undergraduate students in the United States, community college students account for only 2.5% of all students who study abroad (Connell, 2010). However, given that 53% of community college students surveyed by Siaya and Hayward (2003) agreed with the statement that all students should have a study abroad experience sometime during their college career, it seems that study abroad could prove highly attractive in community colleges.

More compelling is that, as Bok (2006) notes, an increasing number of graduates will find themselves interacting with individuals from and making decisions about matters in other countries. Additionally, employers increasingly seek students who can act as cultural and social brokers with cross-cultural and foreign language communication skills (Calhoon, Wildcat, Annette, Pierotti, & Griswold, 2003; Douglas & Jones-Rikkens, 2001). As if to confirm as much,

the under secretary for education in the United States, Martha Kanter, recently stated, “I’m not an expert at international programs, but what I have learned is that they are essential to the future of our higher education institutions and they are also essential to the future of what young people will need to know and do in a global economy in a global world” (Loveland, 2010, p. 20).

With the recent federal attention to community colleges and the appointment of Kanter, a former community college chancellor, to the position of under secretary of education in the U.S. Department of Education, the role and prominence of community colleges are on the rise. Yet, they and their students are disproportionately underrepresented in these programs which Kanter noted are “essential to the future of our higher education institutions and ... to the future of what young people will need to know and do in a global economy in a global world” (Loveland, 2010, p. 20). For the benefit of the students, the colleges, and broader society, community colleges must find ways to effectively offer international programs, especially study abroad. To better appreciate these arguments, however, one must first understand some history and background of these two American ideals.

Evolution of the community college

The idea of the community college emerged in the mid-nineteenth century when the presidents of the Universities of Michigan, Georgia, and Minnesota proposed a junior college to “relieve the university of the burden of providing general education for young people” (Cohen & Brawer, 2003, p.6). Half a century later, William Rainey Harper, president of the University of Chicago, promoted the same idea. Harper, often considered the father of the community college system, grew tired of contending with overcrowded classes and unprepared students at the University of Chicago. He envisioned the junior college as a place that could serve as a bridge between high school and universities (Phillippe & Patton, 2000). Joliet Junior College was thus

born, the first of what are now nearly 1,200 community colleges, which today comprise some 44 percent of all colleges and universities and 40 percent of all undergraduate higher education enrollments today (American Association of Community Colleges, 2009).

The early American community college, or junior college as it was then called, was a small institution. In 1922, average enrollment was only 150 students in the public institutions and less than half that in the private ones (Cohen & Brawer, 2003). The larger universities supported the junior colleges as a means of diverting the growing number of students who sought a college education, but whose numbers the larger universities could not accommodate (Cohen & Brawer, 2003). The university community seemed divided as to the purpose of the junior college, however, with Harvard president James Bryant Conant decreeing, “By and large, the educational road should fork at the end of the high school, though an occasional transfer of a student from a two-year college to a university should not be barred” (Bogue, 1950, quoted in Cohen & Brawer, 2003, p.13). For many community college attendees today, the road would appear to fork: in California, the nation’s largest community college system, 40% of students transfer to four-year institutions; in Texas the number is half that (Chen, 2009; CityTownInfo.com, 2009; Moore, Shulock, & Jensen, 2009). Overall, only one-quarter of community college students earns a certificate or associate’s degree or transfer to a four-year college or university (Kanter, 2010).

Following the creation of Joliet Junior College in 1901 through World War II, the number of community colleges in the U.S. grew steadily. By 1915, there were 74 junior colleges, a figure which more than doubled to over 200 by 1921 and then doubled again by 1960 (Geller, 2001). Not only did the number of colleges grow, but so did the number of communities with access to community colleges; by 1930 there were some 440 junior colleges, spread through all but five states (Cohen & Brawer, 2003). During the decade of the 1960s, the number of colleges

grew at an unprecedented rate, with 847 institutions by 1970 (Geller, 2001). Their growth was fueled by multiple factors, not the least of which was the growth of high school graduates entering college – from five percent in 1910 to 45% 50 years later (Cohen & Brawer, 2003). After 1970, growth slowed as enrollments leveled off; however the number of students enrolling in community colleges is again on the rise, having doubled since 1993 (Bandler, 2002).

In the first half of the twentieth century, junior colleges were mixed between private and public. Gradually, however, the number of private colleges dwindled, from a high of 322 colleges in 1949, or 50% of all junior colleges, (Cohen & Brawer, 2003) to 148 today, or approximately 13% (American Association of Community Colleges, 2009). It was during the 1950s and 1960s that the term junior college came to be applied to lower-division branches of private colleges, while the term community college referred to publicly supported institutions (Cohen & Brawer, 2003). By the 1970s, “junior college” had fallen out of favor and the term community college was applied to public and private two-year institutions; the same institutions are also sometimes referred to as two-year colleges or city colleges (Cohen & Brawer, 2003).

As the name of the institution has changed, so has the definition of what it means to be a community, or junior, college. Cohen and Brawer (2003) provide an evolution of the definition of community college from the 1922 definition adopted by the American Association of Junior Colleges as “an institution offering two years of instruction of strictly collegiate grade” (p. 3) to their current definition of a community college as “any institution regionally accredited to award the associate in arts or the associate in science as its highest degree” (p. 5). Despite the fact that some community colleges have begun to offer bachelor’s degrees (American Association of Community Colleges, 2009), I will use the Cohen and Brawer definition of community colleges in the remainder of this paper.

Today, America's community colleges represent a diverse collection of institutions. Of the 1,177 community colleges recognized by the American Association of Community Colleges [AACC] (2009), 988 are public, 158 are private, and 31 are tribal institutions. Most instructors have master of arts degrees as their highest credential and two-thirds teach only one or two classes per semester (Cohen, 2002). Together, community colleges enroll some 11.7 million students; 40% of these students are enrolled full time and 6.7 million are engaged in for-credit instruction (AACC, 2009). One-third of students seek employment qualifications, one-third seek credits to transfer to a four-year school, and the final third attend strictly for personal interest or to upgrade themselves in their current job (Cohen, 2002).

From their earliest beginnings, community colleges have been synonymous with access, admitting as students the individuals that four-year colleges generally would not admit: women, minorities, the poor, or those who had done poorly in high school (Cohen & Brawer, 2003). Such open admissions have been a hallmark of the American community college and their students continue to represent a diverse cross-section of America. While nearly half of all students are 21 or younger, 13% are 40 or older and the average age of all community college students is 29. Over one-third of community college students are minorities and 39% of community college students are the first in their family to attend college (American Association of Community Colleges, 2009).

Community colleges embrace myriad missions, from academic transfer to career education to remedial or developmental education to continuing education (Bailey & Smith Morest, 2004; Cohen & Brawer, 2003). These missions, and their implications for study abroad, will be explored in greater detail in the next chapter. However, virtually all community colleges share two important characteristics: open admission and low tuition (American Association of

Community Colleges, 2010b). This access has been an important factor in shaping community colleges and their surrounding communities. In the 1950s and 1960s, the establishment of a community college in an area which previously lacked publicly supported higher education led to an increase in the proportion of local high school graduates who enrolled in college immediately following high school. This increase was sometimes as great as 50% (Cohen & Brawer, 2003). Even today, community colleges in rural communities often “represent one of the largest investments in higher education” (McKenney, as quoted in Fernandez, 2009, p. 17).

Given the recent federal attention to community colleges – for example, in late 2010, President Barack Obama addressed a White House Summit on Community Colleges where he called community colleges the “ ‘unsung heroes’ of American’s education system,” (as cited in Gonzalez, para. 1, 2010) – and the appointment of a former community college chancellor, Martha Kanter, to the role of under secretary of education in the U.S. Department of Education (Kanter is the first community college leader to be appointed to such a position), their role and prominence seem poised to rise. Indeed, Ohio State University President E. Gordon Gee has stated that community colleges are the “drivers of the future” (as cited in Mendoza et al., 2009, p. 881). Yet, for all their areas of historic strength, international education has not been among them, perhaps because, in the words of Under Secretary Kanter, “the opportunity is not well understood...the schools are nervous because they don’t understand that it can be built into the curriculum” (as cited in Loveland, 2010, p. 20).

Mechanisms for internationalization

While community colleges may have struggled with how and when to build international education, or study abroad, into the curriculum, other aspects of internationalization have become more prevalent on community college campuses across the country. Raby and Valeau

(2007) state that “many educators still do not see international education as a key component of the community college’s mission” (p. 5), but a growing body of research and findings suggest that an increasing number of educators and administrators are embracing internationalization.

Such internationalization runs the gamut from the availability of foreign language and area studies courses, to the hiring and enrollment of international faculty and students. Green and Siaya (2005) break the various elements of internationalization into six dimensions. The components of these dimensions include the mechanisms mentioned above as well as such facets of internationalization as the organization infrastructure that is in place to support and promote internationalization to the funding and professional development opportunities available to help faculty increase their own international competencies. All of these activities contribute to campus internationalization, and can help the students – as well as the larger community – to develop an interest in or understanding of international issues or cultures.

To a large extent, community colleges – which have evolved regularly throughout their history – have needed to adapt to the changing demands of a global marketplace and society. Levin (2002) wrote that “in the 1990s, business, industry, and government increased and enlarged the scope of their demands upon the community college, with emphasis upon global competition in the form of a trained workforce and efficiency in production” (p. 121). Given that previous research has found that, from a workforce preparedness and competitiveness perspective, foreign language and cross-cultural competencies are viewed by businesses as most beneficial (Olney, as cited in Romano & Dellow, 2009), it is not surprising that Green, et al. (2008) found foreign language course offerings to be one of the most prevalent means for internationalization in community colleges; Hult and Motz (2008) found the average number of foreign language courses offered at a community college was 6.74.

Raby and Valeau (2007) believe that the popularity of such mechanisms of internationalization as international studies and international business classes signals a “community’s desire for students to learn about cultures so that they can assist in building a more harmonious and economically prosperous community” (p. 10). It follows, then, that over the past several decades, community colleges have made great strides to internationalize their curricula and campuses, and indeed they have. Raby and Valeau (2007) assert that international education in community colleges is now well into its fourth phase, institutionalization, having been preceded by the phases of recognition, expansion and publication, and augmentation.

Moreover, Raby and Valeau (2007) date the beginning of internationalization in community colleges to 1967, when “policymakers and administrators began to see community colleges as a plausible receptacle for international education” (p. 6). During the late 1960s and early 1970s several programs, encompassing multiple aspects of internationalization, were initiated. For example, Rockland and Brevard community colleges adopted an internationalized curriculum in 1974 (Hess, 1982, as cited in Raby & Valeau, 2007), while a few years earlier in 1969, Rockland Community College in New York opened a study abroad office. As the next section will describe, study abroad in this country had nearly a half century of history behind it when Rockland Community College took this step; nevertheless, the opening of their study abroad office in 1969 was the first intersection of community colleges and study abroad.

The growth of study abroad

Study abroad, like the community college, has experienced tremendous growth and success since its inception. In 1923, the University of Delaware established the first study abroad program, sending eight students to France (Kochanek, 1998). Over the next several years, college students transferred to the University of Delaware for the purpose of participating in the

nation's only study abroad program; a practice which became unnecessary with the development of transfer credits from the University of Delaware back to the student's home institution. By 1931, the number of students studying abroad grew to 95 students from 35 U.S. colleges and universities (Hoffa, 2007); a decade after World War II the number had ballooned to 9,887 (Gullahorn & Gullahorn, 1958). In the latter half of the last century and the first decade of the current century, the number has continued to rise. In 2007-2008 (the most recent year with available data), over a quarter of a million Americans, 262,416 students, studied abroad. It should be noted, however, that while the number of students choosing to study abroad annually appears large, the total proportion of students who study abroad still amounts to less than two percent of American higher education enrollment (Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program, 2005). Nevertheless, it is remarkable that in just two decades, from 1987-1988 to 2007-2008, the number of students studying abroad quadrupled (Institute of International Education, 2009).

Although many definitions of study abroad are available, this paper will utilize that of McKeown (2009): "studying abroad is an academic experience, whether short term (as short as one week) or longer (up to a full academic year), during which students physically leave the United States to engage in college study, cultural interaction, and more in the host country" (p. 11). An important addition to this definition is that the program lead to academic credit (Hoffa, 2007). This broad definition encompasses programs led by faculty, academic year abroad programs, and internships. The program types available today are not dissimilar from the three study abroad formats that emerged in the 1920s: the junior year abroad, which was designed for and utilized primarily by language majors; the faculty-led study tour, often visiting multiple

countries and with coursework offered in English; and summer study programs offered by foreign or U.S. institutions, often with a pre-professional training aspect (Hoffa, 2007).

While traditional academic year programs long predominated study abroad, short term programs are now the most common, with 56% of all students and 68% of community college students who study abroad choosing to do so for eight weeks or less (Institute of International Education, 2009). In fact, *Open Doors 2009* reported that just over four percent of all study abroad participants now choose to study abroad for the complete academic year. This contrasts greatly to half a century ago when all but a small handful of programs lasted for the full academic year, and in some cases were as long as 14 months (Cleveland, as cited in Hoffa, 2007). What short term, faculty-led programs did exist were often offered for “enrichment,” and not academic credit (Hoffa, 2007, p. 229).

The majors of students who study abroad are also diversifying. The concept of study abroad began as a way for language majors to immerse themselves in their chosen language; not surprisingly, foreign language majors predominated in study abroad programs for several decades. As late as 1957-1958, virtually all study abroad programs (of which there were 41 in 11 countries managed by 17 colleges and universities) required previous language study for admission (Cleveland, as cited in Hoffa, 2007). Over time, this requirement became less common, opening the doors for more students to study abroad. By 1986, 56% of study abroad participants were majoring in social science, humanities, or foreign languages, a number that dropped to less than 45% by 2002 (McKeown, 2009). At the same time, business, engineering, and health sciences majors have been studying abroad in greater numbers (Institute of International Education, 2009; McKeown, 2009).

Study abroad remained “overwhelmingly Eurocentric” (Hoffa, 2007, p. 283) well into the middle of the last century, with Europe receiving a full 70% of study abroad participants in 1958-1959 (Open Doors 1959, as cited in Hoffa, 2007). Although a majority of students continue to study in Europe (57% according to *Open Doors 2009*), study abroad has moved beyond the western European strongholds offering students a greater variety of locations from which to choose. The most recent *Open Doors* report found 15 of 25 top destinations are outside of Western Europe; 19 of the 25 are countries where English is not the primary language (Institute of International Education, 2009). Africa, Asia, and Latin America have all seen double digit increases in the percentage of students electing to study in those regions, with Africa leading the way with an increase of 18% (Institute of International Education, 2009). (It should be noted that Africa still trails every other region of the world in attracting study abroad students – the increase of 18% brings the total percentage of students choosing to study there to all of five percent.)

Years of research have found that students who participate in study abroad gain the cultural understanding that the earliest supporters of the movement anticipated, as well as self-confidence, global awareness, improved foreign language abilities, and a host of other benefits (Clarke, Flaherty, Wright, & McMillen, 2009; Douglas & Jones-Rikkens, 2001; Ismail, Morgan, & Hayes, 2006; Mohajeri Norris & Gillespie, 2009; Obst, Bhandari, & Witherell, 2007). Hoffa (2007) notes that study abroad leaders have historically found returning students to exhibit “ ‘a broader conception,’ ‘a new outlook,’ and ‘an objective viewpoint’ ” (p. 81). These findings, which will be revisited in more detail in the literature review, are especially important in light of the criticism that study abroad is “academic lite,” or put more bluntly, “that it is a party-filled journey of excess and expense that produces little from our students” (McKeown, 2009, p. 96).

As increasing amounts of research tell us, there are real rewards to be gained from study abroad and all students should have the opportunity to reap them.

Significance of the study

For all the success of both community colleges and study abroad, their histories have rarely intersected. For example, while 85% of four-year colleges offered study abroad in 2000-2001 (Bok, 2006), only 85 total community colleges (out of nearly 1,200, or roughly seven percent) offered study abroad in that year (Raby, 2008). By 2005-2006 that number had increased to 114 (Raby), or roughly 10% of all community colleges. Moreover, community colleges enroll roughly half of all undergraduate students in the United States, yet community college students account for only 2.5% of all students who study abroad (Connell, 2010).

Of course one could argue that this discrepancy is accounted for, at least in part, because study abroad is a less obvious fit with the multiple missions of community colleges than many other programs and experiences. It is true, for example, that some community colleges find it necessary to “keep their international activities ‘under the radar’ lest their boards ask, ‘why are you messing around with this stuff?’ ” (Connell, 2010, p. 37). Community colleges also face the unique challenge, among higher education institutions, of serving an especially diverse student population, which necessitates accommodating work and family responsibilities that may not be conducive to participation in study abroad (Raby, 2008). However, the opportunities and need for community colleges to pursue study abroad opportunities has perhaps never been greater. For example, Bailey and Smith Morest (2004) have found that many community colleges are offering programs such as honors and dual credit to lure students who might otherwise bypass the community college and enroll directly in a four-year institution.

Study abroad programs, especially those that are crafted to meet the specific needs of community college students, can offer another opportunity to attract students. Doing so would seem to keep with the philosophy behind much of the growth of community colleges: “new programs serve new clients” (Cohen & Brawer, 1989, p. 12¹). For example, some community colleges have developed programs for auto mechanics and nursing students to study the teaching of their fields in other countries (Connell, 2009). Programs such as this may be especially important in attracting students to study abroad, as Carlson, Burn, Useem, and Yachimowicz (1990) found that a major deterrent to study abroad was “the perception of the lack of relevance of study abroad to their academic programs” (p. 31). Given that 53% of community college students surveyed by Siaya and Hayward (2003) agreed with the statement that all students should have a study abroad experience sometime during their college career, it seems that such programs could prove highly attractive.

Perhaps the most important argument for increasing study abroad opportunities (and virtually any other activity designed to increase students’ awareness of international cultures and issues) for community college students is that, as Bok (2006) notes, an increasing number of graduates will find themselves interacting with individuals from and making decisions about matters in other countries. As Guerin (2009) so eloquently put it, “the challenge to educate community college students...exists in the overarching cross-cultural and international aspects and ramifications of their future employment and personal lives” (p. 611).

Indeed, employers increasingly seek students who can act as cultural and social brokers with cross-cultural and foreign language communication skills (Calhoon et al., 2003; Douglas &

¹ Cohen and Brawer (1989) is the second edition of *The American Community College*; Cohen and Brawer (2003) is the fourth edition. The second edition (1989) is cited in this dissertation when the material being cited was removed from the later edition. Much of the material referenced from the 2003 edition was also contained in the 1989 edition.

Jones-Ridders, 2001; Kedia & Daniel, 2003; Romano & Dellow, 2009). Moreover, a survey of top managers at businesses across the United States found that “an appreciation for cross-cultural differences and foreign language skills were the most important requirements at the entry level” (Kedia & Daniel, 2003). In short, an increasing number of employers cite global mindedness, which Hett defined as “a worldview in which one sees oneself as connected to the world community and feels a sense of responsibility to its members” (as cited in Clarke et al., 2009, p. 174), as a desired characteristic in their employees.

With nearly a quarter of all American jobs are tied to international trade (Douglas & Jones-Ridders, 2001), many companies find international sales growing faster than domestic sales (Kedia & Daniel, 2003), and many of the “activities and interactions that once were assumed to occur within the borders of one state are increasingly occurring across national boundaries” (McKeown, 2009, p. 16). As such, American students must be able to relate, interact, and compete with people and cultures that differ significantly from mainstream America. The American Association of Community Colleges has itself stated,

Because of technological advances in communication and transportation, foreign trade is growing. Consequently, more businesses are looking for people with an understanding of international issues. Many community colleges offer international programs. While such programs are not available at every college, pressure is increasing for community colleges to foster an awareness of foreign cultures and the interconnected nature of the world economy, (2010a, para. 5).

Like Under Secretary Kanter and the American Association of Community Colleges, community college leaders increasingly recognize the need to prepare their graduates for a global society (Mendoza et al, 2009). As previously stated, community colleges educate nearly half of all undergraduates in this country. They are an integral, essential component of the American higher education system. Yet, they and their students are disproportionately underrepresented in programs that are “essential to the future of our higher education institutions and they are also

essential to the future of what young people will need to know and do in a global economy in a global world” (Loveland, 2010, p. 20).

For the benefit of the students, the colleges, and as this study shows broader society, community colleges must find ways to effectively offer international programs, not least of all study abroad. For those who posit that study abroad is outside the mission of today’s community colleges, I would refer to the President Truman’s *Commission on Higher Education for American Democracy*, which in the late 1940s proposed the creation of a “network of public, community-based colleges to serve local needs” (American Association of Community Colleges, 2010b). If the need for graduates and citizens who can relate, interact, and compete with people and cultures from all corners of the globe is not local, what is?

It is true that study abroad is not the only option for community colleges interested in internationalizing, and may not always be the best or most feasible option, especially at the increasing number of community colleges that face budget shortfalls or outright financial crises. However, study abroad is a key component of internationalization and, as will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter, has consistently shown itself to be one of the most effective ways for students to develop the skills inherent to global mindedness (Institute of International Education, 2007). Providing students with study abroad opportunities is a meaningful way for community colleges to help prepare their graduates for the workforce. Additionally, countries such as Mexico, China, the Netherlands, Israel, and New Zealand are developing community college systems (Bandler, 2002), creating new opportunities for U.S. community colleges to develop linkages with international institutions. Despite the opportunities, only a fraction of community colleges currently offer study abroad programs.

Therefore, this dissertation seeks to begin to understand why, in the face of so much research highlighting the benefits of study abroad, so few community colleges offer their students the opportunity to study abroad. In order to understand this, it may first help to understand what makes the colleges that do offer study abroad different from colleges that do not. Therefore, this study aimed to answer the question, what are the macro-level factors that influence the development and deployment of study abroad programs in community colleges?

Chapter 2

Literature Review and Conceptual Framework

Because of the lack of work specifically related to study abroad in community colleges, my study is informed by several bodies of literature that relate indirectly to this topic, but from which much can be extrapolated. These bodies of literatures include: the literature which examines the relationship between colleges and their surrounding communities and the influence of the community on nearby institutions, literature on the mission of community colleges, especially pertaining to serving local needs, globalization and internationalization of higher education literature, and the literature on study abroad. This literature review will review each of these bodies in order; the literature on internationalization of the academe will be examined with a special focus on internationalization at community colleges. The final section of the literature review will analyze the brief work specifically related to study abroad in community colleges.

The relationship between the community and the college

Understanding the connections between higher education and the surrounding community is important to undertake a macro-level analysis; however, Harkavy (1998) stated over a decade ago that “community impacts on schooling have not been seriously addressed by either governmental policy or American higher education” (p. 4). On the whole his assertion remains true, with the literature focused almost exclusively on the impact of the college on the community, but not vice versa.

The literature on the relationship between a community and the college that inhabits it generally falls into the category of research on “town and gown.” According to Mayfield (2001), “ ‘town and gown’ is a term dating from medieval Europe identifying distinct spheres for the university (gown) and for lay people in the communities (town)” (p. 237). Historically the town-

and-gown relationship has often been fraught with tension over issues ranging from student behavior to traffic to student housing to perceived lack of respect for the expertise of those outside the university (Clavelle, 2001; Gumprecht, 2003; Weill, 2009). A major source of tension has been the frequent treatment of the community as a laboratory, collecting data and enriching scholarship without truly engaging the community (Dardig, 2004; Harkavy, 1998; Mayfield, 2001). Indeed, “the city was the logical site for creative faculty and students to effectively integrate theory and practice” (Harkavy, 1998, p. 11).

Although universities, especially urban universities, have a long history of studying the community, they have much more recently begun engaging in it and developing true university-community partnerships (Clavelle, 2001; Leiderman, Furco, Zapf, & Goss, 2004; Mayfield, 2001; Weill, 2009). An example of such partnerships is the establishment of a University of Vermont (UVM) – Burlington Community Outreach Partnership Center (COPC). The purpose of the UVM/Burlington COPC is:

To create effective, reciprocal, sustainable partnerships within UVM and among UVM, the City of Burlington, and residents and organizations of the Old North End (and in surrounding low-income areas). The overall goal...is to further the Old North End’s physical, economic, social, and political development, while advancing the university’s mission of service, education, and research (Clavelle, 2001, p. 20).

The aims of the example above are not unlike the goals of Seth Low, president of Columbia University from 1890 to 1901. Low’s desire was for the university “to influence the life of New York” (Bender, as quoted in Harkavy, 1998, p. 14). Low, who later served as the mayor of New York, and many university leaders since him have striven for their universities to shape the surrounding communities. To a large extent they have succeeded. In the single study I found in this area, for example, Gumprecht (2003) stated that, in college towns, “colleges and their people shape the urban personality” (p. 52). Notably, the towns in his study were home to

virtually every type of higher education institution, from public research universities to church-related colleges to historically black colleges, except for community colleges.

Unlike the institutions described above, community colleges have the distinction of being themselves at least partially shaped by their communities. For example, community colleges regularly work with local employers “to fashion curricula that dovetail with the needs of industry” (Fernandez, 2009, p. 23). Thus, St. Louis Community College in St. Louis, Missouri, has retrained autoworkers for jobs at the local Boeing plant, while Redlands Community College in El Reno, Oklahoma, teaches agriculture professionals how to write farm-work plans (Fernandez, 2009).

Responding to local community needs has long been a component of what Cohen and Brawer (2003) have identified as the community service function of community colleges. This function was pioneered by those institutions that often served as “cultural centers” for their communities – the private junior colleges and rural colleges (Cohen & Brawer, 2003, p. 23). The public colleges that adopted this idea often did so “as a useful aspect of their relations with the public” (Cohen & Brawer, 2003, p. 23) – that is, to foster town-gown relationships.

The missions of the community college

As discussed in the previous chapter, the American community college began with the creation of a single institution, Joliet Junior College in 1901, and has evolved to include nearly 1,200 public, private, and tribal community colleges. Collectively they enroll some 11.7 million students, or approximately 40 percent of all undergraduate higher education enrollments today. One-third of these students seek employment qualifications, one-third seek credits to transfer to a four-year schools, and the final third attend strictly for personal interest or to upgrade themselves in their current job (Cohen, 2002).

Although each community college has its own mission or missions, mission typologies can help identify mission commonalities. Cohen and Brawer (2003) organize community college missions into six categories: 1) collegiate education or academic transfer; 2) career education or vocational-technical; 3) remedial or developmental education; 4) community service; 5) continuing education; and 6) general education. Many community colleges embrace a combination of multiple missions; moreover, these missions overlap as “education is rarely discrete” (Cohen & Brawer, 2003, p. 24).

Workforce development is one aspect of community college missions that has received significant attention in the literature. In their national survey of community college administrators, Amey and VanDerLinden (2002) found that academic transfer, workforce preparation, and lifelong learning were the primary missions of community colleges. Workforce and economic development and meeting the training needs of employers and students appear to be emerging missions, as those areas were consistently mentioned by the 87% of respondents who indicated that their school’s mission had changed in the previous five years. In contrast, Jacobs and Dougherty (2006) found that “as a fundamental mission of community colleges, [workforce development] faces an extremely uncertain future because of structural changes in the economy and the emergence of new competitors” (p. 53).

Most recently, Mendoza et al. (2009) looked at the perceived challenges, actions, values, and missions of community colleges today and in 10 years. A focus group of board of trustee members, community college presidents, senior administrators, administrators, and faculty members developed the top six critical issues faced by institutions. The full Community Colleges Futures Assembly then voted on these issues. In addition to reaffirming the need to respond continually to local needs and issues, Mendoza et al. (2009) found an anticipated shift toward

life-long learning, globalization (reflecting the need to prepare graduates for a global society), and innovation and partnerships. Study abroad may be one approach for community colleges to address these latter issues.

The results of the focus group study above, especially in regards to globalization, affirm earlier research indicating that the mission of community colleges was being reshaped by the global economy. Nearly a decade before the study conducted by Mendoza et al., Levin (2000) found that governing boards and other members of community college decision-making bodies had begun to react and conform to the needs and expectations of business and industry. By the end of the twentieth century the community college's mission focused less on education, social needs, and individual development and more on training, economic needs, and workforce preparation (Levin, 2000). On the whole, the mission of the community college had become "suited to the rhetoric of the global economy and to its demands" (Levin, 2000, p. 2).

Globalization and higher education

Study abroad has its beginnings well before any current discussion of globalization. Certainly, however, globalization has heightened awareness of study abroad and, possibly, increased the importance of the skills a student gains by studying abroad. While globalization is not the focus of this study, one must understand the impacts of globalization in order to more fully understand the current conversation about study abroad. Therefore, I will briefly address the topic of globalization before refocusing on issues that are more directly related to the study and research questions.

Numerous definitions of the term 'globalization' exist. Altbach and Knight (2007) define globalization from an education perspective as the "economic, political, and social forces pushing 21st century higher education toward greater international involvement" (p. 290). More

often, the term globalization is used in the literature without any precise or formal definition; instead authors frequently describe characteristics of the globalized world or of the global economy.

Duderstadt (2000) described the effects of globalization as rendering the U.S. no longer self-sustaining with an economy and companies deeply interdependent with other countries and peoples. Bok (2006) posited that the global society means Americans are increasingly affected by circumstances outside this country, from international crises to foreign governments and cultures. Gregor (2002) characterized the global economy as being one of internationalized labor markets, knowledge-intensive production processes, and highly specialized information. Levin (2002) described a social process that connects cultures and groups and integrates people. All of these authors also mention the importance of changing and expanding communications networks and technology.

The implications of globalization for higher education are many. According to Bok (2006), today's college students will need to know more about international affairs, countries, and cultures than previous generations of students. Kedia and Daniel (2003) call for U.S. universities to place a stronger emphasis on the integration of international and cross-cultural topics across the curriculum, while Duderstadt (2000) suggests that a key aim of the academe has become to enable students "to communicate, to work to live, and to thrive in multicultural settings whether in this country or anywhere on the face of the globe" (p. 19). As previously noted, the American Association of Community Colleges has similarly stated,

Because of technological advances in communication and transportation, foreign trade is growing. Consequently, more businesses are looking for people with an understanding of international issues. Many community colleges offer international programs. While such programs are not available at every college, pressure is increasing for community colleges to foster an awareness of foreign

cultures and the interconnected nature of the world economy, (2010a, para. 5).

Given that almost 30% of companies in a recent survey believed that insufficient international competence led to a failure to fully exploit international opportunities and that 80% of companies believed their overall business would increase if their staff had greater international expertise (Kedia & Daniel, 2003), businesses would seem to be only too eager for the academe to fulfill this new aim. Globalization is steadily changing the needs of students, which in turn affects higher education, including community colleges. Levin states unequivocally “globalization has altered the community college as an institution, refashioning a local institution...to an institution that is more entrepreneurial and corporate on one hand and more conscious of its connections to a global community on the other” (Levin, 2002, p. 123).

Gregor (2002) identified broader trends in higher education that are the result of globalization. These trends include: the changing objectives of higher education, such as increasing responsibility for meeting national economic development needs; policy and practice which are increasingly related to labor force demands for a highly educated workforce; the massification of higher education, whereby access to higher education is shifting from elite access to universal access; an increase in the number and diversity of higher education institutions and providers; the use of new technology, making the provision of transnational courses easier and cheaper; changes in institutional practices and organization, including the spread of business culture within the academe and private sector partnerships; and the internationalization of higher education (Gregor, 2002). Community colleges have not been unaffected by these trends. The last of the trends identified by Gregor (2002), internationalization, is a response to globalization (De Wit, 2000) and the subject of a great deal

of literature. The next section of this dissertation will explore the literature on the internationalization of higher education.

The internationalization of higher education

Study abroad is very often situated within the context of internationalization at colleges and universities and is sometimes even used as a proxy measure of an institution's overall internationalization. Therefore, it is important to understand the evolution of internationalization in higher education in order to better understand study abroad's role and place within the discourse on institutional internationalization today.

Altbach and Knight (2007) note that universities have been inherently international in nature since their earliest origins, attracting students and scholars from many countries. The current process of internationalization in higher education builds on this tradition and can be defined as “the process of integrating an international/intercultural dimension into the teaching, research, and service functions of the institutions” (De Wit, 2000, p. 10). De Wit (2000) further notes that internationalization is a process and that it is a response to globalization, but should not be confused with globalization itself. That is, globalization of the economy and society begets internationalization of higher education. Internationalization, in turn, can occur in a variety of ways and encompass a number of programs or activities. Examples of the internationalization of higher education may include area studies, infusion of international themes into existing courses, development of international courses, the presence of international students on campus, linkages between institutions for research and exchange, and study abroad (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Bandler, 2002; Bok, 2006; De Wit, 2000; Duderstadt, 2000; Gregor, 2002; Guerin, 2009; Hser, 2005).

Schoorman (2000) has developed a framework exploring how internationalization is implemented on college campuses. This framework is guided by Systems Theory principles and based on the perspective of higher education as an organizational system. This framework conceptualizes internationalization as “educational institution’s adaptation to the changes in an increasingly global and interdependent environment” (Schoorman, 2000, p. 4) and holds that internationalization is a comprehensive, multifaceted process. It also identifies core characteristics necessary for successful internationalization, such as commitment to internationalization, organizational leadership, and funding. As will be discussed in more detail in the following section, most of these characteristics have also been identified as important to the development of study abroad programs.

The American Council on Education (ACE) has conducted the most extensive empirical work on internationalization of U.S. higher education. In 2001, ACE used a series of surveys to examine the status of internationalization in U.S. colleges and institutions (Siaya & Hayward, 2003). They conducted a national sample of 752 community colleges, liberal arts colleges, comprehensive universities, and research universities and a survey of 1,027 undergraduate faculty and 1,290 undergraduate students all from institutions that responded to the first survey. The study was descriptive in nature, but provided a comprehensive, national understanding of the internationalization of higher education. In 2006, ACE conducted a follow-up study to provide an update and comparison; however, faculty and students were not surveyed in 2006 (Green, Luu, & Burris, 2008).

Across institution types Siaya and Hayward (2003) identified a number of weaknesses. These include that most institutions exhibited low overall levels of commitment to internationalization and that the majority of faculty and students were supportive of international

activities, but failed to participate in them. They also found foreign language enrollment to be static and increasingly concentrated in Spanish (Siaya & Hayward, 2003). Green, et al. (2008) found that these same weaknesses remained, and in some cases, became worse. For example, they found a decline in the proportion of institutions that require foreign language study for graduation. This finding is supported by Bok (2006) who also sounded a note of concern regarding language enrollment, stating that “fewer colleges require language study for at least some students (73%) than was true in 1966 (89%)” (p. 233).

Findings from the 2001 surveys include: institutional type alone did not determine internationalization success; the personal interest of faculty and staff contributed greatly to campus internationalization efforts; liberal arts colleges were the most likely and comprehensive institutions were the least likely to earmark funds for scholarships for international students; research universities were the most likely to seek and receive external funding for international programs and to have an office employing full-time, non-student staff to administer international programs; and community colleges were the most likely to offer faculty development workshops in internationalizing the curriculum and the least likely to include internationalization in the mission statement (Siaya & Hayward, 2003). Green, et al. (2008) found that these trends continue, with a minority of institutions mentioning internationalization in their mission statements and also less than half (44%) employing a full-time administrator to coordinate internationalization efforts. However, investment in international opportunities for faculty and education abroad opportunities for students rose in the first half of the 2000s (Green et al., 2008).

Internationalization in community colleges

As discussed in earlier sections of this literature review, both the fact of globalization and the need for higher education to adapt to its demands, largely by internationalizing the institution

and/or curriculum, are well established. In short, globalization means interconnected markets and societies. As noted previously, it also means that students and graduates today must be equipped with a different set of skills than past generations. While their ability to attract students and scholars from around the world has been that colleges and universities have long been international in nature (Altbach & Knight, 2007), the demands of globalization and the changing needs of society and business require that higher education be more purposeful in its internationalization efforts than in the past.

The characteristics for successful internationalization as described in Schoorman's (2000) framework – organizational leadership, funding, and commitment to internationalization – are examples of the conscientious actions and commitments necessary for a college or university to successfully internationalize. Indeed, it is no longer a matter of if, but of when and how, that all higher education institutions internationalize; as the American Association of Community Colleges stated, "...pressure is increasing for community college to foster an awareness of foreign cultures and the interconnected nature of the world economy" (2010a, para. 5). It is within the context of this discourse that I will examine the state of internationalization at the community college level.

In the past few years, as the discussion on educating community college students "in the overarching cross-cultural and international aspects and ramifications of their future employment and personal lives" (Guerin, 2009, p. 644) has increased, higher education scholars have produced a significant amount of literature on internationalization in community colleges (Green, 2007; Green, et al., 2008; Green & Siaya, 2005; Guerin, 2009; Hult & Motz, 2008; Levin, 2000; Levin 2002; Raby, 2008; Raby & Valeau, 2007). This work, which highlights the importance of internationalization to community colleges and their students, as well as the challenges colleges

face in internationalizing, and the successes they have already achieved, is the focus of this section.

As mentioned previously, the American Council on Education included community colleges in their study of internationalization at U.S. colleges (Green et al., 2008; Siaya & Hayward, 2003). Siaya and Hayward (2003) found many positive developments in the internationalization of community colleges including improvements in the area of foreign language (with a small, but growing number, of colleges even instituting a foreign language admission requirement), study abroad, international student enrollment, and the acquisition of external funding to support international programs. Perhaps unexpectedly, they discovered that little difference existed between community colleges and other institution types; on the whole, a greater disparity existed among community colleges than between those institutions and other types (liberal arts, comprehensive, and research universities). Siaya and Hayward (2003) identified the biggest hurdle for internationalization as funding. Additionally, only one-quarter of community colleges included internationalization as part of the college mission statement, perhaps indicating a lack of commitment to the process. Siaya and Hayward (2003) found that 38% of community colleges offered study abroad programs.

In the follow-up survey, Green, et al. (2008) found that many of these issues persisted. For example, they found that community colleges were the least likely institution type to have a written plan addressing institution-wide internationalization, that 68% of community colleges received no external funding for internationalization in 2006, and that 51% of responding community colleges reported that none of their 2005 graduates participated in study abroad (Green et al., 2008). However, they did find that 85% of responding institutions offered study abroad programs for credit in 2006. This differs considerably from Raby (2008), who reported

only a total of 114 community colleges offering study abroad in academic year 2005-2006. One possible explanation for this difference is response bias. Green, et al. (2008) note that community college response rates were so low as to warrant telephone follow-up reminders to institutions. It could be that the institutions with the weakest internationalization efforts were less likely to respond to the ACE survey than those with stronger internationalization implementation. Raby (2008) used the *Open Doors* report, which may experience less response bias, being an annual, well-established survey.

In addition to the inclusion of community colleges in the research of Siaya and Hayward (2003), additional research has focused on internationalization at community colleges specifically. As previously discussed, community colleges made great strides in the area of internationalization, with many adopting an international and multicultural focus (Bandler, 2002; Levin, 2000, 2002; Siaya & Hayward, 2003). This section will look specifically at the ways in which community colleges achieved internationalization and the barriers to further internationalization.

Raby and Valeau (2007) outline the phases of internationalization in community colleges as well as the rationales for internationalization at these institutions. The phases they identify are the recognition phase, expansion and publication phase, augmentation phase, and institutionalization phase (Raby & Valeau, 2007). The recognition phase lasted from 1967 to 1984 and saw many firsts for community college internationalization from the first study abroad office, which opened at Rockland Community College in 1969, to the first faculty-led study abroad programs in 1974. The second phase, expansion and publication, overlapped slightly with the first phase, lasting from 1980-1990. During this phase, community colleges began receiving grants for curriculum internationalization and developing state and regional consortia (Raby &

Valeau, 2007). Augmentation, the third phase, lasted from 1990-2000. At this time, community colleges began to enhance their internationalization efforts, intensifying the recruitment of international students and “diversifying disciplines for infusion and study abroad” (Raby & Valeau, 2007, p. 7). The last phase is that of institutionalization, which began in 2000. This phase has seen “an explicit push to include international education in institutional mission statements” and significant growth in study abroad programs at community colleges (Raby & Valeau, 2007, p. 8).

Raby and Valeau (2007) argue that community colleges have four rationales for internationalizing their campuses. These are: 1) political, or the perception of international education as being important for national security; 2) economic, which recognizes international education as a means to enhance international trade and commerce; 3) humanist, where international education is a process that helps students relate to others and facilitates tolerance and peace; and 4) academic integrity, or the idea that courses and/or programs that lack international themes are incomplete.

The most comprehensive work on the achievement of internationalization at community colleges was conducted by Green and Siaya (2005), who analyzed the responses of 233 community colleges to an institutional survey conducted by the American Council on Education. Green and Siaya (2005) developed an internationalization index to measure the extent of internationalization on community college campuses. Using a five point scale of zero, low, medium, medium-high, and high, they found that the majority of community colleges scored low overall and that none scored high. Individual colleges did, however, score highly active on individual dimensions of internationalization (articulated commitment, academic offerings,

organizational infrastructure, external funding, institutional investment in faculty, and international students and student programs).

Their findings included several common strategies for highly active community colleges, as compared to their lower scoring counterparts (Green & Siaya, 2005). These included: seeking external funding for international education, having an office to oversee international education programs, highlighting education abroad in recruitment literature, providing funding for faculty to lead study abroad programs and attend conferences, having an international general education course requirement, and offering workshops and funding for faculty to internationalize their curricula.

More recently, Green (2007) analyzed barriers to internationalizing community colleges. She found the major barriers to internationalization are institutional as well as individual, with the single most powerful obstacle being the “perception that institutional leaders do not view international education as relevant” (Green, 2007, p. 19). Additional barriers included the lack of institutional strategy, the fragmentation of international programs, a lack of funding, and a lack of faculty expertise and interest in international learning or teaching.

Building on the work of Green and Siaya (2005), Hult and Motz (2008) conducted a benchmark study on international business education in community colleges. Their study focused on five pillars of internationalization – strategic commitment, program offerings, organizational infrastructure, funding, and investment in faculty. Using data from 428 colleges, they found investment in faculty to be the most important pillar in achieving a highly internationalized business program. They also found that nearly two-thirds of community colleges administer international business programs via an individual, presenting a potential hurdle to infusing internationalization more broadly.

The most recent work in internationalization in community colleges, which also builds on the work of Green and Siaya (2005) and Green, et al. (2008), is that of Harder (2010). Using data from the American Council on Education, Harder conducted an ex post facto study designed to explore levels of internationalization at community colleges in the U.S., examine the impact of rural, suburban, or rural settings on overall levels of internationalization, and examine whether relationships exist between the dimensions of internationalization within each classification. The findings from this study include that, while internationalization is low across all community colleges, institutions located in rural areas have significantly lower levels of internationalization than campuses in suburban or urban areas. More importantly, the study found that the lack of international experiences often results in graduates of community college being subject to an employability penalty (Harder, 2010).

While gains in language programs, international or area studies, and internationally-infused curriculum are important, some might argue that such forms of internationalization may not be enough to prepare students for the still developing global realities. Indeed, “teaching other countries’ languages, culture, or geography is inadequate to deal with global issues. Learning about current events in other countries will be insufficient to solve problems of a global nature” (Lim, Miller, Riley, McPherson, & Simon, 2003, p. 10). It should be noted that much of the work on study abroad comes from higher education institutions and/or associations with an interest in the expansion of study abroad. Lim, et al. (2003) is one such example and may therefore overstate its case. Nevertheless, study abroad – which allows students to experience events in other countries – is certainly an alternative to simply learning about events in other countries.

The literature on study abroad

This study is especially interested in one aspect of internationalization in particular, and that is study abroad. Study abroad has nearly 90 years of history in this country, with a steadily increasing number of students choosing to partake in this activity; for example, the number of students studying abroad quadrupled between 1987-1988 and 2007-2008 (Institute of International Education, 2009). Nevertheless, the total proportion of students who study abroad is still less than two percent of American higher education enrollments (Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program, 2005). Therefore, while study abroad has garnered attention from policymakers (for example the Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program, whose report was cited earlier in this paragraph), the relatively small number of students who study abroad, and the especially small number from community colleges, may account for the thin body of research on study abroad in community colleges.

Limited literature exists on study abroad in community colleges. There is little empirical work on study abroad of any kind. In the research that does exist on study abroad, most references to study abroad at community colleges are part of research on internationalization, which includes study abroad. Typically the extent of the focus on study abroad at community colleges is a report on its history or frequency of programs (Green, et al., 2008; Green & Siaya, 2005; Hult & Motz, 2008; Raby, 2008; Raby & Valeau, 2007; Raby 2008). There is also no existing work on connections between study abroad and the larger community, an area in which this study may be of benefit to the field of study abroad research.

Literature on study abroad primarily consists of studies examining the benefits of study abroad on student development. However, one important article looked at study abroad

programs, rather than impacts. In an effort to contribute to a clearer articulation of educational goals in study abroad, Engle and Engle (2003) proposed a classification system for study abroad programs. Their proposed system would divide study abroad programs into five levels. The first level is that of study tour. Such a program lasts from several days to several weeks with collective housing and English language instruction by home institution faculty. Short-term study abroad programs, with a duration of three to eight weeks and the possibility for housing with local families, comprise level two. The intensity of the program increases from level to level until level five, semester and academic year programs with individual integration home stays and all curricular and extracurricular activities conducted in the target foreign language.

Engle and Engle (2003) argue for such a classification system on the grounds that each year a wider range of program options are available to students, all of which are often simply identified as “study abroad.” A rating scale, on the other hand “would work to widen the scope of the student’s ability to discern the true nature of the program he or she is considering” (Engle & Engle, 2003, p. 15). Additionally, they posit that such a scale could shift institutional politics behind study abroad. For example, currently many institutions eagerly display their total number of students participating in study abroad, essentially competing with one another to have the most students abroad. Yet, an increasing number of those students participate in the least demanding programs. Therefore, a classification system could potentially encourage institutions to focus on higher level programs, where students accrue ever greater personal and professional benefits, rather than reveal that, for example, 80% of their students go abroad on level one study tours.

Engle and Engle (2003) do note the important role that study tours play in providing international exposure to students who have never traveled abroad and otherwise likely would

not. This role cannot be understated, especially at the community college level where, anecdotally at least, the single most important role of study abroad is to open students eyes and minds to other parts of the world. Additionally, shorter programs are “especially appealing to students with employment constraints or family obligations which preclude their participation in programs of longer duration” (NAFSA: Association of International Educators, 1997).

The benefits of study abroad

Considerable empirical research on the benefits of study abroad exists. Studies range from those that have studied students directly (Carlson et al., 1990; McKeown, 2009) to a study that surveyed employers regarding differences between recent hires with and without study abroad experience (Gardner, Gross, & Steglitz, 2008). This literature review will divide this research into the four clusters identified by the Michigan State University Office of Study Abroad (2009): 1) academic/intellectual, such as developing problem solving and foreign language skills; 2) professional, such as gaining a sense of direction for the student’s future career; 3) personal, including the development of confidence and a stronger sense of personal identity; and 4) inter-cultural, such as developing an increased interest in other cultures and decreased ethnocentricity. These areas are represented in the literature to varying degrees. While I was unable to locate any studies that have been conducted on community college students, empirical studies have been conducted on students from a wide range of colleges and have consistently found that study abroad benefits students’ development. Therefore, there is no reason to believe that community college students would not similarly benefit from the provision of study abroad.

Before examining the benefits that accrue to study abroad participants, and because study abroad is virtually always a voluntary activity, it is first necessary to understand the ways in

which students who study abroad may differ from those who do not. This question, how do students who study abroad differ from those who remain on their home campus, was the focus of a quantitative study of 303 University of California and University of Massachusetts at Amherst students (Carlson et al., 1990). Study abroad participants (study abroad group) completed pre- and post-study abroad questionnaires probing interest in other countries, attitudes toward the United States, career motivation, and motivations to study abroad. Non-study abroad participants (control group) completed the pre-questionnaire only.

The authors found that study abroad participants have a significantly greater interest in other cultures, current events, and international affairs than students who do not study abroad and to be less positive about cultural life in the United States than non-study abroad participants (Carlson et al., 1990). The study also provided insight into students' motivations for studying abroad, or not. For example, the study abroad group was primarily motivated by the "cultural and living experiences" they expected to have (Carlson et al., 1990, p. 31). A significant proportion of the control group indicated they were interested in studying abroad but chose not to because it was not necessary for their course of studies or might delay their graduation. These concerns are legitimate, and may be especially essential to address for community college students; however, as the following sections indicate, numerous important benefits do accrue to students who study abroad, even for brief periods of time. The four benefits that will be examined in detail, in order, are 1) academic/intellectual; 2) professional; 3) personal; and 4) inter-cultural.

Academic/intellectual.

In 1923, the University of Delaware's Professor Kirkbride argued that study abroad would be an excellent way for students to gain an understanding of other countries and cultures and to improve their language skills (Kochanek, 1998; Massey & Burrow, 2009). In developing

his program, Kirkbride specifically stated that such an experience would be useful for training future foreign language teachers; indeed, for many decades thereafter study abroad was essentially in the exclusive domain of language majors (Mohajeri Norris & Gillespie, 2009). Not surprisingly, then, much research on study abroad outcomes and benefits has focused on the acquisition and improvement of language skills (Cohen & Shively, 2007; Gray, Murdock, & Stebbins, 2002; Magnan & Back, 2007). These findings, the overwhelming majority of which are based on empirical research, will not be reviewed further here.

Unlike much of the work in this area, which focuses on language acquisition, McKeown (2009) investigated the impact of studying abroad on intellectual development. The research used the MID, an existing essay-format instrument, to measure students' intellectual reasoning ability before and after a semester-long study abroad experience. In addition to determining whether students participating in study abroad made gains in intellectual development, McKeown (2009) also sought to understand which additional variables (such as demographics) were associated with any intellectual development gains. McKeown (2009) found that gains in intellectual development were uneven, with the greatest gains occurring within students who had not previously traveled abroad; importantly the intellectual development of students for whom study abroad was their first meaningful international experience "caught up to their more experienced peers after one semester abroad" (p. 92). The study also found that, as Carlson, et al. (1990) and others have reported (as cited in McKeown, 2009), considerable self-selection at every step of studying abroad leading to differences between those students who choose to study abroad and those who do not is well-established.

The second and third development clusters identified by the Office of Study Abroad at Michigan State University (2009), professional development (for example gaining a sense of

direction for the student's future career) and personal development (such as the development of confidence and a stronger sense of personal identity), will be examined in tandem in the next section.

Professional and personal.

The areas of professional and personal skill development are closely intertwined in the literature. Professional development, especially, has long motivated students to study abroad. For example, in 1954-1955 the U.S. Department of State surveyed American students studying abroad and found the goal of professional advancement to be of paramount importance in the decision to study abroad (Gullahorn & Gullahorn, 1958). One student even wrote in their response, "...That way I'll also have better bargaining power when I want a raise once I get established" (Gullahorn & Gullahorn, 1958, p. 370); another wrote, "I'm here to get background that will help me in foreign trade" (p. 373). It is clear, then, that even in the early days of study abroad students were motivated by the idea that studying abroad would equip them with valuable skills for future employment.

In general this is true. Studying abroad provides students with a career skill set that employers increasingly value (Obst et al., 2007). Kitsantas and Meyers (2001) found that study abroad programs were a significant factor in students' preparation to function in multicultural environments and enhance students' international understanding. More importantly, Gardner, et al. (2008) found that fully half of the employers they surveyed believed that recent hires with study abroad or international internship experience differed significantly from recent hires without international experience in several areas. These areas are: interacting with people who hold different interests, values, or perspectives; understanding cultural differences in the workplace; and adapting to situations of change.

More explicitly, study abroad has been shown to be highly correlated with the career decisions of study abroad alumni (Mohajeri Norris & Gillespie, 2009). In a survey of 17,000 former students who participated in study abroad programs between 1950 and 1999, Mohajeri Norris and Gillespie found that the majority of study abroad participants gained skills that influenced their career path and helped them develop interest in a career direction that they pursued. In addition to influencing the career path, Mohajeri Norris and Gillespie (2009) also found that study abroad contributes to personal development and increased self-confidence.

While Norris and Gillespie's (2009) study looked at issues beyond identity development, a number of recent studies have been conducted on the effects of study abroad on identity development. One popular instrument for measuring such development is the Cross Cultural Adaptability Inventory (CCAI), a 50-question survey examining Emotional Resilience, Flexibility/Openness, Perceptual Acuity, and Personal Autonomy. Personal Autonomy, which measures "how one maintains his/her identity and belief system in an unfamiliar environment with different values" (Kitsantas, 2004, p. 444), correlates very well to establishing identity.

In 2004, Kitsantas surveyed 232 students enrolled in European study abroad programs before (pretest) and shortly after (posttest) the study abroad experience using the CCAI and personal data questionnaire to assess their self-awareness and cross-cultural effectiveness. She found students scored higher on the posttest CCAI in all areas, with the greatest gains being made in the area of Personal Autonomy. Likewise, Black and Duhon (2006) used the CCAI to determine whether University of Southern Mississippi study abroad participants were becoming more empathetic and cross-culturally tolerant and whether they were also becoming more self-confident and independent. In both studies, students experienced gains in all areas. In the Kitsantas (2004) study, students gained the most in Personal Autonomy; Black and Duhon

(2006) found student gains ranging from 7.7 points in Personal Autonomy to 17.3 points in Perceptual Acuity.

It should be noted, however, that the professional gains of students are tempered when they do not articulate their international experience in ways that have meaning for potential employers (Gardner, et al., 2008). To maximize the professional value of study abroad, Gardner, et al. (2008) state that students must reflect upon their experience and take care to highlight the academic and personal growth value of their study abroad and not simply present their experience as a travel log. Highlighting their intercultural learning (for example an increased interest in other cultures and decreased ethnocentricity) may also be beneficial to students seeking to help perspective employers understand how study abroad has helped them develop. Intercultural development is the final development cluster that this literature review will explore.

Intercultural.

Among the most prominent and consistently cited benefits of study abroad are an enhanced worldview, global perspective, and cross-cultural effectiveness (Gray et al., 2002; Kitsantas, 2004; Kitsantas & Meyers, 2001; Obst et al., 2007), all of which contribute to world, or global, mindedness. Douglas and Jones-Rikkens (2001) specifically looked at worldmindedness, which they defined as “the extent to which individuals value the global perspective ... and appreciates cultural differences,” (p. 58). Their study found that participating in study abroad positively impacts a student’s worldmindedness. This finding may be of especial interest to community colleges interested in meeting the needs of employers, given that employers, as noted previously in this chapter, place an increased emphasis on such global mindedness.

Clarke et al. (2009) investigated the potential intercultural proficiencies expected from a semester study abroad program for U.S. students. They found that students who had spent a semester abroad were more globally minded than those who had not, had enhanced intercultural communication skills, a greater openness to diversity, and heightened intercultural sensitivity. Given that over half of all students who study abroad do so in short-term programs, a number that increases to three-quarters for community college students, (Raby, 2008), two studies on short-term program effects may be more appropriate.

Gray et al. (2002) used assessment surveys to study students at Missouri Southern State College. They found that even studying abroad for a short period of time increases the awareness students have of themselves and their own culture and challenges strongly held opinions and beliefs. Ismail, Morgan, and Hayes (2006) conducted a similar study at Purdue University using an instrument to measure “openness to diversity.” Their findings indicated that short-term programs (here, three weeks) may significantly increase students’ openness to diversity on a similar magnitude as students who participated in semester-long programs.

Study abroad in community colleges

As stated previously, little work has been published specifically on study abroad in community colleges. The research that does touch on study abroad in community colleges is generally research on internationalization (sometimes with a focus on community colleges) that also covers study abroad, typically by reporting its history or frequency of programs (Green, et al., 2008; Green & Siaya, 2005; Hult & Motz, 2008; Raby, 2008; Raby & Valeau, 2007; Raby 2008). That may be at least in part because of the relative newness and limited scope of study abroad in community colleges. It may also be because of the special challenges that study abroad presents for community colleges, in particular in meeting the needs of non-traditional students,

such as those with work or family obligations (Raby, 2008). This section will revisit a brief background on the history of study abroad in community colleges, as presented in the previous chapter and then review the findings of the work that has been published on community college study abroad programs.

The first community college study abroad programs began in the late 1960s and early 1970s (Raby & Valeau, 2007). Rockland Community College opened a study abroad office in 1969 with other colleges following suit for the next decade. By 1977, 300 community colleges were engaged in international education (Shannon, 1978, as cited in Raby & Valeau, 2007).

Raby (2008) reported that the number of community colleges offering study abroad programs has increased 34% since 2000, while the number of community college students studying abroad has increased 60% in that same time period. Sixty-two percent of community college students who study abroad do so in Europe, with Italy being the top destination of choice. Slightly more than 76% of students participate in short-term, summer programs of eight weeks or less. Business students comprise the greatest percentage (15.6) of study abroad participants with declared majors. Compared to four-year schools, community colleges send more minorities and fewer white students abroad.

Raby (2008) also identified three major challenges to the development of community college study abroad programs. First is the challenge of serving the diverse population of community college students. Specifically, community colleges need to develop programs that can accommodate students with work and family obligations. The second challenge is institutional constraints, such as stakeholder support, funding, and dedicated office staff. Institutional constraints can be especially challenging at those institutions that do not include internationalization or international education in either their mission or strategic plans. Finally,

Raby identified the need for further professionalization of staff to be able to handle issues such as risk management, evaluation, and pre-departure/re-entry programs, as a challenge for community colleges to develop study abroad programs.

Raby (2008) found two models of study abroad predominated in the community colleges. The most common model is faculty-led programs. The second model is that of consortium. Little information is available on the administration of programs by faculty, campus offices, or consortia. Halder (1997) offers the materials developed and used by Iowa's community colleges to establish the Iowa Community College Consortium for Study Abroad in the mid-1990s. These materials are useful in understanding the responsibilities of consortium members, such as "participating colleges will advertise consortium activities in their published schedule of classes" and "the lead school offering the program will provide the faculty member" (Halder, 1997, p. 9).

Hser (2005) identified factors that have been major obstacles for study abroad. These impediments include a lack of funding, negative perceptions by faculty, and in some cases social and/or political chaos in study abroad locations. All of the factors identified in this section of the literature review need to be explored more thoroughly in relation to study abroad in community colleges to better understand which ones, as well as others not identified here, enhance or impede the development of community college study abroad programs.

In sum, much research has been conducted on campus internationalization generally and at community colleges and on study abroad. Much of the work on study abroad focuses on the benefits conferred to students by study abroad. However, virtually no work has been done on the impact of the community on community college programming or study abroad program development at community colleges. This study seeks to examine this process by examining the macro-level factors that impact the development of said programs.

Chapter 3

Methods and Methodology

Chapter 3 describes the methods and methodology that were used in this study. As discussed in the introduction, the purpose of this study is to shed light on factors that may inhibit or promote the development of study abroad at community colleges. Specifically, this is an analysis of macro-level factors that influence the development and success of study abroad programs at community colleges. The primary research question, then, is: What are the macro-level factors that influence the development and deployment of study abroad programs at community colleges? Within the context of this study, macro-level factors include such variables as average income, urbanization of the community, presence of foreign-born individuals, and ties with external constituents in the local community.

Study abroad in community colleges has rarely been studied. What existing research there is has largely been conducted using survey instruments (Green et al., 2008; Green & Siaya, 2005; Hult & Motz, 2008). I followed a similar approach using surveys, first to understand basic demographics, administrative decisions and structures, and study abroad offerings in community colleges, then to query senior-level administrators about the influence of the community in making these decisions. Together the surveys should allow for an understanding of the various factors that impact the development and success of study abroad programs in community colleges.

This chapter describes the methods and methodology I used to conduct a study on the macro-level factors that influence study abroad development in community colleges. I will begin this chapter by examining the reasons to use surveys in this study, to be followed by an

examination of my survey design, and finally by a discussion of the sample and data analysis procedures. The instruments used in this study are included in the appendices.

Why use surveys?

The survey method is well established in educational research. Surveys in educational research appeared as early as 1817 when Marc Antoine Jullien de Paris designed an international survey of education systems (De Landesheere, as cited in Creswell, 2005). The modern educational survey appeared during the interwar years (approximately 1920-1940) with the development of different scales of measurement and improved sampling techniques; by the mid-twentieth century the popularity of surveys in educational research was firmly established (Creswell, 2005).

Creswell (2005) notes that survey research is appropriate for learning about a population and describing trends. Given that the exploratory nature of this study requires further learning about the population and the trends in macro-level factors affecting study abroad program development, survey research seems highly appropriate. Additionally Creswell (2005) states that electronic surveys provide an easy form of data collection, “although their actual use may be limited because not all participants have access to computer or are comfortable using websites and the Internet” (p. 361). Given the nature of the participants (mid- to upper-level administrators at higher education institutions) and the increased prevalence of the internet and technology, this limitation would seem not to apply to this study.

Surveys are especially appropriate for this study which seeks to collect information to understand questions about the relationships between community college study abroad programming and macro-level factors. Alreck and Settle (2004) note that survey research is often the most effective and dependable way to obtain accurate, reliable, and valid information. As is

frequently the case with surveys, those in this study are being conducted with the intention of enhancing the literature within the discipline (Alreck & Settle, 2004).

While surveys are not the only method for acquiring data about attitudes or opinions (Alreck & Settle, 2004), they seem the most appropriate for this study, where field experimentation and focus groups would be impractical owing to geography and the size of the sample. (Given that this study surveyed more than 750 community colleges, and that focus groups should consist of fewer than a dozen participants (Alreck & Settle, 2004), over 60 focus groups would have been necessary to achieve the same reach. Furthermore, community colleges from Maine to Hawaii were surveyed, also making focus groups difficult to implement.) Additionally, surveys typically generate a significantly larger amount of data than experiments (Alreck & Settle, 2004); large amounts of data are especially desirable given the exploratory nature of this study. Additional advantages of the online survey method include the ability to reach a larger and more dispersed sample and the elimination of interviewer bias (Alreck & Settle, 2004).

Alreck and Settle (2004) identify one of the major potential limitations of the survey approach as non-response, with participants feeling “too embarrassed or threatened to give the information” (p. 8). However, most often this problem develops when a survey seeks information on issues associated with social taboos; given the institutional nature of this survey, it is unlikely that any non-response was due to threat or sensitive questions.

Studying a problem of interest to the population is one way to encourage a higher response rate (Creswell, 2005) though. An earlier survey by the organization Community Colleges for International Development (2009) found widespread interest in the topic, as have my wide ranging conversations with community college faculty members, administrators, and

policy makers, all of which point to a sufficient level of interest to solicit responses to this survey.

Survey design

This study was a two-part study. In the first part of the study, I used a survey instrument to collect data from community colleges regarding background/demographic information, international activities on campus, and their experiences with the development of study abroad programs. These data were intended to measure 1) the internationalization of the college and 2) the success of college's study abroad programs. In developing this survey, I modified and built upon the American Council of Education survey which has been the basis for much of the work on community college internationalization to date (Green, 2007; Green et al., 2008; Green & Siaya, 2005; Hult & Motz, 2008; Siaya & Hayward, 2003). The survey was then administered electronically to directors of institutional research at community colleges accredited by the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC). These individuals were identified using information from each school's website. Institutional researchers were selected over other administrators, such as vice presidents, deans, or faculty members, based on numerous conversations with community college faculty, administrators, and policy makers, including community college presidents and high-level personnel from the AACC. The reason for this recommendation concerns the scope of the data being collected, much of which is available only from institutional research offices. However, institutional researchers were requested to consult with other administrators to answer questions they believed were beyond their purview. This request was keeping in practice with other community college surveys such as Green, et al., 2008 and Green and Siaya, 2005.

I examined internationalization by looking at indicator variables. Examples of indicator variables for internationalization of the college included the number of international students on campus, the number of foreign-born faculty members, and foreign language requirements and course offerings. The indicator variables for success of the college's study abroad programs included the number of programs offered, the number of years for which study abroad has been offered, the program format, such as faculty-led, semester-long, community college consortium, or coordination by third party including four-year university, the average number of students who participate in each program, and the overall percentage of students who participate in study abroad. Indicator variables for this study were adapted from the American Council of Education survey as well as created specifically to understand macro-level influences on study abroad program development.

The survey was designed using "smart" survey features so that some of the questions users were asked depended on the answers they gave. For example, if a participant replied that the institution administered study abroad programs, the participant was then asked in what year the first study abroad program was offered. If the institution had no study abroad programs, the survey skipped this question. Respondents also had the opportunity to share additional comments at the end of the survey. These additional comments were then used to give voice to the individual participants and the institutions they represent. The complete survey instrument is included in the appendix.

The survey also asked the respondent to identify the community or district that the college serves. Identification was recorded using both geographic measures, such as city, county, or tribal community, and the level of urbanization, such as urban, rural, or suburban. Participants were also asked about the strength of the institution's ties to entities within the community, such

as local government, chamber of commerce, K-12 school district, four-year college or university, business and industry, etc.

Following the completion of the initial data collection and analysis, I then embarked on the second step of the survey and data collection process. This portion of the study involved surveying senior-level administrators, including chancellors, presidents, vice-presidents, and deans, from institutions that had responded to the question in the first survey that asked whether the institution administered study abroad programs. At institutions that administer study abroad programs, the senior administrator overseeing study abroad was surveyed. At other institutions, the vice president of academic affairs was surveyed; if the position is vacant or non-existent, the president received the survey. The second survey was designed to better understand the connections community colleges have forged with external constituencies within the community and the ways in which these constituencies have influenced study abroad program development, or the lack thereof.

The census survey approach that I employed has been used successfully to study other aspects of internationalization on community college campuses in the past (Green & Siaya, 2005; Hult & Motz, 2008). This approach offers a number of advantages. One of the most important, given the exploratory nature of this study, is generalizability, while the primary limitation is the risk of response bias (Creswell, 2005). While the findings are discussed in detail in the next chapter, I will note here that one-third of institutions that responded to the question of whether they administered study abroad programs responded in the affirmative. This proportion falls between the numbers reported by Raby (2008), who found 114 community colleges, or roughly 10% of all two-year colleges, offering study abroad programs in 2005-2006 and Green, et al. (2008) who found 85% of responding institutions offered study abroad programs for credit in

2006. In 2003 Siaya and Hayward found that 38% of community colleges offered study abroad programs, a number quite close to what this study found. Therefore, the findings from this study appear to offer some level of generalizability, while exhibiting no greater response bias than similar research.

Instrument Design

For the initial survey, a number of questions were adapted from the American Council on Education survey, which was also the basis for the Hult and Motz (2008) survey. Additional questions have also been written to understand stakeholder interest and participation in the development of study abroad programs. Understanding stakeholder interest is especially important in the context of community colleges as community colleges have the distinction of being themselves at least partially shaped by their communities. As previously discussed, community colleges regularly work with local employers “to fashion curricula that dovetail with the needs of industry” (Fernandez, 2009, p. 23). For example, St. Louis Community College in St. Louis, Missouri, has retrained autoworkers for jobs at the local Boeing plant, while Redlands Community College in El Reno, Oklahoma, teaches agriculture professionals how to write farm-work plans (Fernandez, 2009). Responding to local community needs is a key component of what Cohen and Brawer (2003) have identified as the community service function of community colleges.

A number of items asked participants to respond to a statement using a 1-5 Likert scale where 1 is strongly disagree, 3 is neutral, and 5 is strongly agree. Each item was written to be as clear and brief as possible, focus on a single idea, and convey an opinion or feeling rather than a fact. Survey questions were created to represent both ends of the spectrum in keeping with the principles of instrument construction (Thorndike, 2005). In that way a consistent respondent who

strongly agrees with the item representing one end of the spectrum would be expected to strongly disagree with the item at the other end of the spectrum.

Before being administered nationally, the survey was piloted with a small group of approximately 10 community college faculty and administrators, including institutional researchers, deans, policymakers, and faculty members from institutions around the country, in the states of Ohio, Washington, Tennessee, and Wisconsin. This pilot study was designed to ensure that the questions were clear and concise and that instrument had sound face validity. Based on feedback from this pilot group, a few questions were reworded and two follow-up questions added. No major changes were made.

The sample

The sample for this study was American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) member schools and their local communities. The AACC represents roughly 1,200 accredited community colleges in all 50 states, including public, private, and tribal colleges. I chose to survey all AACC member institutions for which contact information for an office of institutional research was available for multiple reasons. Owing to the exploratory nature of this study, a comprehensive sample seemed most appropriate. Using the criteria of online contact information, the sample totaled 751 institutions from all 50 states. In addition to the initial invitation to participate in the study, all institutions received two separate reminder emails requesting their participation. Copies of the invitation and reminders are included in the appendices.

In total 142 institutional researchers submitted a response to this survey. Responses to individual questions ranged from a high of N=43 (Q6: Is your institution authorized to offer baccalaureate degrees?) to a low of N=4 (Q28: How many students received academic credit for

participating in individual study abroad programs?). While low, it should be noted that a low response rate was, unfortunately, expected, given the extra efforts necessary for Green et al. (2008) to obtain a 30% response rate.

The second survey examined the aspects of the relationship with the local community. This survey was distributed electronically to senior-level administrators at the 33 institutions that responded to the question in the first survey that asked whether they administered study abroad questions. This survey, which asked slightly different questions depending whether or not an institution administered study abroad programs, consisted of one Likert-type response and six open-ended questions concerning the impact of the community and stakeholders upon the development of study abroad programs. Administrators who received this survey also received up to three reminder emails requesting their participation. At institutions where a senior-level administrator at a level below the president had not responded, the president then received an invitation and up to one reminder to participate. In total, 11 responses were submitted, for a response rate of 33%. Seven of the responses came from institutions that did not administer study abroad programs (a 32% response rate for that sub-group) and four came from institutions that did administer study abroad programs (a 33% response rate for that sub-group). In contrast to the survey of institutional researchers, every survey submitted in the second part of the survey was completed in full.

Data analysis

The findings from the analysis of the survey data are presented in detail in the following chapter. Initially this study was planned to be a regression study to analyze macro-level factors that influenced the development and success of study abroad programs at community colleges. However, owing to the small sample size (the majority of survey questions had $n < 30$), the data

were analyzed more broadly, primarily with descriptive statistics. The primary research question that is being studied is: What are the macro-level factors that influence the development and deployment of study abroad programs at community colleges? Within the context of this study, macro-level factors include such variables as average income within the community and percentage of students receiving financial aid, transfer rates to four-year institutions, average student age, and degree of urbanization. Additionally, I examined the relationships between elements of college internationalization (foreign language offerings, structure of international programs administration, presence of international faculty and students) and study abroad programming.

As no work has previously been done on relationships between program offerings and macro-level factors, this study was designed to be exploratory in nature. Its focus is on identifying relationships and laying a foundation for future work in this area.

Chapter 4

Findings

This study, an analysis of macro-level factors that influence the development and success of study abroad programs at community colleges, attempted to shed light on factors that may inhibit the development of study abroad at community colleges, as well as factors that may encourage such program development. This chapter presents key findings from two surveys that were administered to institutional researchers and senior administrators at community colleges. The findings are organized around the following themes: 1) profile of community colleges, 2) profile of the communities served, 3) international activities and internationalization efforts at the college, 4) study abroad programming, and 5) the relationship with the community and stakeholders. I also further describe the sample and compare it to the population of community colleges at large. Following this discussion I explore the primary research question: What are the macro-level factors that influence the development and deployment of study abroad programs at community colleges?

Two surveys were conducted to answer the research question. The first surveyed 751 institutional researchers to gain an understanding of the landscape, demographics, and internationalization of community colleges today. The second surveyed 33 high-level administrators, including presidents, chancellors, vice presidents, deans, and directors, from institutions that responded to the first survey to obtain a more in-depth perspective on the successes and challenges of study abroad program development at community colleges. The major focus of this second survey was the influence of the community and relationships with external institutions on such program development. The remainder of this chapter presents the findings from these two surveys.

Survey of institutional researchers

In total 142 institutional researchers responded to the first survey, yielding a response rate of 18.9%. Responses to individual questions ranged from a high of N=43 (Q6: Is your institution authorized to offer baccalaureate degrees?) to a low of N=4 (Q28: How many students received academic credit for participating in individual study abroad programs?). For those questions, 13 in total, which were asked to only those at institutions that administer study abroad programs (n=11), the range was from 9 (7 questions) to 4 (Q44: How many students received academic credit for participating in individual study abroad programs?). Eighteen responses were received to the two questions that were asked exclusively to those at institutions that do NOT administer study abroad programs (n=22).

While on the low side, this response rate was not unanticipated given the difficulties documented by Green, et al. (2008) during their study. For example, due to the lower response rate during the ACE study, non-responding community colleges received telephone reminders, in addition to previous written reminders (Green, et al., 2008). Additionally, policymakers at the American Association of Community Colleges and Community Colleges for International Development had both indicated that response rates for the type of study undertaken in this dissertation tend to be on the lower side. With these issues in mind, the initial survey was piloted to a group of administrators, including deans, faculty, and institutional researchers, to ensure that the questions were appropriate and could reasonably be expected to be answered. The survey instructions also noted that participants were encouraged to consult with other administrators to answer questions they felt were beyond their purview. Additionally, each participant received up to two follow-up reminders about the survey. A full copy of the survey is included in Appendix A; the survey questions have been organized by theme.

Survey of senior administrators

The second survey in this study was distributed electronically to senior-level administrators at the 33 institutions that responded to the question in the first survey that asked whether they administered study abroad questions. This survey, which asked slightly different questions depending whether or not an institution administered study abroad programs, consisted of one Likert-type response and six or seven (depending on the version) open-ended questions concerning the impact of the community and stakeholders upon the development of study abroad programs. Administrators who received this survey also received up to three reminder emails requesting their participation. In total, 11 responses were submitted, for a response rate of 33%. Seven of the responses came from institutions that did not administer study abroad programs (a 32% response rate for that sub-group) and four came from institutions that did administer study abroad programs (a 33% response rate for that sub-group). In addition to the initial invitation to participate, each administrator received up to three reminders. At institutions where a senior-level administrator at a level below the president had not responded, the president then received an invitation and up to one reminder to participate. Copies of the surveys are included in Appendix B (institutions that do not offer study abroad) and Appendix C (institutions that offer study abroad).

The following is an examination of the responses to these surveys. This discussion has been organized around the following themes: 1) profile of community colleges, 2) profile of the communities served, 3) international activities and internationalization efforts at the college, 4) study abroad programming, and 5) the relationship with the community and stakeholders. The first three themes are the province of the first survey; the last two themes were examined in both surveys.

Profile of community colleges

Eight questions from the first survey and one question from the second survey examined the theme of the profile of the institutions that participated in this study. The questions from the survey of institutional researchers covered two areas, a profile of the students (for example, age and financial aid) and a profile of the administrative structure (for example, availability of baccalaureate degrees, appointment of trustees). The survey of senior level administrators asked respondents at institutions that did not administer study abroad programs how they felt their institution differed from, or was similar to, institutions that administered study abroad programs.

Students.

Across all institutions, full-time equivalent (FTE) enrollment ranged from 763 to 32,362. The mean full-time equivalent student enrollment was 6,383 and median was 4,649. At institutions that do not administer study abroad programs (n=19), the minimum was 763 and the maximum was 15,700, with a mean of 5,120, a median of 3,284 and a standard deviation of 4,311.33. For institutions that administer study abroad programs (n=9), the minimum FTE enrollment was 1,348 and the maximum 32,362. The mean was 9,484 and the median was 6,000 with a standard deviation of 9,387.38. These numbers compare to a mean of 5,797 students enrolled in AACC-member institutions (American Association of Community Colleges, 2010c).

The minimum average age of full-time students was reported as 20-21 and the maximum average age was recorded as 36. The overall mean was 25.25 years and the median reported average age was 25.5. At institutions that administer study abroad programs (N=9), the mean age of full-time students was nearly identical to the mean age at all responding institutions, 25.24 and the median was slightly lower at 24.3 years. The standard deviation was 3.26 years. At

institutions that do not administer study abroad programs (N=18), the mean age was 25.17 and the median was 25 years, with a standard deviation of 2.68 years.

While the average age of students at responding institutions seems to be below the national average, overall, the distribution of ages is similar to the national averages, as reported by the American Association of Community College. According to the AACC's most recent statistics, the overall average age of community college students is 28, with 46% being 21 or younger, 40% being 22-39 and 16% being 40 or older (American Association of Community Colleges, 2010c).

Survey participants were also asked about financial aid, as a student's finances have previously been shown to be a major factor in students' decisions whether or not to study abroad (Hser, 2005; Raby, 2008). Percentages of students receiving financial aid at responding institutions ranged from 5 to 95%, with a mean of 54.88% and a median of 60%. At institutions that administer study abroad programs (N=8), the mean is 41.63% and the median is 44.5%, with a standard deviation of 22.16%. At institutions that do not administer study abroad programs (N=16), the mean and median are 68.11% and 70%, respectively, with a standard deviation of 16.88%.

At the 23 institutions that provided information on the average financial aid award in 2009-2010, the average award ranged from a low of \$240 to a high of \$8,085. The median award was \$2,858 and the mean award was \$3,140. One institution that administers study abroad indicated this figure was not available. For the remaining institutions the mean, median, and standard deviation were \$1,941.50, \$2,254.50, and \$1,067.03. Among institutions that do not administer study abroad programs, the mean award was \$3,527, with a median of \$3,300 and a standard deviation of \$1,843.36.

Nationally, 59% of community college students apply for financial aid, with 46% ultimately receiving it (American Association of Community Colleges, 2010c). On average, the institutions that responded to this survey have a higher percentage of students receiving financial aid than the national average, a difference that is most visible when looking at those institutions that do not administer study abroad programs. Figures on average financial aid awards are not available.

As part of understanding the student profile at community colleges participating in this study, the survey also asked about students' transfer rates to four-year colleges and universities. A total of N=25 responses were received to this question; transfer rates ranged from a low of 0% to a high of 56% with an overall median transfer rate of 20.51% and a mean of 20.72%. At institutions that administer study abroad programs (N=8), the median transfer rate was 24.25% and the mean was 23.97%. The median transfer rate at schools that do not administer study abroad programs (N=14) was 20.51% and the mean and standard deviation were 21.67% and 11.78%. These rates are comparable with previously reported transfer rates throughout the country. For example, in California, the nation's largest community college system, 40% of students transfer to four-year institutions; in Texas the number is half that (Chen, 2009; CityTownInfo.com, 2009; Moore, Shulock, & Jensen, 2009). The next section will discuss findings about the second prong of the theme, the administrative profile of community colleges.

Administrative profile.

A growing trend in community college education is the availability of the baccalaureate degree (Lewin, 2009, Moltz, 2010). This model has evolved faster than the scholarship in the field; for example, "scholars do not know enough about these community college baccalaureate

programs to say whether they have adversely affected existing two-year programs” (Moltz, 2010, To add or not to add section, Para. 19).

To see whether a correlation between degree type and existence of study abroad programs existed, this survey asked whether the institution offered a BA or was strictly a two-year institution. Among all survey respondents (N=43), institutions administering study abroad were nearly as likely to be accredited to offer baccalaureate degrees as those that did not administer study abroad. In the former case, 9% of survey respondents indicate they are authorized to offer baccalaureate degrees. At institutions that do not administer study abroad programs, 10% offer the four-year degree. Offering baccalaureate degrees is becoming increasingly common. For example, community colleges in a number of states including Texas, Nevada, and Washington now offer BA degrees, and in Florida 18 of its 28 community colleges offer at least one baccalaureate degree (Lewin, 2009; Moltz, 2010). However, whether or not an institution offers baccalaureate degrees does not seem to factor into frequency of study abroad program administration.

Given the influence of trustees on programming decisions and the various ways in which they can be appointed (Vaughan & Weisman, 1997), the process of trustee selection was one of the administrative areas that this survey queried. Among all responding institutions (N=35), governor appointment of trustees was most common, with 45% of institutions that administer study abroad programs and 47% of institutions that do not, reporting that trustees are selected in that manner. These numbers appear to be slightly lower than the most recent national average. In 2008, the Association for Community College Trustees surveyed almost 750 local boards from 39 states and 34 state boards and found 53% of community college trustees were governor-

appointed (Moltz, 2009). (For historical perspective, in 1995, 35.1% of trustees were appointed by the governor (Vaughan & Weisman, 1997)).

At institutions that do not administer study abroad programs (N=19), appointment by local elected officials and election by precinct were the next most common trustee selection procedures, at 16% each. District-wide election was reported by 11% of institutions, while another 11% indicated that their institution's trustees are selected by a combination of appointment and election, a common practice nationally (Moltz, 2009). At institutions that administer study abroad programs (N=11), 27% of respondents reported selecting trustees via district-wide election with the remaining institutions split between appointment by local elected officials, election by precinct, and other. (The other process of selection was recorded as "appointment by sponsoring school districts.")

Somewhat related to the issue of trustee appointment, in that it can also be out of the control of the institution, is how the curriculum is determined, specifically the level at which it is set. For example, while the majority of all respondents (N=37) indicated that their institution's curriculum is set at the institutional level, such as by the board of trustees or a curriculum committee, a handful of institutions (n=7 or 19%) did report that their curriculum is determined at the state level, such as by a statewide board.

Eighteen percent of those institutions that administer study abroad programs reported their curriculum was set at the state level, as well as 20% of schools that do not administer study abroad. A further 16% (n=6) of all responding institutions indicated that the institution's curriculum is determined in some other way. All six respondents in this category, three of which administer study abroad programs and three of which do not, indicated that their curriculum is determined at a combination of the institutional and state levels.

The majority of respondents, however, indicated that the curriculum is set at the institutional level. At institutions that do not administer study abroad programs (n=20), 65% (n=13) of institutions set their curriculum at the institutional level, versus 55% (n=6) of institutions that administer study abroad. There would appear to be significant self-determination, then, for community colleges to choose whether and how study abroad fits into their curriculum.

Given this leeway, senior administrators from institutions that did not administer study abroad programs were asked in the second survey, “How do you believe institutions that administer study abroad programs are different from or similar to your institution?” A total of N=7 responses were received to this question, and the theme of resources quickly emerged in their responses. A vice president for academic affairs at a college on the west coast replied, “I suspect that schools with big study abroad programs serve a larger proportion of middle income or higher students.” A dean of academic affairs in the northeast echoed that sentiment, adding, “They [the community colleges with study abroad programs] have the resources to advertise, recruit, plan, manage, and evaluate the program. ... Students have the financial resources.” Another vice president for academic affairs in New York was more to the point: “They are wealthier and have a less diverse student population.” A respondent from a college in the Carolinas agreed, writing, “...Students who have more disposable income to cover costs.” Only two responses cited institutional factors (“programs of study that are flexible to include study abroad courses” and not have the same “necessary buy-in from stakeholders including faculty, students, administration, and board”). It is clear from these responses that the communities from which students hail are greatly important in shaping the feasibility and viability of study abroad

programs. The following section presents the findings about the communities these colleges serve.

Profile of communities

As discussed in Chapter 2, the community plays an important role in shaping its community college. Responding to local community needs has historically been a component of the community service function of community colleges (Cohen & Brawer 2003); for example, community colleges often work with local employers to align their curricula with the needs of local industry (Fernandez, 2009). Community has also played a role in international endeavors at community colleges. The first community college international education consortia, created in the late 1960s, consisted primarily of community colleges that, among other characteristics, had strong community support – often for initiatives that went beyond district borders (Korbel, 2007).

Therefore understanding more about the communities they serve is imperative to try to answer the question of what factors impact the development of study abroad at community colleges. The first question respondents to the first survey were asked pertaining to their communities was to identify the geographic area that best described the community or district the institution serves. These geographical areas were: city or part of a city; county or part of a county; multiple counties; tribal community; other. Thirty-nine responses (N=39) were received to this question. One respondent selected “other” and indicated that their institution serves “local school districts.” The remaining responses broke down as indicated in the following table.

Table 1

Community or District Served

	Do not administer study abroad	%	Administer study abroad	%	Total	%
City or part of a city	6	30%	4	36%	12	31%
County or part of a county	3	15%	1	9%	7	18%
Multiple counties	10	50%	6	55%	19	49%
Tribal community	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Other	1	5%	0	0%	1	3%
Total	20	100%	11	100%	39	100%

Note: n=8 institutions responded to this question but did not respond to the question asking whether the institution administers study abroad programs.

At institutions that administer study abroad programs (n=11), the breakdown was 36% institutions that serve a city or part of a city; 9% that serve a county or part of a county; and 55% that serve multiple counties. At institutions that do not administer study abroad programs (n=20), the breakdown was 50% multiple counties; 30% city or part of a city; 15% county or part of a county, and 5% other (local school districts).

The survey instrument next asked respondents to select the degree of urbanization of their community or district. Respondents were given three choices, urban, suburban, or rural. These classifications are the same as the Carnegie classification system. A total of 39 responses were received (N=39), with 21% indicating they serve an urban community or district (n=8); 33% a suburban community (n=13); and 46% a rural community or district (n=18).

Among institutions that administer study abroad programs, the percentages of urban- and suburban-serving institutions were greater than for all respondents (at 27% and 36%,

respectively), while the percentage of institutions serving rural districts was lower (36%). In contrast, 55% of responding institutions that do not administer study abroad programs identified their degree of urbanization as rural, with 20% serving an urban community and 25% serving a suburban area. These findings support Harder (2010), who found overall levels of internationalization to be significantly lower at rural community colleges than at urban or suburban campuses. For example, one respondent from a rural institution articulated the challenges these institutions often face, writing in the comments section:

We are a very rural college. ‘International’ to our students means going to a large city located about 50 miles away; going out of the country would not be considered except by a handful of students at this time due to cost and cultural considerations.

As indicated by the comment above, in addition to the urban or suburban setting of the college, finances often play a role in study abroad participation. Raby (2008) found lack of funds to be one of the single greatest challenges to expanding study abroad in community colleges. It is likely, then, that the economic circumstances of the community could impact study abroad program development and offerings. Therefore, the third question that pertained to community profile concerned the median household income within the service area. Fifty-three percent of all respondents indicated that the median household income in their community or district was \$20,001 to \$40,000. A further 12 respondents, or 35%, indicated a median household income of \$40,001 to \$60,000. The remaining four responses were split between \$20,000 or less (n=1), \$60,001 to \$80,000 (n=1), and \$80,001 to \$100,000 (n=2). At institutions that administer study abroad programs (N=10), the breakdown was split between \$20,001 to \$40,000 (n=6 or 60%); \$40,001 to \$60,000 (n=3 or 30%); and \$80,001 to \$100,000 (n=1 or 10%). Five percent (n=1) of institutions that do not administer study abroad programs reported a median household income in

the community of \$20,000 or less, with 47% reporting a median income of \$20,001 to \$40,000, 42% reporting \$40,001 to \$60,000, and the remaining 5% \$60,001 to \$80,000.

Because community can play such a key role in determining the scope and success of international endeavors at community colleges (Harder, 2010; Korbel, 2007), the survey of senior administrators asked respondents to describe the mindset of the community they serve, and characteristics of that community, regarding “international.” A total of N=11 responses were received to this question and, in general, respondents described communities and students with positive “international” mindsets. “[Our community] is an international/global community. The mindset is a healthy, welcoming one, and students are used to interacting with international students, visitors, and employees,” wrote the Provost of an institution in New York that does not administer study abroad. Likewise, a vice president for academic affairs responded that, “They live it everyday...our students come from 155 different countries and speak 125 different languages.” The respondent from a college in Washington stated, “At our college, ‘international’ is a way of life. Perhaps a third of our local students are immigrants/refugees from a variety of countries. In addition we have 400+ international students on F1 visas.” Only one respondent provided a description that could not necessarily be interpreted as positive. A dean from Maine wrote, “I would describe the mindset as acceptance.” None of these institutions administered study abroad programs.

Participants at institutions in North Carolina and Michigan, neither of which administered study abroad programs, responded to this question from an economic or competitiveness point-of-view. “Some students do not understand the importance of ‘global’ when local economic situation is so poor. Others realize everything is connected globally,” wrote a vice president from a North Carolina community college. Similarly, the president of an institution in Michigan

responded, “I believe that there is little thought about international students, etc., but much consideration to international competition for jobs.”

One president in the Pacific Northwest acknowledged a community that “doesn’t particularly like outsiders” but that fully supports international students and international trips, perhaps because “[the college] brings a diversity of individuals and experiences that is non-threatening and therefore embraced.” Yet, even within an international community, internationalization can be a difficult task, an issue illuminated by the president of a rural college in Washington that administered study abroad programs. “Though we are a fairly rural community college, our area is home to a national laboratory that internationalizes the community significantly. However, the bulk of our students think in provincial terms, so international might well be a trip across the Canadian border not far from here.” Indeed, as the next section will show, while community colleges have made great strides in international activities and internationalization efforts, there is still much work to be done.

International activities and internationalization efforts

Altbach and Knight (2007) note that, in attracting students and scholars from many countries, universities have been inherently international in nature since their earliest origins. The current process of internationalization at colleges and universities builds on this tradition and can be defined as “the process of integrating an international/intercultural dimension into the teaching, research, and service function of the institutions” (De Wit, 2000, p. 10).

Internationalization occurs in a variety of ways and encompasses a number of programs or activities. In addition to study abroad, examples of the internationalization of higher education may include area studies, infusion of international themes into existing courses, development of international courses, the presence of international students on campus, and linkages between

institutions for research and exchange (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Bandler, 2002; Bok, 2006; De Wit, 2000; Duderstadt, 2000; Gregor, 2002; Guerin, 2009; Hser, 2005). Therefore, before asking questions about study abroad offerings, this study first sought to understand the context and extent of internationalization at the responding campuses. The first survey sought the answers to nine questions on internationalization. These questions began by querying the enrollment of international students and presence of international faculty, important for being one of the oldest elements of internationalization (Altbach & Knight, 2007) as well as the fact that “the number of international students on campus represents a strong indicator of an institution’s internationalization” (Hser, 2005, p. 44).

A total of N=33 responses were received to the question, “How many international students were enrolled in your institution in 2009-2010?” Overall, international student enrollment ranged from a high of 9,000 (n=1) to a low of 0 (n=2). The mean number of international students who were enrolled in 2009-2010 was 33, with a median of 633.03 and a standard deviation of 1,997.41. At institutions that administer study abroad programs (n=10) these numbers were noticeably higher, with a mean of 78 and a median of 797.60. The standard deviation was 1,985.13. The range for number of enrolled international students at institutions that administer study abroad programs was 27 to 6,419.

Institutions that do not administer study abroad programs (n=18) had a range of 9,000 to 0, a mean of 530.47, a median of 9, and a standard deviation of 2,055.88. However the mean value owes almost entirely to a single outlier: one institution reported 9,000 international students were enrolled in 2009-2010. When this outlier is removed, the mean becomes 59.89, the median changes only slightly (to 8), and the standard deviation becomes 145.87. Therefore, with

the exception of the outlier, it appears that institutions that administer study abroad programs also enroll a higher number of international students.

The second question that addressed aspects of internationalization was, “How many international faculty members (non-U.S. citizens) taught at your institution in 2009-2010?” Responding institutions (N=27) reported employing very few international faculty members, with the greatest number at a single institution being four and 16 institutions reporting that no international faculty members taught at the institution in 2009-2010. The mean number of non-U.S. citizens teaching at a responding institution was 0.54 at those institutions that do not administer study abroad programs and 0.89 at those that do. The median was 0 across institutional types and standard deviations were 0.89 and 1.45 respectively.

Like the presence of international students on campus, foreign language offerings are an important facet of internationalization in higher education. However, unlike study abroad enrollments, which are on the rise (Institute of International Education, 2009), foreign language enrollments have been steadily decreasing. Bok (2006) stated “fewer colleges require language study for at least some students (73%) than was true in 1966 (89%)” (p. 233). Similarly, Siaya and Hayward (2003) found foreign language enrollments to be static and highly concentrated in Spanish, while fewer and fewer institutions are requiring foreign language study for graduation. The results of this study confirm these findings.

For example, while only two of the 33 institutions that responded to the question “How many foreign languages were offered in 2009-2010” did not offer any foreign languages in that year, the most common number of languages offered was one (n=9 or 27% of respondents offered a single foreign language). The median number of languages offered was two. Interestingly, of the six institutions that offered five or more languages in 2009-2010, four of

them were institutions that did not administer study abroad programs. However, institutions that did not administer study abroad programs also accounted for seven of the nine institutions that offered a single foreign language. Overall, the median number of languages offered at institutions that did not administer study abroad (n=21) was two. At institutions that administered study abroad programs (n=10), the median number of languages offered was three; this was also the most common number of languages offered, with 30% (n=3) of responding institutions offering that number of foreign languages. Means and standard deviations are not possible to interpret because of the “or more” wording in the final response choice.

Thirty-five institutions responded to the follow-up question that asked which languages were offered. Of these institutions, 21 did not administer study abroad programs and 11 did. Spanish was by far the most common language offered in 2009-2010 with 97% of all institutions offering it, including 100% of those that administer study abroad programs and 95% of those that do not. The frequency with which Spanish is offered is not surprising given the fact the foreign language offerings and enrollments are increasingly concentrated in Spanish (Green, et al., 2008; Siaya & Hayward, 2003). French was the second most frequently offered language, and was offered by more than half of all institutions. Chinese, German, and Japanese rounded out the top five most commonly offered foreign languages in 2009-2010. By comparison, Green, et al. (2008) found the top five most commonly taught languages to be Spanish, French, German, Japanese, and Italian, with Chinese coming in sixth.

Study participants were also asked whether they offered any degrees or certificates which included a foreign language requirement. Of the 36 responses received to this question, 20 (56%) offered a degree or certificate program that included a foreign language requirement. Among institutions that administer study abroad programs (n=11), this number rose to 82%, or 9 of 11

institutions. Conversely, at those institutions that responded to this question and also indicated that they do not administer study abroad programs, the number fell to 52%, with 11 of 21 offering a degree or certificate program which included a foreign language requirement. Forty-eight percent, or 10 institutions, do offer such a program or degree.

Sixteen responses were received to the follow-up question, “How many students completed a degree or certificate program which included a foreign language requirement in 2009-2010?” One respondent indicated this information is unavailable and another stated that “foreign language is required in our new baccalaureate programs, and we will graduate about 100 students per year beginning in 2010-2011.” The range for the remaining 14 institutions was from a low of 0 to a high of 1,500 with a mean of 187.64, a median of 30, and a standard deviation of 434.37.

At institutions that administer study abroad programs (n=7) these numbers rise to 278 (mean), 50 (median), and 599 (standard deviation). However, much of this rise is attributable to the outlier institution which reported 1,500 students completing a degree or program which included a foreign language requirement. Without that outlier, the mean falls to 33 and the standard deviation to 29; the median remains unchanged at 50. At institutions that do not administer study abroad programs (n=9), the mean is 120.13, with a median of 29.5 and a standard deviation of 285.73. Again, a single outlier (in this case, 826 students) accounts for the large mean. Removing the outlier, the mean falls to 16.43 while the median remains relatively unchanged at 29.

The fourth component of overall internationalization that this survey sought to understand was the administrative structure of international programs (internationalization efforts, international student/scholar services, study abroad) at each community college. A total

of N=34 responses were received to this question. Overall, exactly half of all respondents selected “a single office oversees international activities and programs” as the statement that best represents the administrative structure of international programs. At institutions that administer study abroad programs this answer was selected by 45% of respondents, compared to 48% at institutions that do not administer study abroad programs. However, while nearly one-quarter of all respondents indicated “no office oversees international activities and programs,” only nine percent, or a single institution, chose this answer from institutions that administer study abroad programs.

Table 2

Administrative Structure of International Programs

	Do not administer study abroad	%	Administer study abroad	%	Total	%
No office oversees International activities and programs	7	33%	1	9%	8	24%
A single office oversees International activities and programs	10	48%	5	45%	17	50%
Multiple offices oversees International activities and programs	2	10%	4	36%	6	18%
Other	2*	10%	1**	9%	3	9%
Total	21	100%	11	100%	34	100%

* “Admissions and business oversees admission process. There is no program.” and “Interested faculty create initiatives.”

** “Ad hoc committee under auspices of VP/Instruction and Student Services”

Note: N=2 institutions responded to this question but did not respond to the question asking whether the institution administers study abroad programs.

These findings compare favorably with what other research has found. For example, while only 12% of community colleges had at least one office dedicated exclusively to administering international education programs at the beginning of the decade (Hayward and Siaya, 2001, as cited in Green, 2007), more recently Green and Siaya (2005) found that 61% of community colleges had an office that administered international education programs.

In contrast, 33% (N=7) of institutions that do not administer study abroad programs chose this answer. Likewise, 36% (N=4) of institutions that administer study abroad chose “multiple offices oversee international activities and programs” compared to 10% (N=2) of institutions that do not. Additionally, three institutions, one that administers study abroad programs and two that do not selected “other.” The institution that administers study abroad indicated the administrative structure of international programs is “ad hoc committee under [the] auspices of vice president of instruction and student services.” Alternate structures at non-study abroad administering institutions were “there is no program” and “interested faculty create initiatives.”

Across all institutions (N=31), the number of people specifically assigned to international education duties ranged from 0 to 9. The median was 2, with a mean of 2.14, and a standard deviation of 2.18. At institutions that administer study abroad programs (n=11), the range was from 1 to 9, with a median of 2, a mean of 3.18, and a standard deviation of 2.56. At institutions that do not administer study abroad programs (n=20), the median, mean, and standard deviation were 1, 1.49, and 1.49, respectively.

It is not surprising then, based on the analysis above that, when asked about which internationalization activities the responding college engaged in (N=31), recruitment/enrollment of international students and foreign language education were the most common activities to

comprise internationalization efforts. As illustrated Table 5, these activities were by far the most common at institutions that did not administer study abroad programs. At institutions that did administer study abroad programs, however, study abroad was the most common activity, followed by foreign language education, the incorporation of international content across the curriculum, and fourth, recruitment/enrollment of international students.

Table 3

Internationalization Activities at Community Colleges

	Do not administer study abroad (N=19)	%	Administer study abroad (N=11)	%	Total (N=31)	%
Recruitment/enrollment of international students	13	61%	8	73%	22	71%
Incorporation of international content across the curriculum	7	37%	9	82%	16	52%
Foreign language education	13	61%	9	82%	22	18%
Study abroad	5	26%	10	91%	16	52%
International professional dev. opportunities for faculty	5	26%	6	55%	11	35%
Other	3*	16%	1**	9%	4	13%

* “No specific focus on international students.” “None.” and “Annual international festival.”

** “Hosting of Fulbright Scholars from international countries.”

Note: N=1 institution responded to this question but did not respond to the question asking whether the institution administers study abroad programs.

Looking at the breakdown of internationalization activities at community colleges that did and did not administer study abroad programs, it appears that overall internationalization more frequently involves more activities at colleges that administered study abroad than at those that did not. Following this question, which was designed to understand the internationalization

landscape before narrowing the focus to study abroad, the survey's attention turned squarely to study abroad. The next section will discuss the findings about study abroad in community colleges.

Study Abroad Programs

Ultimately, the most important question of the first survey came in this section. The question was, "Does your institution administer any study abroad programs?" The responses to this question (yes or no) were used to identify trends and patterns between institutions that administered study abroad programs and those that did not in all other questions. Responses to this question were also used to determine which version of the second survey the senior administrator would receive. A total of N=33 responses were received to this question, 22 of whom indicated the institution did not administer study abroad programs and 11 of whom responded affirmatively. As a percentage of institutions that administer study abroad programs, 33% seems reasonable. This number falls between the numbers reported by (Raby, 2008) who found 114 community colleges, or roughly 10% of all two-year colleges, offering study abroad programs in 2005-2006 and Green, et al. (2008) who found 85% of responding institutions offered study abroad programs for credit in 2006. Siaya and Hayward (2003) found that 38% of community colleges offered study abroad programs, a number quite close to what this study found.

All respondents to the first survey, whether or not they administered study abroad programs, were asked to estimate the percentage of students at the institution who participated in study abroad in 2009-2010. Overall, 82% of all responding institutions, or 28 of 34 respondents, indicated that less than one percent of students at their institution participated in study abroad in 2009-2010. The remaining six institutions (28%) reported that one to three percent of students

studied abroad. Among institutions that administer study abroad programs (n=10), the numbers were evenly split, with half reporting less than one percent studied abroad and half reporting one to three percent did so. Twenty of 21 institutions that do not administer study abroad programs reported less than one percent of their students participated in study abroad, with a single institution reporting the one to three percent participation rate. These numbers are to be expected, and in fact compare favorably with the national average; the proportion of all college students who study abroad annually amounts to less than two percent of total higher education enrollments (Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program, 2005).

When students do participate in study abroad programs, it appears that they almost always participate in a program affiliated with their college (either administered directly by the institution or available through a consortium or other formal agreement). For example, when asked whether the institution supports students in individual study abroad efforts (i.e., facilitate participation in study abroad programs of interest to the student, but which are not administered by the institution or through a consortium or special agreement), most institutions that responded to this survey answered no. Of the 33 total responses, 23 institutions (70%) indicated they did not support students with 10 institutions (30%) doing so. At institutions that did not administer study abroad programs, slightly fewer did not provide this support, with only 5 of 21 institutions (24%) responding affirmatively to this question. At institutions that administered study abroad programs, roughly half (5 of 11, or 45%) supported individual study abroad efforts.

Far fewer institutions, a total of four, responded to a follow-up question asking how many students received academic credit for participating in individual study abroad programs. The most likely reason for this especially small response is that relatively few institutions support individual study abroad programs; this information also may not be readily available. The

respondents included one institution that did not administer study abroad programs and three institutions that did. The institution that did not administer study abroad programs responded that zero students received academic credit for participating in individual study abroad programs. The three institutions that administered study abroad programs reported that 10, 40, and 70 students received academic credit for participating in individual study abroad programs.

Similar to questions relating to overall internationalization, respondents to the first survey were asked several questions pertaining to the administrative structure of study abroad and their institutions. The first of these questions was whether the institution had “one or more professional staff or faculty members dedicated at least half-time to study abroad program development and/or administration.” Of the 37 responses received to this question, 78% (N=29) responded that the institution did not have one or more professional staff or faculty members dedicated at least half-time to study abroad program development and/or administration. Twenty-two percent (n=8) did have one or more professional staff or faculty members dedicated at least half-time to study abroad program development and/or administration. At institutions that administered study abroad programs (n=11), 45% responded yes and 55% responded no. At institutions that did not administer study abroad programs (n=22), 14% responded yes and 86% responded no.

As discussed in the previous question, of the eight institutions that indicated that one or more professional staff or faculty members were dedicated at least half-time to study abroad program development and/or administration, three were from institutions that did not administer study abroad programs and five from institutions that did. Seven of the eight institutions, including all three institutions that did not administer study abroad, had one person specifically assigned to study abroad duties. A single institution had two people assigned to these duties. Not

surprisingly, that institution administered study abroad programs. Nationally, in 2006 39% of community colleges reported that study abroad was supported by at least a half-time professional staff or faculty member (Green, et al., 2008).

Beyond personnel resources, the survey then sought to understand the prevalence of alternative models of study abroad that are in place at community colleges. I was especially interested in two models in particular: 1) the consortium model, which has existed for several decades and is perhaps best exemplified by the Community Colleges for International Development (CCID) organization (Korbel, 2007) and 2) formal agreements with four-year institutions, such as the one Michigan State University has in place with a local community college. As such, the next two survey questions asked about these models.

Consortia are important because they allow community colleges to offer their students study abroad opportunities without the college needing to develop and administer programs directly. In the senior administrators' survey, the associate vice president for academic affairs at an institution in Florida described the college's membership in CCID as a best practice; likewise, the president from a college in Washington that administered study abroad programs also highlighted the college's involvement in a consortium of colleges in the region.

In the first survey, of the N=35 institutions that responded to the question that asked whether the institution belonged to a consortium of community colleges which offered study abroad programs in which the institution's students could participate, 22 (63%) did not belong to a consortium of community colleges which offers study abroad programs and 13 (37%) did. A similar breakdown was reported by institutions that did not administer study abroad programs (n=22), with 68% not belonging to such a consortium and 32% doing so. At institutions that

administered study abroad programs (n=11), slightly more than half (n=6 or 55%) belonged to a consortium and the remaining 45% of respondents did not.

As stated above, another possible way for a community college to offer its students study abroad, without directly administering a program, is via an agreement with a four-year college or university which allows the community college's students to participate in study abroad programs administered by the four-year school. Thirty-four institutions responded to the question that asked if the institution had such an agreement in place. Of the 34 institutions, eight had such an agreement and 26 did not (or 24% and 76%). At the 11 institutions that administered study abroad programs, four (or 36%) had an agreement with a four-year college or university to allow the community college's students to participate in study abroad programs administered by the four-year school and seven (64%) did not. At institutions that did not administer study abroad programs (n=22), 82%, or 18 institutions, did not have such an agreement in place and 18% (four institutions) did. One respondent to the senior administrators' survey, a dean in Maine, included in the response to a question about the development of study abroad programs that the community college "ha[d] been contacted by a local four-year institution about their program and they have extended an invitation for our students to participate" but there were "no takers" to date.

In light of the fact that the majority of community colleges do not administer study abroad programs, the survey of senior administrators sought to better understand the particular barriers to study abroad. Seven responses were received to the question, "If your institution were to decide today to develop study abroad programs, what would be the biggest hurdle to this implementation?" Six of the seven cited insufficient financial resources, at either the institutional or student level, or both. The only response that did not mention a lack of financial resources

highlighted another pressing need at community colleges that do not administer study abroad programs, a “lack of experience of administration, faculty, and students.”

In lieu of the above question, respondents from institutions that administered study abroad programs were asked, “What characteristics of your community made study abroad development possible at your institution?” Two of the responses to this question also directly referenced the importance of financial resources. The president at one community college in Washington stated bluntly, “Sufficient wealth and levels of education. The national lab and a significant federal presence makes us one of the most educated (per capita) spots in the U.S.” The other respondent to this question, an associate vice president for academic affairs at a community college in Florida, did not have this natural wealth to point to, but instead responded, “...Our current provost applied for a Title VI grant to develop the study abroad program at our college.” From all responses to both questions, it is clear that financial resources are the major barrier or enabler to the development of study abroad programs. This finding is supported by Hser (2005) who previously highlighted the lack of funding as one of the biggest obstacles to study abroad program development.

The following section will present additional findings and practices specific to institutions that administer study abroad programs.

Institutions that administer study abroad.

After obtaining information in regards to overall study abroad participation and the administrative structure of study abroad programs, several questions queried specific study abroad practices at the institutions that indicated they administered study abroad programs. The first of these was in what year the first study abroad program was offered. Six responses were received to this question, with study abroad programs first offered in: 1971, 1990, 1995-1996,

1998-1999, 2000, and 2005. Given that the first study abroad programs began in the late 1960s and early 1970s (Raby & Valeau, 2007), this distribution indicates responding institutions' programs were of varying degrees of maturity, including one program that is among the most mature in the country.

Respondents were then asked to indicate the number of for-credit, semester- or quarter-long study abroad programs they administered across three categories: faculty-led programs, exchange programs, and third-party programs. None of the institutions administered any third-party programs. Two institutions indicated they offered faculty-led programs (1 or 2 programs and 3 programs) and three indicated they offered exchange programs (1, 2, and 92 programs). This is not surprising as short-term programs have previously been reported to comprise the majority of study abroad offerings at all types of institutions, especially community colleges. For example, Raby (2008) and recent *Open Doors* reports (Institute of International Education, 2009; 2010) found that faculty-led programs predominate; they reported that over half of all students who study abroad do so in short-term programs, a number that increases to 76% for community college students. (Engle and Engle (2003) note the important role that study tours play in providing international exposure to students who have never traveled abroad and otherwise likely would not. This would appear to be the case for at least two colleges in this study. Replying to a question in the second survey one president wrote, "the bulk of our students think in provincial terms, so international might well be a trip across the Canadian border not far from here," while another stated, "many of our students have never traveled outside the valley." Both schools have successfully implemented short-term study abroad programs, however.)

Eight responses were received to the follow-up question in the initial survey, which asked respondents to indicate the number of for-credit, short-term programs they administer in two

categories: faculty-led programs and not faculty-led programs (which could be exchange programs, offerings by third-party providers, or any other model). Of the eight institutions, none offered a program that was not faculty-led. Numbers of faculty led programs were 1 (at two institutions), 2 (at three institutions), and 3, 5, and 300 (at one institution each). The last number could be data entry error. As to the average number of participants in each study abroad program, eight institutions responded to the question that sought this information. The mean number of participants in each study abroad program was 15, with a median of 13.5 and a standard deviation of 7.65.

This study also sought to learn the extent to which financial resources were spent on study abroad programs in 2009-2010. Of the six responding institutions, two indicated this information was unavailable. The remaining four responses, from lowest to highest were: \$0 beyond salaries; \$8,000; \$25,000; and \$700,000.

One of the most positive findings, from an international education perspective, is that the majority of respondents believe that, over the next decade, their institution is likely to increase the number of study abroad programs it administers. This is not surprising when considering the results of the question that asked to what extent the respondent perceived the following as benefits to offering study abroad programs for the college's students. As Table 6 demonstrates, the helpfulness of study abroad in developing an internationally aware workforce, perhaps the single most important long-term benefit of study abroad, did not go unnoticed by the respondents. Seven of nine respondents indicated that study abroad was beneficial or very beneficial in meeting this objective.

Table 4

Extent to Which Study Abroad Is Beneficial for the Following Activities

	No. of responses	Mean score	Standard deviation
Helpful for the hiring needs of local businesses	9	2.56	1.51
Helpful for the college to recruit students	9	3.11	0.78
Helpful for students transferring to 4-year institutions	9	3.67	0.71
Helpful for developing an internationally aware workforce	9	4.22	0.83
Other	No responses	No responses	No responses

Impact of the community on study abroad program development.

The relationship between the community colleges in this study and their stakeholders (including local businesses) and communities will be discussed in the following section.

However, before examining those relationships, I will present findings from the survey of senior administrators regarding the impact of the community on study abroad program development.

Respondents from institutions that administered study abroad programs were asked how the community influenced the development of study abroad programs at the institution, while participants at community colleges that did not administer study abroad programs were asked to what extent the community, and characteristics of the community, matter in thinking about the development of study abroad programs. The most succinct response, from a dean of academic affairs in Maine, was one word: critical. Others illustrated this point by referencing the economic conditions, size and degree of urbanization, or racial/ethnic backgrounds of their students. For example, the participant from a community college in North Carolina wrote, “The cost of study

abroad is out of the reach of most of our students. Unemployment is high, students or parents are out of work. Study abroad is considered a luxury that is just not affordable at this time.” Echoing the findings of Harder (2010), the president from a small community college in Michigan responded, “We are small, rural, and see ourselves as disadvantaged for international programs.” From a college in Florida that administered study abroad programs, the associate vice president for academic affairs illustrated the same point, but with the opposite outcome: the community college’s “proximity to a major university” has positively influenced the college’s development of study abroad programs. The vice president from a college in Washington offered perhaps the most complete response about the dilemmas facing many community colleges today.

The community demographic creates a paradox for us. While the global nature of our students and curriculum argue for creating more opportunities for international education experiences, the flip side is that our community is largely low-income and ties to jobs/family. Though many endured significant hardships in getting to the U.S., travel abroad is now unattainable.

When a college does begin to think about study abroad, the characteristics of the community can have a real impact on the programs the institution develops. One respondent wrote, “the interests of students and community members have led to study abroad programs in Central and South America.” Similarly, another participant referenced the community’s impact on the choice of potential program locations. “The characteristics of this community matter a lot in determining study abroad programs. For these reasons, we are focusing on Africa and South America.” One institution seeks and incorporates feedback regarding “the need for local residents to learn about global trade and international issues.” A community college in Washington that administered study abroad went a step further, allowing the “destination and location [to be] developed by a community advisory board.” Clearly the relationship with the

community and stakeholders can be important in the development and success of study abroad programs.

Relationship with the community and stakeholders

After collecting information about the institution, the district or community it serves, internationalization practices, and study abroad programs and practices, this study then sought to understand the relationship between various stakeholders and the development and implementation of study abroad programs. To understand these relationships, both surveys asked the question, “How strong is the relationship between your community college and the following organizations: Local school district, Local government offices, Chamber of commerce or trade center, Four-year college or university, Local/district business and industry?”

In the first survey, a total of 36 responses (N=36) were received to this question, with N=11 responses from institutions that administered study abroad programs. As illustrated in Table 7, the majority institutions indicated a “strong” relationship with all organizations. Average relationship strength was higher for institutions that administered study abroad programs than for those that did not. While institutions that did not administer study abroad programs reported a mean relationship strength of 3.75 across all categories, institutions that did administer study abroad programs reported relationship strengths ranging from 4.18 (strength of relationship between the college and local school districts) and 3.90 (with local/district business and industry).

Table 5

Survey 1: Strength of Relationship with External Stakeholders

	Do not administer study abroad (N=20)		Administer study abroad (N=11*)		Total (N=36*)	
	mean	std. dev	mean	std. dev	mean	std. dev
Local school district (K-12)	3.75	0.85	4.18	0.75	3.83	0.85
Local government offices	3.75	0.79	4.00	0.63	3.81	0.71
Chamber of commerce or trade center	3.75	0.91	4.18	0.63	3.86	0.83
Four-year college or university	3.75	0.64	4.18	0.70	3.83	0.65
Local/district business and industry *	3.75	0.79	4.18	0.74	3.80	0.72
Other	Not selected		Not selected		Not selected	

* N=10 for institutions that administer study abroad; N=35 total responses.

Note: N=5 institutions responded to this question but did not respond to the question asking whether the institution administers study abroad programs.

In the second survey, a total of N=11 responses were received to this question, seven of which came from institutions that did not administer study abroad programs. The responses to the second survey are displayed in Table 8.

Table 6

Survey 2: Strength of Relationship with External Stakeholders

	Do not administer study abroad (N=7)		Administer study abroad (N=4)		Total (N=11)	
	mean	std. dev	mean	std. dev	mean	std. dev
Local school district (K-12)	3.86	0.69	5.00	0.00	4.27	0.79
Local government offices	3.86	0.69	4.75	0.50	4.18	0.75
Chamber of commerce or trade center	4.57	0.79	4.75	0.50	4.64	0.67
Four-year college or university	4.14	0.69	4.75	0.50	4.36	0.67
Local/district business and industry *	4.43	0.79	5.00	0.00	4.64	0.67
Other	Not selected		Not selected		Not selected	

The small number of responses to this question makes it difficult to interpret these results. However, it does appear that senior administrators judged the strength of the relationships between their institution and all external stakeholders to be stronger than suggested by the initial survey. The connection between strength of relationship with external stakeholders and prevalence of various programming at the community college (in this case study abroad) is an area for future research.

In order to better gauge the relationships with external stakeholders generally, senior administrators were asked, “How has your institution leveraged its relationships with external constituents to develop programs or curriculum on campus?” The most common response was the use of advisory boards, particularly with technical and career and workforce preparation programs (9 of 11 respondents indicated they leverage relationships with external constituents by way of advisory boards). Similarly, two institutions indicated they work directly with local

employers to develop appropriate programs. The respondent from a community college in North Carolina stated, “We use feedback from local employers to develop courses/programs to meet their need for employees or training. Our advisory committees provide feedback on our programs to ensure we are meeting employee needs.” Likewise, the president of a Washington state community college responded, “Any program that we consider developing starts with an advisory board of community members from the relevant professions, and we work with these experts to design a curriculum.”

Other examples of relationships with external stakeholders included K-12 partnerships to “create a seamless pipeline from the high school program to the college ones by working closely with the principals and teachers” to partnerships with regional healthcare facilities for clinical rotations and internships, to “international travel to Ghana through Habitat for Humanity” and inviting external constituencies “to college policy making events.”

Beyond overall relationships with stakeholders, this study sought to understand how these relationships might impact the development of study abroad programs. Therefore, in the first survey, institutions that did not administer study abroad programs were asked two additional questions about stakeholder support: “To what extent have the following stakeholders influenced the decision not to develop study abroad programs?” and “To what extent would support from the following stakeholders be necessary for your institution to develop study abroad programs?” As illustrated in the following tables, in both cases the stakeholders were board of trustees, students, faculty, administration, local community, local businesses, and other. Higher scores indicate a greater extent of influence on the decision not to develop study abroad programs. It is important to note, however, that the number of “don’t know” responses climbs dramatically

when dealing with stakeholders outside the immediate campus community of students, faculty, and administration.

Table 7

Extent to Which Stakeholders Influenced Decision Not to Develop Study Abroad Programs (at Institutions That Did Not Administer Study Abroad Programs)

	No. of responses	Mean score	Standard deviation
Board of trustees	17	2.88	0.86
Students	18	2.56	1.10
Faculty	18	3.00	1.19
Administration	18	3.39	1.09
Local community	17	2.82	1.07
Local businesses	16	2.63	0.72
Other*	6	3.33	1.69

* Respondents were requested to indicate what the other was. Only one institution did so, indicating “other institutions” had impacted the decision not to develop study abroad programs.

Respondents from institutions that did not administer study abroad programs were also asked to what extent support from the same stakeholders would be necessary to develop study abroad programs. Based on the results in the preceding question, it is not surprising that administration, faculty, and students were the stakeholders from whom support was considered most necessary for an institution to develop study abroad programs, with every responding institution (N=18) indicating support from these groups would be either “important” or “very important.” In contrast, when asked about the local community and local businesses, half or more of respondents selected “neither important nor unimportant.” While this could very well be

true, as the mid-point on a five-point scale, this selection may also have been used as a form of “I don’t know.”

Table 8

Extent to Which Stakeholder Support Would Be Necessary to Develop Study Abroad Programs (at Institutions That Did Not Administer Study Abroad Programs)

	No. of responses	Mean score	Standard deviation
Board of trustees	17	4.18	0.86
Students	18	4.39	1.10
Faculty	18	4.61	1.19
Administration	18	4.78	1.09
Local community	18	3.44	1.07
Local businesses	18	3.11	0.72
Other*	1	4.00	1.69

* Respondents did not indicate what other stakeholder support was necessary.

Respondents from institutions that administered study abroad programs were asked similar questions about stakeholder support: “To what extent have the following stakeholders negatively impacted the decision to develop study abroad programs at your institution?” and “To what extent has support from the following stakeholders been important in the development of study abroad programs at your institution?” As was also the case with institutions that did not administer study abroad, and illustrated in the following tables, the stakeholders were board of trustees, students, faculty, administration, local community, local businesses, and other. Higher scores indicate greater negative impact on whether or not to develop study abroad programs. As shown in Table 11, “board of trustees” was the stakeholder most often reported as negatively impacting the decision whether or not to develop study abroad programs.

Table 9

Extent to Which Stakeholders Negatively Impacted the Development of Study Abroad Programs

	No. of responses	Mean score	Standard deviation
Board of trustees	8	2.13	0.86
Students	9	1.89	1.10
Faculty	9	1.78	1.19
Administration	9	1.78	1.09
Local community	9	2.00	1.07
Local businesses	9	2.00	0.72
Other*	2	2.00	1.69

* No indication what other stakeholders negatively impacted program development.

To better understand the issue of stakeholder support, the second study asked senior administrators from institutions that did not administer study abroad programs, “What type of support and from which stakeholders, would be necessary for your institution to develop study abroad programs?” Interestingly, only one of the seven responses mentioned specific stakeholders (administration, foundation, and state approval). The remaining six responses all highlighted the need for financial resources to develop these programs. The respondent from a community college in Washington summed up the needed and desired stakeholder support succinctly by writing, “We would need significant scholarship support for student participants. That could come from private foundations, business groups, or others.” Yet, beyond financial support, one participant hinted at an issue that may be deeper than support any stakeholder could provide, responding that one of the most necessary types of support would be “assurance of safety when traveling abroad.”

Beyond these questions, variations of which were asked to respondents from all community colleges, participants at community colleges that administered study abroad programs were also asked several questions in the first survey which the results indicate may have been difficult for institutional researchers to answer. For example, when asked, “With 1 being not at all and 5 being very much, to what extent do you believe the local community has supported the development of study abroad programs at your institution?” eight of nine respondents selected the mid-point (3) of the five-point scale, suggesting that this information may be unknown to many institutional researchers. The same issue may have impacted the following question, which asked, “With 1 being not at all and 5 being very much, how aware is the local community of your institution’s study abroad programs?” Again, the responses all clustered around the mid-point, though less dramatically than in the previous question, with a mean of 2.44 on the 5-point scale. The question of community support for and awareness of study abroad programs is, however, central to the second survey that was conducted of senior-level administrators.

Ultimately, both the community and college can benefit by raising awareness and support for study abroad programs. The last question senior administrators were asked was, “In what ways does your community benefit from your institution’s study abroad programs?” One respondent focused on the value to business, stating “students gain an international perspective” that “makes for a better employee once our students graduate.” Another highlighted the value of study abroad to rural communities, writing “we are not a cosmopolitan community so these programs add a more global perspective to members of the community.” A third response highlighted both the value to the community as well as the workplace: “the people who participate...bring back with them an enthusiasm for the topic and ideas that are then further

developed for the community. Graduates of the college who are associated with study abroad initiatives in any way benefit from an increased understanding of global issues in the workplace.”

Moreover, beyond being a beneficiary of the new outlook participants bring to the community, its members and businesses, the community can play a key role in the success of study abroad. The president from a community college in Washington responded to the question, “Why has study abroad succeeded at your institution?” by noting that the college’s model worked “because we included community members in the trip who could travel on an audit/non-credit basis.” Similarly, the college in Florida has “sponsored trips to the Ukraine for business programs,” which had the effect of allowing the community to benefit from the college’s study abroad programs directly, as well as indirectly because “a global perspective makes [students] well-rounded citizens.” Collaborations of this nature could potentially allow study abroad to continue to grow at community colleges while simultaneously benefiting the community.

Conclusion

This chapter presented the findings from two surveys of institutional researchers and senior administrators. Although the small sample size does not allow for any formal statistical analysis, a number of potential findings emerge from the first survey. Based on responses to survey questions, institutions that administered study abroad programs tended to be larger, more urban, and from higher income areas than those that did not. These macro-level factors seem to impact whether an institution administers study abroad programs. These findings are not unsurprising: intuitively it makes sense that “wealthier” students are more likely to have the means to study abroad and that larger institutions have a larger pool of students and faculty to draw from to develop and fill study abroad programs. Raby (2008) has previously found that

ability to afford study abroad programs is a challenge for many community college students, an issue which was echoed repeatedly in the written responses submitted by senior administrators. Likewise, the findings from this study seem to indicate that community colleges in rural areas administer study abroad programs at lower frequencies than urban or suburban schools. This finding is in keeping with Harder (2010), which found that rural colleges have lower levels of internationalization as compared to suburban or urban campuses overall.

Additionally, community colleges that administered study abroad programs also tended to enroll higher numbers of international students, employed more international faculty members, and offered foreign language classes in greater numbers than institutions that did not administer study abroad programs. These findings make sense, too, from the perspective that study abroad is one element of internationalization (Green, et al., 2008) and institutions with a commitment to internationalization may take a multi-pronged approach to implement that strategy. These factors, too, which are institutional in nature but also impact the overall flavor of the campus and community, seem to impact study abroad program development and deployment.

The most significant finding from the initial survey, however, is the relationship between the community college and external constituencies including school districts, four-year institutions, local businesses, and trade associations. The initial findings indicated that institutions that administer study abroad programs have stronger relationships with these organizations than institutions that do not administer study abroad programs. Because of the small sample size in the second survey of senior administrators, it is difficult to draw any correlations or conclusions, but this is an area that could benefit from future study. The findings presented in this chapter will be discussed further in Chapter 5.

Chapter 5

Discussion, Limitations, and Recommendations

This chapter presents a discussion of this study's findings, which were detailed in Chapter 4. The conceptual framework and literature review presented in Chapter 2 is used to further explore and understand the issues raised in this study. Limitations of this study and recommendations for future research are presented. The final section of this chapter focuses on recommendations for community colleges and policymakers.

The purpose of this study was to shed light on factors that may inhibit or promote the development of study abroad at community colleges. Specifically, this was an analysis of macro-level factors that influence the development and success of study abroad programs at community colleges. Within the context of this study, macro-level factors included such variables as average income, urbanization of the community, presence of foreign-born students and faculty, and ties with external constituents in the local community. Before analyzing the findings, it should first be stated that this study is operating with a sample that is very small. While more will be said about the limitations of the study in the section on limitations, it should be stated that, due to this small sample size, the generalizability of the results and the recommendations that follow from them must be considered within the context of the small sample size.

The findings indicate that the single most important factor is financial resources, at the institutional as well as individual (student) level. Additionally, community colleges in urban or suburban locations administered study abroad programs with greater frequency than those in rural locations. This is consistent with Harder's (2010) research, which found rural schools have lower overall levels of internationalization than their urban or suburban counterparts. While the presence of foreign-born individuals on campus may help the college achieve greater

internationalization, high immigrant populations with fewer financial resources may make study abroad programs less viable. Likewise, ties with external constituents and stakeholders may be important, but the most important aspect of these relationships, as far as study abroad is concerned, is the financial resources these constituents may be able to provide for the college. The reason is that, as with previous research (Hser, 2005; Raby, 2008; Schoorman, 2000; Siaya & Hayward, 2003), this study found the availability of financial resources to be the single greatest factor in a community college's ability to develop study abroad programs.

Implications for practice and recommendations

The evidence is clear that, to achieve success in today's world, students must have a global mindset. As the president from a community college in Washington stated, "Internationalizing ones' campus presents students with the new global culture. It's a prereq for life in the contemporary world." That said, it is also clear that for many community colleges today, the financial reality is such that study abroad is a luxury, out of reach for cash-strapped schools, students, and communities. This study has found that these schools tend to be smaller and more rural. While study abroad may be financially infeasible, with employers increasingly seeking students with cross-cultural and foreign language communication skills (Calhoon et al., 2003; Douglas & Jones-Ridders, 2001; Kedia & Daniel, 2003; Romano & Dellow, 2009), and graduates of community college often subject to an employability penalty due to lack of international experiences (Harder, 2010), students must have opportunities to develop a global mindset on campus. The following table shows various ways in which this can be accomplished.

Table 10

Forms of internationalization at community colleges

Internationalization Mechanism	Description
Enrollment of international students	Enrolling international students allows community colleges to diversify their student bodies and can potentially provide an additional revenue stream. In 2006, the student body consisted of at least 5% of international students at more than one out of ten community colleges (Green, et al., 2008).
Employment of international faculty and/or staff	This mechanism encompasses the hiring of foreign nationals and/or naturalized U.S. citizens into positions with direct interaction with students. Community colleges responding to this study reported engaging in this activity in minimal numbers.
Foreign language course offerings	Foreign language offerings and enrollments are increasingly concentrated in Spanish (Green, et al., 2008; Siaya & Hayward, 2003). Ninety-seven percent of institutions responding to this dissertation study offered Spanish classes.
Foreign language requirements	Requiring a set number of foreign language courses or credits for admission or as part of a degree or certificate program. Green, et al. (2008) found that 10% of community colleges had a foreign language admission requirement and 19% had a foreign language graduation requirement.
Area studies courses or other internationalized course offerings	Area studies or other international program offerings may consist of anything from a course featuring a geographic region of the world to coursework on global trends or issues to an international business course. Hult and Motz (2008) note that program offerings can readily be adapted to market situations.

Table 10 (cont'd)

Intercultural events	Intercultural events vary widely, and include everything from international festivals to programs that pair U.S. and international students (Green, et al., 2008). The goal is to increase exposure to and showcase the myriad cultures on a campus.
Study abroad	Study abroad is a for-credit, academic activity of variable duration, during which students, often accompanied by faculty members, travel overseas to study and interact in another country and culture. The number of community colleges offering study abroad varies considerably from a high of 85% (Green, et al., 2008) to a low of 10% (Raby, 2008). One-third of respondents to this study offered study abroad programs.

As Table 12 illustrates, when study abroad is not practicable, numerous alternatives exist to enhance the global mindset of the student body. Indeed, even when study abroad is offered, to best support the development of globalmindedness in students who are unable or uninterested in study abroad, the board and administration should emphasize an attainable program of internationalization: the ready availability of foreign language and area studies courses, for example, or the hiring and enrollment of international faculty and students. All of these activities contribute to campus internationalization, and can help the students – as well as the larger community – to develop an interest in or understanding of international issues or cultures. Program offerings, which refer to the curriculum, are an important aspect of internationalization because they are “relatively easy to reverse, can be adapted to market situations, and have shorter impact” (Hult & Motz, 2008). Importantly from a workforce preparedness and competitiveness perspective, other research has found that foreign language and cross-cultural competencies are viewed by businesses as most beneficial (Olney, as cited in Romano & Dellow, 2009).

Community colleges therefore have many possibilities to internationalize without developing and implementing study abroad programs.

Some participants in this study provided specific examples of how their institution is able to facilitate such international understanding without administering study abroad programs.

“[Our community] is an international/global community. The mindset is a healthy, welcoming one, and students are used to interacting with international students, visitors, and employees,” wrote the provost of one college. Likewise, a vice president for academic affairs highlighted the diversity represented in the student body: “They live it everyday...our students come from 155 different countries and speak 125 different languages.” The respondent from a college in Washington stated, “At our college, ‘international’ is a way of life. Perhaps a third of our local students are immigrants/refugees from a variety of countries. In addition we have 400+ international students on F1 visas.” None of these institutions administered study abroad, yet senior administrators all felt that the college and its community had a positive international mindset, in part because of the internationalization activities at the school.

Beyond internationalizing the curriculum and student body, study abroad offers an excellent opportunity for international experience for those students for whom it is feasible. For an institution that wants to offer study abroad programs to its students, but that lacks the financial or administrative resources to develop and deploy its own programs, consortia with other community colleges or partnerships with four-year institutions can be viable options. While the Community Colleges for International Development (CCID) consortium is one of the largest, oldest, and best-known (and membership in which was suggested as a best practice by one community college president who participated in this survey), other consortia are developing. For example, one respondent noted that a consortium for community colleges in the state of

Washington has allowed the institution to develop longer, non-faculty-led programs. Likewise, a collaborative partnership between Michigan State University and Lansing Community College (LCC) gives LCC students the opportunity to participate in the university's vast study abroad program offerings (Lansing Community College, 2011). Such collaborations can go the other way, as well. A professor at a community college in New York noted that his school, which has developed an international business study abroad program, has had drop-in students from Dartmouth College and Georgetown University (personal communication, June 2, 2010).

Additionally, community colleges should look for collaborations with businesses and other community organizations that could lead to sustainable study abroad programs (and help to promote the importance of understanding international cultures to the community). For example, one college in this study developed a successful model by allowing members of the community to participate in a study abroad trip to Australia; another school found success in sponsoring trips to the Ukraine for business programs. In seeking these partnerships, administrators and trustees would do well to ask whether a joint model with business(es) could be developed. For example, is there a business with a need in a specific location? Might a local business be willing to help provide scholarships for students, who could be their future employees, or other financial support? Beyond the business community, is there a natural connection to a particular country or region owing to immigration, a sister city, or major industry that might increase interest in study abroad on the part of students or the larger community? Not only can asking these questions help a college to develop a successful and sustainable study abroad program, but by engaging the business community to it allows the college to further its community service function and deepen its role as a "cultural center" (Cohen & Brawer, 2003, p. 23).

It is worth noting again that this study found that community colleges that administered study abroad programs had stronger relationships with external stakeholders than institutions that did not. While more research is necessary to better understand this connection, certainly working to cultivate relationships with local business and industry, chambers of commerce or trade centers, school districts, government offices, and four-year colleges or universities could be beneficial in an effort to develop successful study abroad programs as well as helping to solidify support for the college and its activities generally. Joining forces to create a long-term relationship with the goal of developing a program meaningful to the community and allowing other stakeholders to be part of a process normally reserved for those on campus also exhibits some of the best practices cited by Leiderman, et al. (2004) in their work on campus-community partnerships.

In addition to examining opportunities or strengthening relationships with external stakeholders, community colleges must also focus on building and sustaining faculty support for study abroad and other international programs. From the responses from senior administrators, faculty support would seem to be a necessity for study abroad to be successful. Responding to the survey, the administrators cited “the initiative of individual faculty and staff members,” “the willingness of individuals and groups to step up and support our efforts,” and “very committed faculty members” as characteristics that made study abroad development possible and successful at participating community colleges. Training and education of the faculty vis-à-vis the importance of instilling a global perspective in students for their future success is one potential course of action. For example, the president from a community college in North Carolina that administered study abroad indicated that “many of our faculty strongly support the incorporation of international education into the curricula,” but that “some faculty view international education

as a diminishment of traditional curricula.” As this is the experience at an institution with a successful study abroad program, it seems clear that cultivating faculty support does not end with the implementation of study abroad, but is an ongoing process.

While faculty support or community involvement may be able to provide the initial impetus or final push in the successful development of study abroad at community colleges, this study found that the overriding factor is financial. For that reason, the strongest recommendation in this chapter is directed not to any community college, but to policymakers. Martha Kanter, a former community college chancellor and current undersecretary for education in the United States, has stated that international programs “are essential to the future of our higher education institutions and they are also essential to the future of what young people will need to know and do in a global economy in a global world” (Loveland, 2010, p. 20). Essential, but also expensive. And while funding is available, such as the Title VI grant used to develop a study abroad program mentioned by a vice president from one college, it is not enough. For example, the requirement for matching funds that is a requisite for applying for or receiving many grants may well deter colleges with the greatest financial need. While funding for colleges to develop study abroad programs cannot be paramount in the current fiscal and political environment, it is important for policymakers to recognize the dichotomy that exists between what they do in commissioning work that calls for an ever-greater number of students to study abroad and pressures colleges and universities to meet a specific target (Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program, 2005), and the lack of funds they allocate to meet this goal.

The impact of such actions is to create yet another unfunded (and often ignored) mandate or to potentially divert college-level funds from programs, such as language study and other

areas of the curriculum, which may benefit a larger number of students than study abroad can benefit, especially at the community college level. The latter, whereby study abroad might be developed or deployed in lieu of other aspects of internationalization, could have especially dire consequences for students. As Guerin (2009) noted, “relying on study abroad as the chief vehicle of international education, however appealing it may be, will ultimately fail to appreciably impact the lives and learning of the large majority of students” (p. 612).

This is especially important when considering that Harder (2010) has found that a lack of exposure to international experiences often results in an employability penalty for graduates of community colleges. Given that nearly half of all U.S. undergraduates are enrolled in community colleges, and that this study and others (Raby, 2008; Siaya & Hayward, 2003) have found that fewer than half of all community colleges offer students the ability to study abroad, a significant number of individuals never have the opportunity to gain exposure to international experience in this way. Perhaps the greater concern, however, is not the lack of study abroad opportunities, *per se*, but the lack of other international activities and programs that often go hand-in-hand with study abroad. A glaring example from this study was the responses to the question, “how many international students were enrolled in your institution in 2009-2010?” Institutions that administered study abroad programs reported a mean of 797.60 international students studying on campus, while those that did not administer study abroad reported a median of 9. While the sample size of this study is too small to allow for any generalization of this statistic, it is nevertheless worth considering, keeping in mind previous research that has found that “the number of international students on campus represents a strong indicator of an institution’s internationalization” (Hser, 2005, p. 44).

The lack of exposure to international experiences can have implications not only for students, but for their communities. International programs, including study abroad, were repeatedly described as enriching communities, especially small, isolated, rural communities, never more clearly than by one community college president from the state of Washington:

In general ours is a very conservative rural community that doesn't particularly like outsiders or government for that matter, yet our international students and international trips are fully supported by the community. We bring a diversity of individuals and experiences that is non-threatening and is therefore embraced. That being said the community is better off and changed because of what we do.

Beyond providing the community with new and different perspectives and ideas, internationalization, from enrolling international students, to focusing on language and area studies, to study abroad, helps provide employers with a globally-aware workforce that, in turn, helps business to be more competitive. Kedia and Daniel (2003) found that 80% of companies believed their overall business would increase if their staff had greater international expertise and 30% of companies believed that insufficient international competence led to a failure to fully exploit international opportunities. The changes wrought by globalization on business have necessarily changed the needs of students, simultaneously reshaping the institutions that serve them. Levin is clear that globalization has refashioned community colleges from local institutions to schools that are "more conscious of [their] connections to a global community" (Levin, 2002, p. 123). Such changes are likely to continue as a workforce with the ability to relate, interact, and compete with myriad people and cultures is increasingly necessary to compete effectively in the globalized world.

Institutional factors impacting study abroad development

As noted previously, this study was especially interested in one particular example of internationalization at community colleges: study abroad. This section, then, will examine the

institutional factors that appeared to impact study abroad development. This study found that financial resources were the single largest factor in whether or not a community college chose to develop a study abroad program. This finding is in keeping with Siaya and Hayward (2003), who identified funding as the biggest hurdle for internationalization. Funding has also previously been identified as necessary, not only to study abroad, but to campus internationalization generally by Schoorman (2000), who developed a framework exploring how internationalization is implemented on college campuses. This framework conceptualizes internationalization as “as educational institution’s adaptation to the changes in an increasingly global and interdependent environment” (Schoorman, 2000, p. 4), and identifies several core characteristics necessary for successful internationalization, such as commitment to internationalization, organizational leadership, and funding.

A vice president for academic affairs enumerated these exact institutional characteristics when he attributed the success of the college’s study abroad program to, “faculty and departmental support, presidential support, a full-time coordinator of international education, and support from student affairs.” Moreover, this institution was also able to marshal the necessary financial resources to develop study abroad programs by utilizing a Title VI grant from the U.S. Department of Education.

Beyond institutional financial considerations, this study also found that community colleges that administered study abroad programs tended to have larger student bodies as well as smaller percentages of the student bodies that received financial aid than at community colleges that did not administer study abroad. Given that previous research has identified funding as the largest hurdle for students to participate in study abroad (Hser, 2005; Raby, 2008), it is reasonable that institutions with wealthier student bodies as indicated by fewer students receiving

financial aid would be more likely to administer study abroad programs, as well as that larger institutions would be better able to support these programs. For example, if one percent of students were interested in and able to study abroad, an institution with 1,000 students would have a total of 10 students who might study abroad, whereas at an institution of 5,000 students, there might be 50 to justify and support a study abroad program.

Institutional resources were certainly key, as reflected by one senior administrator who wrote, “the president of the college ensured that funds were available to meet expenses. In addition, student life funds \$15,000 in scholarships for study abroad students.” In addition to such financial resources, the responses to the survey of senior administrators also highlighted the significance of faculty and administrative support, as well as student interest, on the development of study abroad programs. Specifically, survey respondents cited “more faculty willing to travel,” “students...have a keen interest in participating,” and “buy-in from stakeholders including faculty, students, and administration” as ways in which institutions that administered study abroad programs differed from their institutions, which did not. These responses align with previous research findings. Hser (2005) identified negative perception by faculty and in some cases social and/or political chaos in study abroad locations as barriers to program development. Raby (2008) identified as challenges the need for community colleges to serve a diverse population of students along with institutional constraints, such as stakeholder support, funding, and dedicated office staff, and the need for further professionalization of staff to be able to handle issues such as risk management and pre-departure/re-entry programs. These challenges were also articulated by participants in the senior administrators’ survey. For example, the vice president from a college in North Carolina indicated that “instructors interested and trained to

handle international travel” and “assurance of safety when traveling abroad” would be necessary for the college to develop study abroad programs.

Finally, this study found that, at the institutional level, overall internationalization may be an important factor in whether a college offers study abroad programs. For example, the variables in this study that were used as proxy measures for overall internationalization – the number of international students enrolled in the college, the number of international faculty members, and the number of languages offered – all occurred in higher numbers at institutions that administered study abroad programs than at those that did not. These factors are important, particularly those that relate to foreign language offerings and degrees that require language study, in that previous research has found that these variables are “some of the highest indicators of an institution’s internationalization” (Hser, 2005, p. 44). The connection between internationalization and study abroad programs could be reflective of a commitment to imbue students and the community with a global perspective. These institutional-level factors would clearly seem to have an impact on the development of study abroad programs. Likewise this study found that community-level factors appear to have an equally important impact on program development.

Impact of the community on study abroad development

Community colleges do not exist in a vacuum, but as part of a larger community. Other scholars have noted the symbiotic relationship between community and college. For example, Fernandez (2009) found that community colleges regularly work with local employers to develop a curriculum that meets the needs of industry. The findings of this study very much support the idea that the community matters in how (and if) a community college thinks about study abroad,

develops study abroad programs, what model of program the college develops, and whether the programs are successful.

Geographically speaking, the degree of urbanization appears to impact the development of study abroad programs. Proximity to specific businesses or institutions can be a factor in program development. For example, one community college in Florida partially attributed its success with study abroad to the college's proximity to a major research university. Likewise, an otherwise-rural college in Washington reaps the benefits of a "national laboratory and significant federal presence" in an area that otherwise has a "lack of cosmopolitanism" according to its president, in his response to a survey question. However, overall, this study found that community colleges located in rural areas are less likely to administer study abroad programs than institutions in more urban areas. Harder (2010) found that institutions located in rural areas have significantly lower levels of internationalization than campuses in suburban or urban areas. It is not surprising, then, that colleges in rural areas are less likely to administer study abroad programs than their urban and suburban counterparts. When they do, however, the benefits to the community of study abroad can be especially pronounced, as other opportunities for developing a global perspective may not exist. In their responses to a survey question, senior administrators highlighted that these benefits include: "bring[ing] a diversity of individuals and experiences that is non-threatening;" "add[ing] a more global perspective to members of the community;" and students who return to the community with "an enthusiasm...and ideas that are then further developed for the community."

Whether rural, suburban, or urban, this study found that the community itself is a factor in program development and can exercise influence over study abroad development and success. From the survey of senior administrators, which focused on the impact of the community in

developing study abroad, two areas of influence stand out in particular: 1) the ability to support study abroad, especially financially, and 2) the ability to influence the location for study abroad programs. Just as the most important institutional-level factor would appear to be financial resources, so too does the wealth of the surrounding community have an impact on the development of study abroad programs. The wealth factor was mentioned specifically by administrators at community colleges that did not administer study abroad programs. One respondent wrote, “I suspect that schools with big study abroad programs serve a larger proportion of middle income or higher students.” A vice president for academic affairs in New York was more to the point: “They are wealthier and have a less diverse student population.” Responding from an institution that administered study abroad programs, the president of a community college in Washington addressed the ability of community involvement in offsetting the issue of a student body with insufficient resources: “There is a money problem in our student population as a whole” but the study abroad program was successful “because we included community members in the trip who could travel on an audit/non-credit basis.” It is clear from these responses that the communities from which students hail are greatly important in shaping the feasibility and viability of study abroad programs.

The second area of influence that stands out is influence over the locations for study abroad programs. The president of a community college in Washington stated, “the destination and curriculum is developed by a community advisory board.” At another college, the president responded that, “the interests of students and community members have led to study abroad programs in Central and South America.” The provost of a third institution reported that “strong relationship with the Pan-African community” led to the development of an exchange program

with the University of Namibia and the increase in the Hispanic population and students has “influenced faculty-led short-term programs in South America.”

These practices within study abroad development appear quite similar to the practices discussed by Fernandez (2009), whereby community colleges regularly work with local employers “to fashion curricula that dovetail with the needs of industry” (Fernandez, 2009, p. 23). Just as St. Louis Community College in St. Louis, Missouri, has retrained autoworkers for jobs at the local Boeing plant, or Redlands Community College in El Reno, Oklahoma, teaches agriculture professionals how to write farm-work plans (Fernandez, 2009), these findings show that community colleges are tailoring their study abroad programs to the needs and interests of their communities.

Additionally, it appears that local business has an important impact on community colleges generally and can play an important role in study abroad programming. As globalization changes the landscape for business, business in turn looks to community colleges to provide them with employees with the skills for a globalized world. The American Association of Community Colleges (2010a) has noted “...more businesses are looking for people with an understanding of international issues...pressure is increasing for community colleges to foster an awareness of foreign cultures and the interconnected nature of the world economy” (para. 5). Mendoza et al. (2009) found an anticipated shift toward life-long learning; globalization, which reflects the need to prepare graduates for a global society; and innovation and partnerships. The findings from this study support the shift toward globalization and foreign awareness. For example, multiple respondents from community colleges that administered study abroad programs articulated benefits to business as ways the community benefits from the institution’s study abroad program. “Students gain an international perspective that helps them in their

careers...This also makes for a better employee once our students graduate,” wrote one community college president. Another participant responded to the question that “graduates of the college who are associated with study abroad initiatives in any way benefit from an increased understanding of global issues in the workplace.”

Overall, these findings are in keeping with Levin (2000), who found that governing boards and other members of community college decision-making bodies had begun to react and conform to the needs and expectations of business and industry. By the end of the twentieth century the community college’s mission had become “suited to the rhetoric of the global economy and to its demands” (Levin, 2000, p. 2). Responses such as the two above also directly fulfill one of the rationales posited by Raby and Valeau (2007) for community colleges to internationalize their campuses: the economic rationale, which recognizes international education as a means to enhance international trade and commerce. The economic benefit to the local economy as well as the individual students may be especially important at rural institutions where Harder (2010) found that the lack of international experiences for many graduates of rural community colleges often results in them being subject to an employability penalty. Further research would be necessary to determine the magnitude, if any, of the economic benefit to the local economy. Additional areas for future research, as well as the limitations of this study, are discussed in the following section.

Limitations and future research

The largest limitation to this study is the small sample size and likelihood of response bias. For example, a number of institutional researchers responded to the initial survey email indicating that they would not be responding because their institution did not offer study abroad programs. While each received a prompt response encouraging their participation, it is likely

many chose not to participate. Additionally, others in the same circumstance may have chosen to simply disregard the request without sending an email stating as much.

Additionally, this survey requested 2009-2010 data, based on feedback and advice from institutional researchers. However, the survey instructed clearly that if 2009-2010 data is unavailable, respondents may use data from 2008-2009 for all questions in this survey. In that case, they were asked to make a note of the earlier data in the comments section. Two respondents indicated they used earlier data to respond to the enrollment and financial aid questions in this survey.

A third limitation, in hindsight, was the use of institutional researchers to complete the initial survey. As previously noted, this approach was suggested to me in conversations with community college policy makers and administrators (including one community college president), because of the breadth and depth of the information collected by and available to institutional researcher. Ultimately, however, I believe that most institutional researchers simply did not have the knowledge to respond to many of the questions, and the available data varied considerably by campus. This limitation is especially apparent with regard to questions that asked about the community. Institutional researchers were requested, in the instructions, to confer with other administrators as necessary to complete the survey. While at least one did so, indicating in the comments section, “I had assistance from the vice chancellor for instruction in completing this survey,” it is more likely that others chose not to respond, or responded to few questions. Therefore, this limitation may have directly led to what I have already stated is the biggest limitation of this study, the small sample size, which in turn limited the possible sample size for the second survey, total responses which numbered only nine.

Finally, it must be noted that, in part due to the small sample size, this study has limitations as far as its contributions to the field of study abroad research. There is little here that is new in regards to which factors impact the development of study abroad programs. Findings that the financial situation of a college or its students is the single largest factor, and that factors such as overall level of internationalization at the college, perception of risk, faculty interest, and urbanization of the community also play a role, support previous research (Green, 2007; Green, et al., 2008; Harder, 2010; Hser, 2005; Hult & Motz, 2008; Raby, 2008). However, these findings generally do not further the assertions others have made. Where the study brings value is in its contribution to the discourse of internationalization as internationalization impacts the community served by a college. Given community colleges' historical mission of community service (Cohen & Brawer, 2003), and the indications from this study that international programs, including study abroad, serve to internationalize the broader community, this could be a new direction in the study of internationalization at community colleges.

As a result of the limitations mentioned above, particularly the limitation of sample size, future research would be necessary before generalizing the findings in this study. Additionally, research focusing on connections with external constituents and the prevalence of study abroad programming – or other international activities – could also be useful based on the strength of relationship differences observed in this study. An additional opportunity for future research could lie in studying the community's institutions (for example, elementary and secondary schools, businesses, and local government offices) to understand how study abroad programming could best meet the community's needs.

Another area for future research could be to examine the impact immigrant populations have on the demand for study abroad programs. Comments from senior administrators initially indicate

that a lack of financial resources, perhaps combined with previous exposure to global viewpoints, might decrease the demand for study abroad at community colleges with large immigrant populations. A complementary question, however, is whether such a population might lead to an increase in demand in other areas of internationalization, from foreign language offerings to specific courses. Finally, future research could examine the study abroad models mentioned by two senior administrators. One of these models allowed members of the local community to participate in study abroad programs on a non-credit basis; the other institution had sponsored trips for business programs. While neither of these models has been mentioned in previous research on the topic, future research could help practitioners understand the opportunities these models may present.

Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to explore the impact of macro-level factors on the development and implementation of study abroad programs in community colleges. In order to investigate the impact of numerous factors, the following research question was explored: What are the macro-level factors that influence the development and deployment of study abroad programs at community colleges?

The results of this study found that several factors appear to impact the development of study abroad programs, the single largest of which is financial: the wealth of institution, the student body, and the surrounding community all have a major impact on the development of study abroad programs. Beyond wealth, this study indicates that the makeup of the community, its employment base, connections to other countries or regions (such as through immigration), and overall support are all key factors that impact the development of study abroad and the locations where the programs occur. The findings also indicate that institutions that administer

study abroad programs have stronger relationships with external stakeholders. The results of this study also found that degree of urbanization appears to be a factor (in support of Harder (2010)), as well as institution size. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, it appears that institutions with other international programs (such as international students enrolled on campus, foreign language classes, and international faculty) are more likely to administer study abroad programs.

A global mindset is crucial for American students, communities, and employers; yet currently too few community college students have the opportunity to understand and experience international issues and cultures. Hopefully the results of this study can help to shape the thinking of community colleges looking to embark upon greater internationalization of the college, and especially the creation of study abroad opportunities for their students.

APPENDICES

Appendix A – Survey of Institutional Researchers

Study Abroad in Community Colleges Survey

This survey is part of a research study for a doctoral dissertation at the Michigan State University College of Education. This survey requests background and demographic information about your institution and about your institution's experiences with study abroad programs. You will also be asked a few questions about the community that your institution serves.

The survey requests data for the 2009-2010 academic year. IF 2009-2010 DATA IS UNAVAILABLE, you may use data from 2008-2009; however, please make a note of that in the comments section. To answer some questions you may wish to consult with other faculty or administrators at your colleges, for example from international programs offices (including study abroad and international student services), and/or the chief academic officer. If exact totals or percentages are unavailable for a question, please provide your best estimate. If you serve multiple campuses or institutions, you may complete the survey for each campus or college you serve.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary; you may withdraw at anytime or refuse to answer any particular questions. You indicate your voluntary agreement to participate by completing and submitting the survey.

This section collects information about your institution and community.

1. How many full-time equivalent students were enrolled in 2009-2010 (as reported to IPEDS)?
IF 2009-2010 DATA IS UNAVAILABLE, you may use data from 2008-2009 for this and all questions in this survey; however, please make a note of that in the comments section.
2. What was the average student age of full-time students in 2009-2010?
3. What percentage of students received financial aid in 2009-2010?
4. What was the average financial aid award in 2009-2010?
5. What was the transfer rate to four-year colleges or universities reported for your institution for the 2009-2010 IPEDS Graduation Rate Survey?
6. Is your institution authorized to offer baccalaureate degrees?
☐ Yes ☐ No
7. Which of the following best describes the community or district your institution serves?

☐ City or part of a city	☐ Tribal community
☐ County or part of a county	☐ Other
☐ Multiple counties	

8. Select the degree of urbanization of your community or district.

☐ Urban ☐ Suburban ☐ Rural

9. What was the median household income in your community or district in 2009?

☐ \$20,001 to \$40,000 ☐ \$60,001 to \$80,000 ☐ More than \$100,000

10. How strong is the relationship between your community college and the following organizations?

	Very weak	Weak	Neither weak nor strong	Strong	Very strong
Local school district (K-12)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Local government offices	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Chamber of commerce or trade center	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Four-year college or university	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Local/district business and industry	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

11. How are your institution's trustees selected?

☐ Appointed by governor ☐ District wide election
☐ Appointed by local elected officials ☐ Election by precinct
☐ Appointed by state elected officials ☐ Other

12. At what level is your institution's curriculum determined?

☐ State level, such as by a statewide board
☐ Institutional level, such as by the board of trustees or curriculum committee
☐ Other

This portion of the survey collects information about international activities.

13. How many international students were enrolled in your institution in 2009-2010?

14. How many international faculty members (non-U.S. citizens) taught at your institution in 2009-2010?

15. Does your institution offer any degree or certificate programs which include a foreign language requirement?

☐ Yes ☐ No

15a. [Asked to those who responded yes to question 15.] How many students completed a degree or certificate program which included a foreign language requirement in 2009-2010?

16. How many foreign languages were offered in 2009-2010? Do not include English as a Second Language or American Sign Language.

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

17. Select the foreign languages that were offered in 2009-2010 from the list below.

- | | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| ☐ Arabic | ☐ Japanese |
| ☐ Chinese | ☐ Russian |
| ☐ French | ☐ Spanish |
| ☐ German | ☐ Other <input type="text"/> |
| ☐ Italian | ☐ Other <input type="text"/> |

18. Choose the statement that best represents the administrative structure of international programs (internationalization efforts, international student/scholar services, study abroad) at your institution:

- ☐ No office oversees international activities and programs.
- ☐ A single office oversees international activities and programs.
- ☐ Multiple offices oversee international activities and programs.
- ☐ Other

19. How many people are specifically assigned to international education duties?

20. Which of the following activities comprise internationalization efforts at your institution?

Select all that apply.

- | | |
|---|---|
| ☐ Recruitment/enrollment of international students | ☐ Study abroad |
| ☐ Incorporation of international content across the curriculum | ☐ International professional development opportunities for faculty |
| ☐ Foreign language education | ☐ Other <input type="text"/> |

This portion of the survey collects information about study abroad.

For the purposes of this survey, study abroad refers to academic, for-credit study during which students physically leave the United States to study in a host country. Study abroad programs may range from one week (including programs that are embedded within a course) to a full academic year.

21. Estimate the percentage of students at your institution who participated in study abroad in 2009-2010.

- ☐ Less than 1 percent ☐ 1 percent to 3 percent ☐ 3.01 percent to 5 percent
☐ 5.01 percent to 10 percent ☐ 10.01 percent to 25 percent ☐ More than 25 percent

22. Does your institution have one or more professional staff or faculty members dedicated at least half-time to study abroad program development and/or administration?

- ☐ Yes ☐ No

22a. [Asked to those who responded yes to question 22.] How many people are specifically assigned to study abroad duties?

23. Does your institution belong to a consortium of community colleges which offers study abroad programs in which your students may participate?

- ☐ Yes ☐ No

24. Does your institution have an agreement with a four-year college or university which allows your students to participate in study abroad programs administered by the four-year school?

- ☐ Yes ☐ No

25. Does your institution support students in individual study abroad efforts? (i.e., facilitate participation in study abroad programs of interest to the student, but which are not administered by your institution or through a consortium or special agreement.)

- ☐ Yes ☐ No

25a. [Asked only to those who responded yes to question 25.] How many students received academic credit for participating in individual study abroad programs?

26. Please rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
My institution's study abroad offerings exceed those of our peer institutions.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
My institution's study abroad offerings are on par with those of our peer institutions.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Study abroad offerings at our peer institutions exceed offerings at my institution.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

27. Does your institution administer any study abroad programs?

(Note: for the purposes of this study, administered means that the institution has control over and runs the daily operation of the program.)

☐ Yes ☐ No

[Questions 28 and 29 were asked only to those who indicated their institution did not administer study abroad programs.]

28. To what extent have the following stakeholders influenced the decision NOT to develop study abroad programs at your institution?

	Definitely have not	Probably have not	Don't know	Probably have	Definitely have	N/A
Board of trustees	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Students	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Faculty	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Administration	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Local community	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Local businesses	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

29. To what extent would support from the following stakeholders be necessary for your institution to develop study abroad programs?

	Very Unimportant	Unimportant	Neither Important nor Unimportant	Important	Very Important	N/A
Board of Trustees	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Students	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Faculty	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Administration	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Local community	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Local businesses	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

[Questions 30 to 40 were asked only to those who indicated the institution administered study abroad programs.]

30. In what academic year was your first study abroad program offered?

31. How many for-credit, semester- or quarter-long study abroad programs are administered by your institution?

Faculty led programs	
Exchange programs	
Third-party programs	

32. How many for-credit, short-term (less than 8 weeks in length) study abroad programs are administered by your institution?

Faculty led programs	
Not faculty led programs	

33. What is the average number of participants in each study abroad program administered by your institution?

34. How much (in dollars) did your institution spend on study abroad programs in 2009-2010?

35. To what extent has support from the following stakeholders been important in the development of study abroad at your institution?

	Very Unimportant	Unimportant	Neither Important nor Unimportant	Important	Very Important	N/A
Board of trustees	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Students	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Faculty	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Administration	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Local community	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Local businesses	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

36. To what extent have the following stakeholders negatively impacted the development of study abroad programs at your institution?

	Definitely did not	Probably did not	Don't know	Probably did	Definitely did	N/A
Board of trustees	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Students	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Faculty	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Administration	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Local community	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Local businesses	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

37. With 1 being not at all and 5 being very much, to what extent do you believe the local community has supported the development of study abroad programs at your institution?

38. With 1 being not at all and 5 being very much, how aware is the local community of your institution's study abroad programs?

39. Please rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Over the next decade, my institution is likely to increase the number of study abroad programs it administers.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Over the next decade, my institution is likely to reduce the number of study abroad programs it administers.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

40. With 1 being not at all beneficial and 5 being very beneficial, to what extent do you perceive the following as benefits to offering study abroad programs for your students?

	Not at all beneficial 1	2	3	4	Very Beneficial 5
Helpful for the hiring needs of local businesses	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Helpful for the college to recruit students	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Helpful for students transferring to 4-year institutions	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Helpful for developing an internationally aware workforce	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

41. Please share any additional thoughts or comments you have on study abroad at your institution or in community colleges generally.

42. Contact information (optional):

Name	
Title	
Email address	
Number of years at current institution	

Appendix B – Survey of Senior Administrators at Institutions That Do Not Administer Study Abroad

Study Abroad in Community Colleges Survey

This survey is part of a research study for a doctoral dissertation at the Michigan State University College of Education. This survey contains one multiple choice question and seven open-ended questions. You will also have the opportunity to add any additional comments or information that you would like to add.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary; you may withdraw at anytime or refuse to answer any particular questions without penalty. You indicate your voluntary agreement to participate by completing and submitting the survey.

1. How strong is the relationship between your institution and the following organizations?

	Very weak	Weak	Neither weak nor strong	Strong	Very strong
Local school district (K-12)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Local government offices	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Chamber of commerce or trade center	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Four-year college or university	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Local/district business and industry	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

2. How has your institution leveraged its relationships with external constituents to develop programs or curriculum on campus?
3. Describe the mindset of your community and your students regarding “international.”
4. To what extent does your community, and characteristics of this community, matter in thinking about the development of study abroad programs?
5. If your institution were to decide today to develop study abroad programs, what would be the biggest hurdles to this implementation?
6. What type of support, and from which stakeholders, would be necessary for your institution to develop study abroad programs?
7. How do you believe institutions that administer study abroad programs are different from or similar to your institution?

Please share any additional comments you may have on this topic.

Appendix C – Survey of Senior Administrators at Institutions That
Administer Study Abroad

Study Abroad in Community Colleges Survey

This survey is part of a research study for a doctoral dissertation at the Michigan State University College of Education. This survey contains one multiple choice question and seven open-ended questions. You will also have the opportunity to add any additional comments or information that you would like to add.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary; you may withdraw at anytime or refuse to answer any particular questions without penalty. You indicate your voluntary agreement to participate by completing and submitting the survey.

1. How strong is the relationship between your institution and the following organizations?

	Very weak	Weak	Neither weak nor strong	Strong	Very strong
Local school district (K-12)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Local government offices	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Chamber of commerce or trade center	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Four-year college or university	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Local/district business and industry	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

2. How has your institution leveraged its relationships with external constituents to develop programs or curriculum on campus?
3. How has the community you serve influenced the development of study abroad programs at your institution?
4. Describe the mindset of your community and your students regarding “international.”
5. What characteristics of your community made study abroad development possible at your institution?
6. Why has study abroad succeeded at your institution?
7. In what ways does your community benefit from your institution's study abroad programs?

Please describe any best practices you would like to sharing regarding the development and administration of study abroad programs at your institution.

Please share any additional comments you may have on this topic.

Appendix D – Invitations to Participate and Content Forms

Dear [Name],

I am inviting you participate in research to study macro-level factors that influence the development and success of study abroad programs at community colleges. This study is for my doctoral dissertation at the Michigan State University College of Education.

This study is open to institutional research administrators at community colleges and is conducted using electronic surveys.

To participate, please follow this link to the survey:
\${l://SurveyLink?d=Take the Survey}

Alternately, you may copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:
\${l://SurveyURL}

This survey requests background and demographic information about your institution and about your institution's experiences with study abroad programs. You will also be asked a few questions about the community that your institution serves. You may refuse to any questions and may withdraw at any time without penalty.

I do not know of any risks to you if you decide to participate in this survey. All reports of the results will not include any identifiable information all responses will be kept strictly confidential. You may choose whether or not to include your name and contact information at the end of the survey.

The survey should take you about 30 minutes to complete. I hope you will take the time to complete this questionnaire and return it. Your participation is entirely voluntary, but would be greatly appreciated. Regardless of whether you choose to participate, please let me know if you would like a summary of my findings. To receive a summary, please email me at singersm@msu.edu. I anticipate the dissertation will be complete, and the results available, by the fall of 2011.

If you have any questions or concerns about completing the survey or about this study, you may contact Dr. Reitumetse Mabokela, Principal Investigator, at 517-353-6676 or mabokela@msu.edu. If you have any concerns about your rights as a participant in this study you may contact the Human Research Protection Program via email at irb@msu.edu or 517-355-2180.

Sincerely,

Sarah Singer,
Doctoral Candidate
singersm@msu.edu

Dear Dr. [Last Name]:

I am inviting you to participate in a research study on macro-level factors that influence the development and success of study abroad programs at community colleges. This study is for my doctoral dissertation at the Michigan State University College of Education.

Earlier this fall I surveyed institutional researchers to understand which community colleges are and are not developing and administering study abroad programs. As [your institution] responded to this initial survey, I am now inviting you to participate in the second portion of this study, which surveys senior administrative personnel, including presidents and chancellors, provosts, vice presidents, and deans, to gain a deeper understanding of the impact of the community on the decision to develop study abroad programming.

To participate, follow this link to the survey:

[\\${l://SurveyLink?d=Take the Survey}](#)

Alternately, you may copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:

[\\${l://SurveyURL}](#)

This survey contains one multiple choice question and seven open-ended questions. You will also have the opportunity to add comments or additional information. You may refuse to answer any question and may withdraw at any time without penalty. I do not know of any risks to you if you decide to participate in this study. All reports of results will not include any identifiable information and all responses will be kept strictly confidential.

The survey should take you approximately 30 minutes to complete and is available through Friday, December 17, 2010. Your participation is entirely voluntary, but would be greatly appreciated. Regardless of whether you choose to participate, please let me know if you would like a summary of my findings. To receive a summary, please email me at singersm@msu.edu. I anticipate the dissertation will be complete, and the results available, by the fall of 2011.

If you have any questions or concerns about completing the survey or about this study, you may contact Dr. Reitumetse Mabokela, Principal Investigator, at 517-353-6676 or mabokela@msu.edu. If you have any concerns about your rights as a participant in this study, you may contact the Human Research Protection Program via email at irb@msu.edu or 517-355-2180.

Sincerely,
Sarah Singer
Doctoral Candidate
singersm@msu.edu

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Alreck, P. L., & Settle, R. B. (2004). *The survey research handbook* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Irwin.
- Altbach, P. G., & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3/4), 290-305.
- American Association of Community Colleges. (2009). Fast facts. Retrieved October 22, 2009, from <http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/Pages/fastfacts.aspx>
- American Association of Community Colleges. (2010a). A look at the future. Retrieved November 5, 2010, from <http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/history/Pages/lookatfuture.aspx>.
- American Association of Community Colleges. (2010b). Community colleges past to present. Retrieved January 24, 2010, from <http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/history/Pages/pasttopresent.aspx>
- American Association of Community Colleges. (2010c). Fast facts. Retrieved November 8, 2010, <http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/Documents/factsheet2010.pdf>
- Amey, M. J., & VanDerLinden, K. E. (2002). *The institutional context of community college administration (Research Brief Leadership Series No. 4, AACC-RB-02-03)*. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.
- Bailey, T. R., & Smith Morest, V. (2004). *The organizational efficiency of multiple missions for community colleges*. New York.
- Bandler, M. J. (2002). The global linkage [Electronic Version]. *U.S. Society & Values: Community Colleges in the United States*, 7, 11-14.
- Black, H. T., & Duhon, D. L. (2006). Assessing the impact of business study abroad programs on cultural awareness and personal development. *Journal of Education for Business*, 81(3), 140-144.
- Bok, D. (2006). *Our underachieving colleges: A candid look at how much students learn and why they should be learning more*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Calhoon, J. A., Wildcat, D., Annette, C., Pierotti, R., & Griswold, W. (2003). Creating meaningful study abroad programs for American Indian postsecondary students. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 42(1), 46-57.
- Carlson, J. S., Burn, B. B., Useem, J., & Yachimowicz, D. (1990). *Study abroad: The experience of American undergraduates*. New York: Greenwood Press.

- Chen, G. (2009). Why 60% of community college students never transfer. Retrieved February 12, 2010, from <http://www.communitycollegereview.com/articles/191>
- CityTownInfo.com. (2009). Texas looking to boost community college transfers. Retrieved February 12, 2010, from <http://www.citytowninfo.com/career-and-education-news/articles/texas-looking-to-boost-community-college-transfers-09052601>
- Clarke, I., III, Flaherty, T. B., Wright, N. D., & McMillen, R. M. (2009). Student intercultural proficiency from study abroad programs. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 31(2), 173-181.
- Clavelle, P. (2001). Progressive approaches to university-community relations. *Connection*, Winter 2001, 19-20.
- Cohen, A. D., & Shively, R. L. (2007). Acquisition of requests and apologies in Spanish and French: Impact of study abroad and strategy-building intervention. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(2), 189-212.
- Cohen, A. M. (2002). America's community colleges: On the ascent [Electronic Version]. *U.S. Society & Values: Community Colleges in the United States*, 7, 5-8.
- Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (1989). *The American Community College* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (2003). *The American Community College* (4th ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program. (2005). Global competence & national needs: One million Americans studying abroad. Washington, DC.
- Community Colleges for International Development. (2009). Survey of Members on Global Education Concerns. Retrieved November 29, 2009, 2009, from <http://ccid.kirkwood.cc.ia.us/news/Survey%20of%20Members%20on%20Global%20Education%20Concerns%20JuneJuly%2009.pdf>
- Connell, C. (2010). Global community. *International Educator*, 19, 32-40.
- Creswell, J. W. (2005). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Dardig, J. C. (2004). Urban connections: A course linking college students to the community. *College Teaching*, 52(1), 25-30.

- De Wit, H. (2000). Changing rationales for the internationalization of higher education. In L. C. Barrows (Ed.), *Internationalization of high education: An institutional perspective. Papers on higher education*. (pp. 9-21). Bucharest, Romania: United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.
- Douglas, C., & Jones-Rikkens, C. G. (2001). Study abroad programs and American student worldmindedness: An empirical analysis. *Journal of Teaching in International Business*, 13(1), 55-66.
- Duderstadt, J. J. (2000). *A university for the 21st Century*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Engle, L., & Engle, J. (2003). Study abroad levels: Toward a classification of program types. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, IX, 1-20.
- Fernandez, K. (2009). Back to work: Training programs offer displaced workers skills for success in a reviving economy. *Community College Journal*, 80(3), 16-25.
- Gardner, P., Gross, L., & Steglitz, I. (2008). *Unpacking your study abroad experience: Critical reflection for workplace competencies*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Collegiate Employment Research Institute.
- Geller, H. A. (2001). A brief history of community colleges and a personal view of some issues (open admissions, occupational training and leadership). George Mason University, Fairfax, VA.
- Gonzalez, J. (2010). At the White House, praise and new challenges for education's 'unsung heroes.' [Electronic Version]. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved January 7, 2011 from <http://chronicle.com/article/PraiseNew-Challenges-for/124822/>.
- Gray, K. S., Murdock, G. K., & Stebbins, C. D. (2002). Assessing study abroad's effect on international mission. *Change*, 34(3), 44-51.
- Green, M. F. (2007). Internationalizing community colleges: Barriers and strategies. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, (138), 15-24.
- Green, M. F., Luu, D., & Burris, B. (2008). *Mapping internationalization on U.S. campuses: 2008 edition*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Green, M. F., & Siaya, L. (2005). *Measuring internationalization at community colleges*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Gregor, A. D. (2002). *Globalization, trade liberalization and higher education: Research areas and questions. Occasional papers in higher education*. Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada: The University of Manitoba Center for Higher Education Research and Development.

- Guerin, S. H. (2009). Internationalizing the curriculum: Improving learning through international education: Preparing students for success in a global society. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 33(8), 611-614.
- Gullahorn, J. T., & Gullahorn, J. E. (1958). American Objectives in Study Abroad. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 29(7), 369-374.
- Gumprecht, B. (2003). The American college town. *Geographical Review*, 93(1), 51-80.
- Halder, J. (1997). *How Iowa community colleges developed a consortium for study abroad*. Paper presented at the Conference of the Community Colleges for International Development.
- Harder, N. (2010). Internationalization efforts in United States community colleges: A comparative analysis of urban, suburban, and rural institutions. Poster session presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Community Colleges, Seattle, WA.
- Harkavy, I. (1998). *School-community-university partnerships: Effectively integrating community building and education reform*. Paper presented at the Joint Forum: U.S. Department of Education and U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. from http://www.community-wealth.org/_pdfs/articles-publications/universities/paper-harkavy.pdf.
- Hoffa, W. W. (2007). *A history of U.S. study abroad: Beginnings to 1965*. Carlisle, PA: The Forum on Education Abroad.
- Hser, M. P. (2005). Campus internationalization: A study of American universities' internationalization efforts. *International Education*, 35(1), 35-48.
- Hult, T., & Motz, W. (2008). *Benchmark study on international business education at community colleges*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.
- Institute of International Education. (2007). *Open doors 2007*. New York: Institute of International Education.
- Institute of International Education. (2009). *Open doors 2009*. New York: Institute of International Education.
- Institute of International Education. (2010). *Open doors 2010*. New York: Institute of International Education.
- Ismail, B., Morgan, M., & Hayes, K. (2006). Effect of short study abroad course on student openness to diversity. *Journal of Food Science Education*, 1, 15-18.
- Jacobs, J., & Dougherty, K. J. (2006). The uncertain future of the community college workforce development mission. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 136, 53-62.

- Joliet Junior College. (n.d.). *History*. Retrieved October 20, 2009, from <http://www.jjc.edu/about/college-info/Pages/history.aspx?c=1>
- Kanter, M. (2010). *The Linchpin: The new mission of community colleges*. Secretary Arne Duncan's remarks at the White House Summit on Community Colleges. Retrieved January 7, 2011 from <http://www.ed.gov/news/speeches/linchpin-new-mission-community-colleges>.
- Kedia, B. L., & Daniel, S. (2003). *U.S. Business Needs for Employees with International Expertise*. Paper presented at the Needs for Global Challenges Conference.
- 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(3), 441-452.
- Kitsantas, A., & Meyers, J. (2001). *Studying abroad: Does it enhance college student cross-cultural awareness?* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the San Diego State University and the U.S. Department of Education Centers for International Business Education and Research (CIBER 2001).
- Kochanek, L. (1998). Study abroad celebrates 75th anniversary [Electronic Version]. *UD Special Delivery*, 1. Retrieved October 12, 2009 from <http://www.udel.edu/PR/SpecialUDelivery/vol1no1/anniversary.html>.
- Korbel, L. (2007). In union there is strength: The role of state global education consortia in expanding community college involvement in global education. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 138, 47-55.
- Lansing Community College. (2011). Study abroad through Lansing Community College and Michigan State University. Retrieved January 6, 2011, from <http://www.lcc.edu/aa/studyabroad/>.
- Leiderman, S., Furco, A., Zapf, J., & Goss, M. (2004). *Building partnerships with college campuses: Community perspectives*. Washington, DC: Council of Independent Colleges.
- Levin, J. S. (2000). The revised institution: The community college mission at the end of the twentieth century. *Community College Review*, 28(2), 1-25.
- Levin, J. S. (2002). Global culture and the community college. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 26, 121-145.
- Lewin, T. (2009, May 3). Community colleges challenge hierarchy with 4-year degrees [Electronic Version]. *New York Times*, A23. Retrieved June 10, 2010 from <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/05/03/education/03community.html>.

- Lim, G. C., Miller, M. F., Riley, R. W., McPherson, M. P., & Simon, L. A. K. (2003). *Strategy for a global university: Model international department experiment*. East Lansing, Michigan: International Studies and Programs, Michigan State University.
- Loveland, E. (2010). A renewed commitment to international education. *International Educator*, 19, 18-21.
- Magnan, S. S., & Back, M. (2007). Social interaction and linguistic gain during study abroad. *Foreign Language Annals*, 40(1), 43-61.
- Massey, J., & Burrow, J. (2009). Student affairs - history and development of study abroad. Retrieved October 23, 2009, from <http://www.queensu.ca/studentaffairs/assessment/current/exchange/history.html>
- Mayfield, L. (2001). Town and gown in America: Some historical and institutional issues of the engaged university. *Education for Health*, 14(2), 231-240.
- McKeown, J. S. (2009). *The first time effect: The impact of study abroad on college student intellectual development*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Mendoza, P., Basham, M. J., Campbell, D. F., O'Daniels, T. M., Malcolm, Z., Felton, S., et al. (2009). Missions, values, and "flying monkeys": Critical issues for community colleges today and in 2019. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 33(11), 866-882.
- Michigan State University. (2009). Study abroad objectives. Retrieved October 23, 2009, from <http://studyabroad.msu.edu/shared/objectives.html>
- Mohajeri Norris, E., & Gillespie, J. (2009). How study abroad shapes global careers: Evidence from the United States. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 13(3), 382-397.
- Moltz, D. (2009). Who are community college trustees? [Electronic Version]. Inside Higher Ed. Retrieved November 11, 2010 from http://www.insidehighered.com/news/focus/community_colleges/leadership/acct.
- Moltz, D. (2010). Not just a foot in the door [Electronic Version]. Inside Higher Ed. Retrieved November 11, 2010 from <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2010/08/12/baccalaureate>.
- Moore, C., Shulock, N., & Jensen, C. (2009). *Crafting a student-centered transfer process in California: Lessons from other states*. Sacramento, California: California State University Sacramento Institute for Higher Education Leadership & Policy.
- NAFSA: Association of International Educators. (1997). Basic facts on study abroad in the 21st century. Washington, DC.

- Obst, D., Bhandari, R., & Witherell, S. (2007). *Meeting America's global education challenge: Current trends in U.S. study abroad & the impact of strategic diversity initiatives*. New York: Institute of International Education.
- Phillippe, K. A., & Patton, M. (2000). *National profile of community colleges: Trends and statistics*. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.
- Raby, R. L. (2008). *Expanding education abroad at U.S. community colleges*. New York: Institute of International Education.
- Raby, R. L., & Valeau, E. J. (2007). Community college international education: Looking back to forecast the future. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 138(Summer), 5-14.
- Romano, R. M., & Dellow, D. A. (2009). Technological change, globalization, and the community college. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 146(Summer), 11-19.
- Schoorman, D. (2000). *How is internationalization implemented? A framework for organizational practice*.
- Siaya, L., & Hayward, F. M. (2003). *Mapping internationalization on U.S. campuses*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Thorndike, R. M. (2005). *Measurement and evaluation in psychology and education* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Vaughan, G. B. & Weisman, I. M. (1997). *Community college trustees: Leading on behalf of their communities*. Washington, DC: Association of Community College Trustees.
- Weill, L. V. (2009). The president's role in cultivating positive town-gown relations. *Planning for Higher Education*, 37(4), 37-42.