



LIBRARY Michigan State University

This is to certify that the dissertation entitled

WHERE ARE ALL THE MALES?: A MIXED METHODS INQUIRY INTO MALE STUDY ABROAD PARTICIPATION

presented by

JAMES M. LUCAS

has been accepted towards fulfillment of the requirements for the

Ph.D. degree in

Higher, Adult, & Lifelong Education

Um & Questin

Major Professor's Signature

8/24/09

Date

MSU is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer

PLACE IN RETURN BOX to remove this checkout from your record.
TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.
MAY BE RECALLED with earlier due date if requested.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE

5/08 K:/Proj/Acc&Pres/CIRC/DateDue.indd

H

WHERE ARE ALL THE MALES?: A MIXED METHODS INQUIRY INTO MALE STUDY ABROAD PARTICIPATION

Ì.

By

James M. Lucas

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to Michigan State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Higher, Adult, and Lifelong Education

ABSTRACT

WHERE ARE ALL THE MALES?: A MIXED METHODS INQUIRTY INTO MALE STUDY ABROAD PARTICIPATION

BY

James M. Lucas

Study abroad represents a powerful tool for internationalizing students' higher education experience; however, current participation numbers indicate that male students go on study abroad programs at half the rate of female students. This rate reflects broader engagement trends for male college students, who have fallen behind female participation rates in terms of college entry and college completion. If higher education institutions want to prepare global scholars, citizens, and workers ready for the 21st-Century, all students must engage in and benefit from study abroad opportunities. To address this problem, this study employed a mixed methods inquiry at a large, public, Midwestern research university to analyze an institutional survey and conduct personal interviews with male graduating seniors based on a participation model that suggests that institutional, situational, informational, and dispositional factors influence the decision to participation.

Based on the themes from the interviews and the qualitative analysis, male students have four motivations related to study abroad, which included (1) fun, (2) cultural learning, (3) resume-building, and (4) major and/or career benefits. Although all four motivations were common amongst the study's volunteers, benefits to the individual's major or career were strongest. From the analysis of these motivations, this study suggests that in relationship to study abroad, male dispositions—specifically their adherence to traditional notions of masculinity play a vital role in their decision-making process and how they weight these motivations. Other factors related to participation influenced this decision positively or negatively depending on the individual, but the idea that a male should further his career and achieve success was a strong and universal consideration amongst all the volunteers.

Copyright by JAMES M. LUCAS 2009

DEDICATION

I dedicate this study to my parents, James D. Lucas and Sharon Neumaier, who always knew I would go to college, but never thought I would stay there for so long; my dissertation advisor, Dr. Ann Austin, who always encouraged me and found my topic interesting, even when I was unsure; and to all my friends and colleagues at MSU who went through this rite of passage with me, what a great family we became writing our dissertations.

I would also like to dedicate this effort to my grandparents, Grandma and Grandpa Lucas, your support led me to explore study abroad for the first time as a student and that single experience has shaped me both personally and professionally. Also, Grandma and Grandpa Senn, although you passed before I finished my writing, I have a sense you were with me all the way.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Writing a dissertation can feel like the loneliest endeavor in the world, but in reality, it takes a large support system. For that I would like to acknowledge the on-going support and assistance played by many in my life.

First, I would like to acknowledge my dissertation chair, Dr. Ann Austin, who was the first faculty member with whom I worked as I considered my degree program. Her support and encouragement were invaluable to me not only as I considered entering the program, but throughout my dissertation.

I also appreciated the time and support of my wonderful committee members— Dr. Kristen Renn, Dr. John Dirkx, and Dr. John Meltzer. In your own ways, you each contributed to my thinking and pushed me to be a better researcher and scholar.

Second, I would like to acknowledge the support of my study abroad and international colleagues at Michigan State University. Special thanks to Dr. Inge Steglitz, who seemed more excited about my topic than I was and constantly pushed me to finish; Dr. Jeff Riedinger, who graciously allowed me to tap into data collected by his office; and to all the other staff and advisors who helped me conduct research and obtain names for interviews.

Fourth, I could not have finished without the guidance, support, and tough love of Dr. Phil Gardner, who was the best statistics teacher I've ever had. You are brilliant!

Fifth, I would like to thank all the students who took time to speak with me for the study, many of whom actually became interested in the topic.

Next, I would like to acknowledge my co-workers, especially Dr. Doug Estry, who graciously allowed me to work on the dissertation as much as I needed to in the

v

months before the defense. Also, Drs. Linda Gross and Korine Steinke Wawrzynski, who provided listening ears, advice, and kicks in the butt depending on the circumstance.

Finally, I cannot express my gratitude to all my friends who supported me during my program, especially during the last six months. Gretchen, Jesse, Casey, Eric, and Jody, thank you for being a family and support system as we shared the experience together. Glad we all made it (sorta). Abby, Kevin, Sean, Marc, Mark, Amy, Elizabeth, Luke, Connie, Julie, Derek, Brandon, and all the rest, thanks for putting up with the insanity.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	. xi
LIST OF FIGURES	xiv
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION Internationalization and Study Abroad Access and Study Abroad Importance and Problem Statement Conceptual Framework Dissertation Overview	1 2 4 8 .13
CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE	.16 .17 .20 .26 .28 .31 .32 .34 .39 .40 .42 .46 .48 .55 .56 .63 .66
CHAPTER 3 Methods	.71
Ideas about Male Study Abroad Participation Grounded Theory Pilot Study Mixed Method Design Strengths and Limitations of this Design Rationale for this Design: Pragmatist Philosophies Institutional Setting	.71 .75 .77 .78 .81 .83

,	
Research Questions and Sequential Design	84
Phase 1: Quantitative Survey	86
Instrument Design	87
Survey Analysis	88
Survey Limitations	89
Phase 2: Interview Design and Implementation	89
Researcher's Role	90
Interview Population and Setting	91
Data Collection Strategy and Instrument	93
Data Analysis Procedures	95
Limitations of the Interview Data	96
CHAPTER 4	
Ouantitative Findings	
Survey Overview	
Analysis Methods	
Survey Design and Sample	101
Participants and Nonparticipants	
Comparison of Male & Female Participants & Nonparticipants	105
Research Ouestion 1: Programmatic Variables	
Research Question 2: Situational Variables	109
Research Question 3: Dispositional Variables	115
Research Question 4: Informational and Relational Variables	120
Factor Analysis of Influences and Obstacles	125
Factor Analysis of Influences	127
Factor Analysis of Obstacles for Participants	132
Factor Analysis of Obstacles for Nonnarticipants	134
Summary of Factor Analysis Findings	138
Concluding Thoughts	130
Concluding Thoughts	
CHAPTER 5	
Qualitative Findings	142
Background on Phase 2	142
Sample and Analysis	142
Family Background and Percentions of Support	144
Previous Research and Overview	144
Theme 1: Study Abroad and Personal Connections	146
Theme 7: Family as Watch-guard	148
Theme 2: Males' Silent Duties	152
Conclusions on the Role of Family	155
Reputation and Deer Messages	155
Previous Research and Overview	159
Theme 4. Broad Knowledge Little Denth	150
Limited and Imperfect Understanding	139
Theme 5. Message Disconnect	101
Dervesive Information Limited Messages	104
rervasive monitation, Limited Messages	100

Theme 6: Personal Connections and the Male Voice	169
Male Messages Limited or Missing	174
Concluding Thoughts	
Interest and Risk-Taking Behaviors	
Previous Research and Overview	
Theme 7: Let's have an Adventure	
Interest in the Value-Added	
Theme 8: Independence, Please	
Theme 9: Organized Safety vs. Spontaneous Experience	191
Concluding Thoughts on Risk and Fun	198
Careerism and Success	199
Previous Research and Overview	
Theme 10: Value to Major and Career	
Theme 11: The Pragmatic Mindset	
Theme 12: Intra- and Inter-Group Differences	217
Concluding Thoughts	
Conclusions	

CHAPTER 6

Analysis and Implications	224
Summary of Findings	224
Nonparticipant Issues	227
Interaction between Findings	228
Understanding Differences amongst Males	229
Players and Workers	230
Players and Workers on Study Abroad	232
Analysis of Themes	235
Depth, Clarity, and Meaning of Study Abroad Messages	237
Fun as a Valued Programmatic Feature	240
Weak and Strong Motivators	244
Situations Define Benefits and Obstacles	247
Masculinity as Influencer	249
Conclusion: Disposition is Key	251
Model of Study Abroad Participation	256
Gender Roles and Masculinity	258
Recommendations for Action	260
Study Abroad Offices	260
Colleges and Faculty Members	262
Student Affairs Professionals	263
Families and Mentors of Young Males	264
Research: Limitations and Future Directions	264
Conclusion	268
APPENDICES	271
Appendix A: Summary of Sweet Briar Alumni Survey Data	272
Appendix B: Recruitment Letters	273

,

Appendix C: Volunteer Consent Form	274
Appendix D: Interview Protocol	276
Appendix E: Overview of Survey Volunteers by Demographic Characterist	ics.278
Appendix F: Tables Related to Background Variables	279
Appendix G: Tables Related to Institutional and Programmatic Variables	286
Appendix H: Tables Related to Situational Variables	288
Appendix I: Tables Related to Dispositional Variables	290
Appendix J: Tables Related to Relational/Informational Variables	292
Appendix K: Factor Analysis Tables	295
Appendix L: Male Volunteers by Participation Status and Major Category.	302
Appendix M: Follow-up Analysis on Males and Age	303
BIBLIOGRAPHY	306

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1: Summary of Significant Quantitative Findings	141
TABLE 2: Summary of Significant Qualitative Findings	223
TABLE 3: Connection between Schneider's Groups and Study Abroad	236
TABLE A1: Summary of Sweet Briar Alumni Survey Data	272
TABLE E1: Overview of Survey Volunteers by Demographic Characteristics	278
TABLE F1: Crosstab Table for Participation Status by Sex	279
TABLE F2: Chi-Square Test for Participation Status by Sex	279
TABLE F3: Crosstab of Racial Status by Sex	280
TABLE F4: Chi-Square Test for Racial Status by Sex	280
TABLE F5: Crosstab of Previous Travel by Sex	281
TABLE F6: Chi-Square Test for Racial Status by Sex	281
TABLE F7: Crosstab Table for Major by Sex	282
TABLE F8: Chi-Square for Participation Status by Sex	283
TABLE F9: Crosstab Analysis for Participation Status by Sex	283
TABLE F10: Chi-Square Test for Major by Participation Status	283
TABLE F11: Crosstab Analysis for Transfer Status by Sex	284
TABLE F12: Chi-Square Test for Transfer Status by Sex	284
TABLE F13: Crosstab Analysis for Major by Participation Status	285
TABLE F14: Chi-Square Test for Transfer Status by Participation Status	285
TABLE F15: Descriptives and ANOVA Results for Respondents' GPA	285
TABLE G1: Descriptives and ANOVA Results for Programmatic Variables	286
TABLE G2: Crosstab Analysis for Program Duration by Sex	287

TABLE G3: Chi-Square Test for Program Duration by Sex 287
TABLE H1: Descriptives and ANOVA Results for Situational Variables (Participants)
TABLE H2: Descriptives and ANOVA Results for Situational Variables (Nonparticipants)
TABLE I1: Descriptives and ANOVA Results for Dispositional Influences (Participants).
TABLE I2: Descriptives and ANOVA Results for Dispositional Obstacles (Participants)
TABLE I3: Descriptives and ANOVA Results for Dispositional Influences (Nonparticipants)
TABLE I4: Descriptives and ANOVA Results for Dispositional Influences (Nonparticipants)
TABLE J1: Descriptives and ANOVA Results for Information/Relational Influences (Participants)
TABLE J2: Descriptives and ANOVA Results for the Informational/Relational Obstacles
TABLE J3: Student Ratings for Institutional Helpfulness for Study Abroad
TABLE J4: Participants' Ratings of Interpersonal Support for Study Abroad294
TABLE K1: Principal Components Analysis for Participant Influences 295
TABLE K2: Principal Components Analysis for Male Participant Influences
TABLE K3: Principal Components Analysis for Female Participant Influences296
TABLE K4: Principal Components Analysis for Participants' Obstacles
TABLE K5: Principal Components Analysis for Male Participants' Obstacles 298
TABLE K6: Principal Components Analysis for Female Participants' Obstacles
TABLE K7: Principal Components Analysis for Nonparticipants' Obstacles
TABLE K8: Principal Components Analysis for Male Nonparticipants' Obstacles300

TABLE K9: Principal Components Analysis for Female Nonparticipants' Obstacles300
TABLE K10: Principal Components Analysis for Participants' Influences and Obstacles
TABLE L1: Male Volunteers by Participation Status and Major Category
TABLE M1: Descriptives and ANOVA Results for Participants' Academic Level303
TABLE M2: Crosstabs for Academic year by Participation for Males and Females303
TABLE M3: Chi-Square Test for Academic Year by Participation Status

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE 1: Factors Affecting Enrollment Adult Education	10
FIGURE 2: Conceptual Study Abroad Participation Model	12
FIGURE 3: Explanatory Sequential Model	82
FIGURE 4: Understanding Male Values and the Decision to Participate	257

Chapter 1: Introduction

Internationalization and Study Abroad

In a post-9/11, global world, all undergraduate students need to have the ability to work, learn, and live across cultural boundaries (Deardorff, 2004; Kirkwood, 2001). According to the Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program (2005), international and global knowledge-bases represent vital needs for future national security, leadership, diplomacy, and economic prosperity, and numerous higher education institutions have launched efforts to change curricula and increase study abroad experiences (Stearns, 2009). Despite agreement about the skills students needed between higher education and government organizations, U.S. students lag behind their international peers in terms of their language, geographic, and intercultural knowledge and abilities (Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program [Lincoln Commission]; Deardorff; Kirkwood; Spring, 1998).

The response to these needs has led higher education to emphasize campus internationalization (Green & Olson, 2003; Stearns, 2009). This process includes an array of programs and experiences for students, including curricular options such as language and internationally-based majors, internships, service learning, and most prominently study abroad. Mestenhauser (2003) believes that universities place too much emphasis on study abroad opportunities; however, according to the data, study abroad represents a unique and powerful way to promote learning (Carlson, Burn, Useem, & Yachimowicz, 1990; Dwyer & Peters, 2004; Garraty, Kemperer, & Taylor, 1981; Kauffmann, Martin, & Weaver, 1992; Opper, Teichler, & Carlson, 1990). Although other campus programs, such as interaction with international students or language instruction, can improve

intercultural knowledge and understanding, research shows that the disorientation of international travel produces significant personal and cultural learning beyond what can occur domestically (Deardorff, 2006; Erwin & Colman, 1998; Sell, 1983).

Although internationalizing higher education includes activities beyond study abroad, most higher education institutions use and emphasize study abroad as a major—if not the primary—means by which to internationalize the curriculum and provide students with international learning. In 2005, the federally organized and supported Lincoln Commission declared 2006 the Year of Study Abroad and set a goal of one million U.S. undergraduate students traveling abroad by 2017, a figure that represents a sevenfold increase and a 50% growth rate per year over 2006 participation levels (Davis, 2007). When discussing barriers to this goal, they cited the lack of institutional support and high financial costs, two factors often highlighted in the literature (Booker, 2001; Chiefflo, 2001). As part of their proposed implementation plan, the Commission recommended improving institutional support, better integration of study abroad into the curriculum (especially in the sciences), and more federal funding to defray costs as a means of increasing access to study abroad for a broader range of students.

Access and Study Abroad

As the importance of study abroad participation intensifies within higher education, so has the issue of who is and is not going abroad. Just as the American higher education system evolved from a few institutions offering a liberal arts education for the elite classes to a collection of institutions offering a wider-array of curricula to a diverse range of students (Rudolph, 1977; Thelin, 2004), study abroad participation has widened access through curriculum integration, increased safety, and lower travel costs (Garraty,

Kemperer, & Taylor, 1981). Historically, study abroad involved wealthy, white women traveling to Europe for a year to study humanities, social science, or language (Gore, 2005), but curricular, technological, and economic changes have made study abroad increasingly accessible to a broader range of students in terms of their disciplines and economic backgrounds (Garraty et al.; Lincoln Commission, 2005).

In the last decade, the number of students traveling overseas has doubled, with 205,983 students traveling abroad in 2004/2005, a 7.7% increase over the previous academic year and about a 270% increase from the 1993/1994 academic year (Davis, 2007). Although this increase is significant, current study abroad rates reflect only about 10% of all the students graduating from accredited U.S. institutions of higher education according to the Lincoln Commission Report (2005), and of this 10%, many students cluster into a few fields of study. Most students (22.6%) studying abroad still represent social science disciplines, but non-traditional fields are making significant participation increases. Currently, business, at 17.5%, ranks as the second highest field studied abroad and yearly growth in the sciences—engineering (9.4%), agriculture (8.9%), physical science (8.3%), and health (8.3%)—continues to outpace the traditional disciplines such as language and social science (Davis).

Despite these curricular changes in study abroad, professionals still struggle to increase the number of low-income, minority, and—perhaps surprisingly—male students studying abroad. A few researchers have studied theories related to minority student involvement and linked it to factors such as family relationships, culture, and socioeconomic status (Akomolafe, 1993, 2000; Carter, 1991; Chichester & Akomalafe, 2003; Doan, 2002), but the issue of male participation in study abroad is less studied (Gore,

2005). Also, according to NAFSA data (NAFSA is a major U.S.-based professional organization related to international education and study abroad), over the last 10 years, the percentage of men studying abroad actually dipped from 37.1% in 1995 to 34.5% of total enrollments in 2005, and according to their most recent data, overall females participate in study abroad at a rate of two to one or 65.5% to 34.5% (Davis, 2007). Data from studies conducted by other professional organizations confirm these figures. The Council for International Educational Exchange (CIEE) indicates that 67% of their participants have been female, and various studies conducted by the Institute for International Education of Students (IES) indicate that over the last 50 years, between 69% and 72% of their participants have been female have been female (Gore).

Importance and Problem Statement

According to 2005 data, males comprise about 43% of undergraduate enrollments and, according to 2003 data, about the same percent of degrees conferred at U.S. higher education institutions (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2008), yet only about 35% of study abroad participants are male according to the latest *Open Doors Report* published by the Institute of International Education (Davis, 2008; Redden, 2008). This trend reflects broader concerns within education that suggest male students are falling behind females in their achievement and engagement (Kimmel, 2008; Sax, 2007).

Some individuals might argue that lower male study abroad participation is not an important topic, but determining the factors associated with males' lower participation rates is beneficial for three reasons: First, understanding male study abroad participation provides insight to general male engagement in college. Second, study abroad is increasingly linked with educational goals and outcomes such as internationalization,

diversity, citizenship, and general education. Third, many faculty members and study abroad professionals would like to see male study abroad enrollment levels increase for practical reasons such as program logistics and planning. Fourth, pedagogical reasons exist for having a more diverse participant population. I discuss these factors more fully below.

In relation to the first point, numerous studies have cited the problem of male engagement in college, including the fact that men are less likely to attend, graduate from, and engage in leadership and academic activities while in college (Davis & Laker, 2004; Kimmel, 2008; Sax, 2008; Sax, 2007), including service learning (Finch, 1991). Although this study specifically looks at male engagement related to study abroad, the qualitative methods employed are based around a general theory of academic participation. This study is open to a variety of possibilities related to male participation decisions and allows for responses related to gender roles, academic constraints, athletics, family backgrounds, and peer pressure. This approach is especially important because, just as within study abroad, many theories exist about low male academic participation in college. Thus, my study may provide some insights that could be generalizable to broader theories of male engagement in college (Maxwell, 1992).

Second, professional organizations such as the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) have linked study abroad to aspects of experiential, liberal, civic, and general education. Many professionals view study abroad as an important and beneficial learning experience in its own right (Dwyer & Peters, 2004; Garraty et al., 1981), yet now AAC&U and others view study abroad as also a powerful way of advancing the values of a liberal education and educating students about diversity, critical

thinking, citizenship, and globalization (Hovland, 2006; Kirkwood, 2001; Stearns, 2009). AAC&U views intercultural and global knowledge as an essential aspect of a 21st Century education and has called for de-centering Western perspectives and content from the curriculum (Hovland, 2006; Cornwell & Stoddard, 2009).

Related to this idea, as more and more institutions seek to better integrate study abroad into the curriculum and highlight the importance of study abroad to student learning, they must also concern themselves with who participates in study abroad. If faculty members and curriculum committees use study abroad as a means of educating students about global issues, citizenship, and general education topics, then they must also have tools to engage diverse types of students in these activities. Related to this idea, as the world changes and the nature of education becomes more globally-focused, study abroad will move from an "extracurricular" dalliance to an essential part of a student's educational experience. If, as Kirkwood (2001) and others claim, being a well-educated, viable professional in the 21st century means having an international experience, then universities must consider how to promote participation among a greater number and type of students, including male students.

Third, from a practical stand-point, greater gender diversity matters while abroad. With many accommodations overseas being sex-specific, having lower numbers of male participants and large numbers of female participants can overwhelm or unbalance some accommodations' availability. Related to program logistics, some faculty members also desire having male students around for safety reasons in certain international locations, believing that a man in the group helps ward off threats and harassment. Also, Tyre

(2008) suggests that female students enjoy having male students present, and that female participation can drop if the number of males participating falls below 40%.

Finally, a better balance between male and female participants also makes sense for pedagogical reasons. Diverse participation brings more perspectives to the educational setting and assists with the social integration and development of the students (Hurtado & Carter, 1997). Just as students of color can feel isolated at predominantly white higher educational institutions (Hernandez, 2002), males can feel isolated while on study abroad if they are one of only a handful of other males. During a pilot study for this dissertation, male study abroad participants reported difficulty making friends and feelings of loneliness because they were one of only a few males on the program. One student described his involvement on a program with only three males, stating that he did not get along with the other two males, so he had to try and "fit in" with the female students.

For these reasons, Dr. Gary Rhodes, director of Loyola Marymount's Center for Global Education, believes "it is critical that students who study abroad mirror all the students who study at US colleges and universities" (Dessoff, 2006, p. 22). The Lincoln Commission report (2005) agreed with this statement, and its report indicated that the student demographic studying abroad does not accurately reflect current higher education enrollments. It believes that better integration of study abroad into all academic majors and lowering participation costs through scholarships would allow more U.S. students to participate.

Undoubtedly, lowering costs would help many students, especially those students with lower socio-economic statuses, but this action alone would not address the gender

imbalance because female students, not males, are more likely to be from lower socioeconomic backgrounds in college (Kimmel, 2008). Similarly, although males dominate certain fields and disciplines, such as technology and engineering, male participation in study abroad in these disciplines still lags behind female participation (Redden, 2008). Also, money alone cannot account for the low male engagement across higher education.

Hence, although action on the Lincoln recommendations would undoubtedly improve access for some students, no studies clearly link major selection and cost to lower male participation rates (Redden, 2008). In fact, as academic integration has expanded and relative program costs have decreased, male participation has actually declined slightly over time (Davis, 2008), so obviously the reasons for lower male participation and methods to increase males' participation are not well understood (Booker, 2001; Dessoff, 2006; Shirley, 2006; Redden) and thus unlikely to be fully explained or ameliorated by the Commission's recommendations. In an attempt to better understand the issue of male participation in study abroad, this study will use a mixed methods approach, using both analysis and on-line survey to which 2,040 students responded and personal interviews with 24 graduating male seniors to investigate the question: "why do traditionally-aged college males not participate in study abroad programs as often as females?"

Conceptual Framework

As a framework for understanding this problem, I employ an academic participation model based in the adult education literature. Although adult education theories are often associated with older individuals or adults returning for education and training, no actual age ranges define the field (Merriam, Caffarella, & Baumgartner, 2006). In fact, many theories and models within adult education include traditionallyaged college students within their design. More importantly, participation theory in adult education mirrors the questions posed in this study in relationship to study abroad. In their book, Merriam et al. write that:

Since participation in adult education is largely a voluntary activity, knowing who is participating, reasons for participating, and what conditions are likely to promote greater participation can help providers better serve adult learners. An understanding of participation patterns can also raise important questions about assumptions underlying what is offered, who is benefiting for participating, and whose needs are not being met. (p. 53)

Related to the problem posed in this dissertation, the words "study abroad" could easily replace "adult education." As with many adult education activities, study abroad is typically a voluntary pursuit, and as suggested by these authors, to engage with any voluntary activity, students must have certain motivations and overcome obstacles to their participation (Merriam et al.).

In Chapter 2, I provide detail about the literature related to participation in education, but for the purposes of the conceptual framework, I use a participation model designed by Henry and Basile (1994). This model (Figure 1, p. 10) describes their assessment of the decision-making process used by individuals regarding *voluntary*, *formal educational activities*, which conceptually include study abroad. This model is useful because it considers the numerous factors often associated with study abroad involvement, including the benefits associated with participation, information and marketing, program characteristics, obstacles, and institutional factors.





Based on Henry and Basile's model (1994), I have depicted my conceptual model for male participation in Figure 2 (p. 11). My model makes three important changes from the original. First, it links the information category with the reputation category by showing a relationship between these two areas, suggesting they are aspects of both external and internal participation factors. This change reflects the idea that study abroad's general reputation, and specifically for my institutional setting, influences the information individuals hear about study abroad. Also, it highlights that what a student hears externally does not necessarily equate with how they process it internally. In other words, some students might perceive the information and support given to them differently based on their personal characteristics and some students might be more or less influenced by the opinions provided by external information than other students.

Second, the information and reputation boxes are also connected back to personal characteristics directly, highlighting the influence of an individual's background on both what information they receive and how they interpret this information. This change reflects the critical theory and social capital literature related to participation (Merriam, et al., 2006), and it supports literature about minority student involvement, which indicates that these students face cultural barriers when seeking to participate in study abroad (Dessoff, 2006).

Third, this model shows more links between and among potential obstacles and the available information. These links illustrate the connection within study abroad related to how the programs are marketed and what study abroad professionals already know about student decision-making. In other words, study abroad offices understand that cost is a barrier, and they communicate—more or less effectively—with this factor in



Figure 2: Conceptual Study Abroad Participation Model (based on Henry & Basile, 1994)

mind. Showing connections backward and forward shows a better, more accurate interaction between students' needs and how the programs are marketed. Looking internally at obstacles, I also added links between the program attributes and potential obstacles, depicting the direct connection between these factors. For example, longer programs cost more and have more potential to delay graduation or interfere with other activities than shorter programs.

I adapted this model based on Henry and Basile's (1994) model's applicability to my study. Like me, they wanted to understand why some individuals did or did not participate in formal, university course offerings. Like my study, their design allowed for various motivations, obstacles, and personal characteristics to influence an individual's decision. Finally, they empirically studied their model and supported it with theory; their model has also been cited in other studies about participation. In the next chapter, I provide additional background on participation as specifically related to education and service learning. Then, in Chapter 3, I discuss my research methods and illustrate how the conceptual model based on this literature fits into the design of my study (see Figure 3 in Chapter 3 on p. 82).

Dissertation Overview

In the next chapter, I will review the relevant literature related to my problem, including research about study abroad—both its value and participation issues, participation studies, and I conclude Chapter Two by connecting information about study abroad and participation to theory about the target population in question by providing an overview of studies about males in college and gender roles. This literature provides important insight on males, specifically as related to what they might think and believe

about study abroad, how they are motivated to participation, and their perceptions of the obstacles they might encounter. These three literature bases serve as a foundation and a launching point for this study, and I revisit them in Chapter 6 during my analysis.

In Chapter Three, I discuss a pilot study I used to begin the conceptualization of this study. I also explain the mixed methods design I used to investigate the problem of low male participation, which involves a sequential explanatory design. In a sequential design, the researcher uses a first phase to help inform a second phase of research, typically mixing quantitative and qualitative methods. For this study, I combined an analysis of a large-scale study abroad survey and one-on-one interviews with 24 male students at a large research university in the Midwest. This chapter also elaborates on the conceptual model introduced in this chapter.

Chapters Four and Five present the data from the research effort. First, Chapter Four presents the results of the institutional survey I analyzed as the first phase of this study. Specifically, it presents chi-square, ANOVA, and factor analysis data related to the following domains as suggested by the conceptual framework:

- Institutional and Programmatic characteristics, including length of program, timing of program, courses offered on the program, and cost;
- Situational factors such as students' perception of study abroad as conflicting with internships or work, athletics, student involvement, and graduation timelines;
- Some dispositional characteristics included in the original survey, including issues such as fun, safety, and health factors as motivators or barriers; and

• Informational and support factors such as students' knowledge and perception of the institution's, parents', and peers' messages concerning study abroad.

Then in Chapter Five, I present a summary of the second, qualitative phase of the research, which involved personal interviews with 24 male seniors. I organize this chapter around the four research questions associated with this phase of my inquiry:

- Factors related to social capital, such as family educational and economic background as suggested by McClenaghan (2000); and
- Informational factors focusing on male's perceptions of the reputation of, messages about, and support for study abroad that they receive from their institution, parents, and peers;
- Dispositional factors related to male's development, maturity, as well as their sense of risk and safety; and
- Dispositional factors such as males' opinion of careers and work, goals, and motivations (or lack thereof) for participation.

Finally in Chapter Six, I present an integrated discussion of the data from both phases of the study in terms of my overall findings. I also discuss the connection between the findings and the literature in terms of themes, as well as offer recommendations for action related to the issue of male participation on study abroad. In concluding, I discuss the limitations of this study and the needs for future research building on my work.

Chapter 2: Review of Literature

This chapter reviews three bodies of literature as they relate to low male study abroad participation. First, I discuss study abroad specifically, in terms of its benefits for students and studies conducted about participation. This section provides some insight on participation studies more specific to this study's problem and addresses why study abroad is an important aspect of the undergraduate experience. Second, I review the broader literature about participation in voluntary educational programs to provide a context for the issue of educational participation broadly. Finally, I summarize the literature-base about males as a means of providing a context for the gender issues related to participation. This section provides the background for understanding how participation motivations and obstacles might vary by sex and/or gender.

Study Abroad Literature

Much of the research done in study abroad is theoretical or small-scale in nature, and even when larger, more inferential studies are conducted, they generally lack consistency in design, definition, measurement, and focus between institutions. Thus, as a field, study abroad lacks not only in substance but in the continuity of its research agenda. Increasingly, professional groups seek to provide a more solid basis for understanding study abroad, usually in the context of learning assessment and outcomes. As campus internationalization efforts become more and more common in higher education, academic leaders are looking to study abroad to provide valuable learning outcomes for their students. In the following section, I provide a summary of the major studies within study abroad, emphasizing issues related to teaching and learning abroad and participation.

Student Learning and Study Abroad

To understand the potential motivations and barriers to study abroad participation, an understanding of study abroad itself is important; however, the majority of the literature on study abroad emphasizes student learning from a few fragmented surveys implemented to quantify the activity's value. Referencing this literature-base against the current political and institutional calls for increased global awareness and international skills among undergraduates, the literature often portrays study abroad as providing the workforce skills needed by today's students and highlights the importance of study abroad as an aspect of higher education internationalization efforts (Deardorff, 2006; Kirkwood, 2001). A summary of empirical studies related to study abroad indicates that study abroad does benefit students beyond the resume. Studies show that study abroad benefits students' learning in one or more of the following three general domains: academic knowledge and skills, personal growth, and intercultural sensitivity (Carlson, Burn, Useem, & Yachimowicz, 1990; Dwyer & Peters, 2004; Erwin & Colman, 1998; Garraty, et al. 1981; Ingraham & Peterson, 2004; Kauffmann, Martin, & Weaver, 1992; Opper, Teichler, & Carlson, 1990; Sell, 1983).

First, Garraty et al. (1981) and Kauffmann et al. (1992) indicate that study abroad provides important knowledge-based skills. They believe that learning occurs best in a relevant context, and various studies state that studying abroad increases understanding and retention of language abilities and content-knowledge related to one's major or career goals (Carlson et al., 1990; Dwyer & Peters, 2004; Ingraham & Peterson, 2004; Opper et al., 1990). Although study abroad traditionally served language learners, Garraty et al. show that learning abroad can benefit all disciplines by providing an experiential context

(Dewey, 1963). For example, students in environmental policy could gain a better understanding of water shortages by visiting drought-ridden Australia. In addition, Carlson et al. indicate that students who study abroad demonstrate increased ability to integrate concepts from other disciplines into their thinking, so architectural and engineering students might gain an appreciation for the cultural factors influencing design, thus learning to think beyond science alone.

Although gains in academic ability are significant on study abroad programs, Ingraham and Peterson (2004) also report a potential for negative academic learning due to the presence of intervening variables such as program structure, student preparation, and the availability of alcohol and drugs. Their study shows that if a program is too short or faculty members do not adequately prepare students for intercultural interactions and learning, students might not need to confront—or could have a negative reaction to cultural differences and thus reinforce stereotypes (Bennett, 1993). Similarly, if alcohol and drugs are readily available to students, study abroad may facilitate or engender a vacation-like atmosphere, decreasing academic motivation and learning.

The second domain of positive effects from study abroad is the improvement in personal growth, which includes the students' confidence, maturity and self-reliance, ability to work with others, ability to clarify values, and willingness to accept new ideas (Carlson et al., 1990; Erwin & Coleman, 1998; Ingraham & Peterson, 2004; Kauffmann et al., 1992; Opper et al., 1990). Navigating life in a foreign culture necessarily challenges students on a daily basis, requiring them to find new ways to perform typically simple tasks such as asking for directions. If they can successfully live in such an environment, they achieve a greater sense of confidence and self-esteem (Garraty et al.,

1981). Dwyer and Peters (2004) report a 98% increase in students' self-confidence after one year abroad and suggest that programs longer than six weeks result in significantly more growth in this domain than shorter programs.

Third, research shows improvement in students' intercultural sensitivity in three areas: their interest in global issues, their ability to interpret ideas from different perspectives, and their ability to have empathy and relate to difference (Carlson et al., 1990; Dwyer & Peters, 2004; Erwin & Coleman, 1998; Ingraham & Peterson, 2004; Kauffmann et al.; Medina-López-Portillo, 2004; Opper et al., 1990; Sell, 1983). Researchers believe that through comparison of their home culture to their host culture, students gain a better appreciation of both by expanding their overall understanding of the world in a broader context (Dwyer & Peters; Kauffmann et al.; Kirkwood, 2001; Sell). Erwin and Coleman and Kauffmann et al. also suggest that students begin to question their native culture as they interact with the new ideas, lifestyles, and standards experienced in the host culture. Ingraham and Peterson's (2004) study shows that of all the outcome domains, intercultural development increased the most regardless of intervening factors such as program structure or duration.

Recently, work by Dolby (2004, 2005, 2007) suggests that an important learning outcome from study abroad occurs in relationship to students' sense of their own national identity. By going abroad, U.S. students come home with a clearer understanding of their American identity (Dolby, 2004), and her comparisons of U.S. and Australian students suggest that this learning domain might be stronger for Americans, who have often never questioned or considered their national identity (Dolby, 2005). Her latest work suggests that in a post-9/11 world, students' awareness of their identity is generally more
heightened than before 2001; however, the students must now work harder to manage their American identity vis-à-vis the host culture and its perceptions of Americans (Dolby, 2007).

Participation in Study Abroad

Beyond the emphasis on learning outcomes from study abroad, the available study abroad literature devotes considerable attention to questions about why students decide whether to participate in study abroad. As noted in the introduction, current study abroad participation rates do not mirror higher education's current enrollment demographics, and research indicates that more students express an interest in study abroad than actually participate (Booker, 2001; Chiefflo, 2000). For these reasons, understanding how and why students choose to pursue education abroad is important.

Booker (2001) conducted a survey of study abroad participants and nonparticipants to determine why students who expressed interest in study abroad during their first year of school never applied. To test his ideas about who decides to study abroad, he analyzed and compared responses from a group of students who participated on study abroad and a group who did not participate based on a model of consumer choice. This model proposes that students evaluate their options and base their decisions on the availability of information and other influences—such as students' personal background, the availability of other opportunities, and institutional, parental, and peer support for study abroad.

Based on this institutional survey (2001), Booker found that applicants were most likely to be middle-class, majority, females and less likely to be students who rely significantly on financial aid or work as a means of funding their education. Applicants

were also more likely to start planning for study abroad early, and they showed more interest in cultural immersion and foreign language study than non-applicants. Booker also found that non-applicants were more likely to be double-majors and students with concerns about cost and academics, such as delay of graduation. Booker's findings support the study abroad literature in terms of these demographic profiles and perceived obstacles (Dessoff, 2006); however, he did not analyze his data by gender to indicate if males were more or less likely to have concerns about cost or curriculum.

Chiefflo (2001) conducted a similar study seeking to understand why students study abroad by surveying classes with high numbers of potential participants (i.e., foreign language majors). She found that most students chose to participate to have fun, to have a cultural experience, and to help their career. Students who did not participate cited lack of time because of other obligations and cost as major factors. Concern over security and unsupportive family members were not cited as major obstacles for students; however, her research did find that peer and family opinion weighed heavily on student's decision-making.

This study indicated that 20% of students hear about study abroad for the first time from a peer, and 66% of students seek out programmatic advice and information from peers when making a decision about study abroad. This finding implies that, generally, family and friends play a positive role in influencing students regarding study abroad and might highlight a potential reason why fewer men participate. If fewer men participate in study abroad programs, then male students have fewer male friends and family members to serve as role-models and from whom to seek advice about the topic.

This idea will be explored more fully in the section below concerning male participation rates generally within education.

Shirley (2006) conducted one of the only participation studies that included sex as a major variable. This study critiques the commonly held belief that males, who dominate science and engineering enrollments, participate less often because study abroad did not fit with their curriculum because, as noted by Davis (2007), science and engineering fields are among the fastest growing within study abroad. Shirley indicates that scientific fields accounted for 12.9% of study abroad in 2004, which exceeded the 7.7% rate in 1986. Despite this upturn, male participation decreased slightly during the same period. Based on this premise, Shirley surveyed male and female students at 14 western universities who went abroad to look for significant "motivating factors that influences them to pursue a study abroad experience" (Shirley, p. 63).

Generally, this study supports many of the findings found by more general surveys of participants, and, with few exceptions, finds that male and female participants responded similarly to most measures. One significant difference between males and females related to the influence of parents, with males reporting a 22% and females an 11% disagreement with the statement that their parents positively influenced their decision to study abroad. Conversely, males reported a 53% and females reported a 66% agreement with this statement. Similar findings resulted from questions related to grandparents and other non-sibling relatives.

A second area of significant difference involved perceptions of barriers to participation. In this area, males were less likely than females (49% to 65%) to view study abroad as conflicting with internship or work opportunities. Similarly, males

expressed significantly less concern than females (68% to 87%) about cost as a barrier to participation. In terms of delaying graduation, the situation was reversed, with males twice as likely (10% to 5%) to report a need to delay graduation as a result of study abroad participation. These findings are interesting, as they refute anecdotal information that males would view work opportunities and money as a potential barrier to studying abroad (Dessoff, 2006), yet they support findings that college men tend to be better off financially than women (Kimmel, 2008) and the belief that male-dominated fields such as engineering allow less time for study abroad, requiring a delay of graduation (Dessoff; Lincoln Commission, 2005; Redden, 2008).

Finally, Gore (2005) used the oldest ongoing study abroad program in the United States, Junior Year Abroad offered by the University of Delaware and Sweet Briar College, as a means of examining the current state of study abroad discourse with an emphasis on gender. Like other researchers, Gore recognizes the importance of study abroad and acknowledges the lack of male participation as a historic trend. Using discourse analysis, Gore analyzed major assumptions that dominate study abroad writings, both formally and informally. She states that the lack of male participation in study abroad allows faculty and administrators to marginalize study abroad as an additive, female-orientated option within U.S. higher education on multiple levels.

First, she believes that when people recognize "that women predominate as study abroad participants" they "associate that recognition with the cultural assumption that women's search for education is not as serious as that of men" (pp. 43-44). Beyond the statement about females' education, Gore goes on to explain that study abroad is also viewed as frivolous because of disciplinary factors. Citing Briggs and Burn (1985, p. 52),

Gore believes that the link between gender role and field of study implies "that more women than men study abroad as undergraduates and more in humanities than in professional fields may exacerbate the perception that undergraduate study abroad lacks in seriousness of purpose" (as cited by Gore, p. 44).

As part of her study, Gore (2005) reported survey findings from the Junior Year Abroad program, and these findings clearly show the historic nature of low male participation. Based on data from 1949 through 2004, females comprised 75% of the program's participants. Not only has the overall trend indicated strong female participation, but the general trend over time indicates decreasing male participation. During the 1948-1949 school year, male and female participation was almost equal at 33 and 34 participants respectively. By 2003-2004 though, females increased to 102 participants and males decreased to 12 participants (Gore).

One factor overlooked by Gore is that after World War II, primary administration of the program transferred from University of Delaware to Sweet Briar, a female-only college. Even though the program is coeducational and intercollegiate, the influence of its administrative home should have been addressed as it could influence how males perceive it. Despite this issue though, the Junior Year Abroad program does offer survey data of its participants. In 1995 and 2004, Gore surveyed 20% of the alumni of the program from 1948-49 through 1994-95, and subsequently 1994-95 through 2003-04. In both cases, the response rate to the survey was between 20 and 23%, a low figure that the author explains as related to the address records maintained by the college.

As with the other surveys discussed in this paper, Gore (2005) does not analyze the data for significant differences, but she does highlight the large differences between

factors based on sex. Some of the information points relevant to this discussion are included in Table 1 (see Appendix A, p. 271), which suggests that males could be influenced by male faculty members and peers more than females, yet males seem to receive fewer negative messages about study abroad from faculty than females. Along similar lines, males seem to be slightly more interested in gaining independence than females, but males appear less worried about academics than females.

Gore's survey (2005) highlights some interesting trends based on the previous research. It supports the stereotypes that males are career-focused and females are more interested in cultural pursuits. Second, it shows that females, not males, might be more influenced by the message that study abroad is not a valuable academic pursuit, and third, it suggests that referrals from same-gendered professionals, peers, and parents might be different for men than for women. This point is supported by Redden (2008), who reports that because most study abroad participants are women, Offices of Study Abroad tend to create marketing materials that target women—their main audience.

Finally, Gore's study (2005) suggests some participation differences by major, because females dominated the survey response rates, yet few females pursue technical degrees when compared to males. This idea makes sense based on college enrollment rates by major (Sax, 2008), but less sense when looking at the majors represented on study abroad (Shirley, 2006). As Redden (2008) states, the curriculum offered on study abroad has diversified considerably, with physical and life sciences rates increasing about 14.5% and engineering rates about 13% in 2007. Given these increases, one would expect these male-dominated fields to bolster male participation in study abroad, yet although 80% of engineers are males, 40% of engineers studying abroad are female according to

the Global Engineering Education Exchange (Redden). In the end, without tests for statistical significance, statements either way cannot be verified. The lack of empirical rigor with this survey and others highlights a major deficit within the study abroad literature-base.

Strengths and Limitations of the Study Abroad Literature

The primary weakness within the study abroad research are the methods employed to conduct the work. Carlson et al. (1990) and Dwyer (2004) suggest that reporting learning outcomes is problematic for three reasons. First, many studies rely on quantitative methods, which might poorly measure these concepts. Second, many studies rely on self-reported data so what one student defines as learning does not necessarily equal the same quality or quantity of learning reported by another student. Finally, the time between the experience and the reporting can positively distort perceptions. For these reasons, several studies (Carlson et al.; Erwin & Coleman, 1998; Ingraham & Peterson, 2004; Kauffmann et al., 1992; Opper et al., 1990) have called for the increased use of qualitative methods to supplement the use of surveys. Also, as noted in the section above, many studies rely on raw data and do not perform statistical analyses to investigate the power, meaning, or relationships between variables. Without these analyses and proper controls over potentially intervening variables, the quantitative data available lacks validity.

A second limitation cited by Carlson et al. (1990) and Dwyer (2004) involves the use of, or rather the lack of, theory in study abroad research. As illustrated by the studies cited in this paper, no general guiding principles or theories exist across the research. Instead of building off each other's work, many researchers conduct studies with similar

purposes locally, using slightly different methods and research questions that do not connect to one another or to the broader field of international education. Even after conducting their research, few scholars have attempted to relate their findings back to each other or the literature. In the studies presented in this paper, some ideas about male participation were supported, others seemingly refuted, and some ideas had mixed results. Small sample sizes might explain part of this situation, as too would the populations studied. In most cases, the only volunteers used for the research were participants. When looking at reasons for why a particular student may or may not participate, it seems warranted to make more of an effort to talk with the "non-converted."

Beyond these two limitations, the study abroad literature does not include many modern theories related to student learning, identity, and development commonly used within education. Some theorists base their assumptions about study abroad on experiential learning theories by Dewey (1963) and Kolb (1984), but none of the empirical studies actively employed these theories—or their updated counterparts within their conceptual frameworks. Thus, these experiential writers, while foundational, also represented a dated and male-orientated theory base. More recent thinking, for example, the work by Gilligan (1993) provides new insight on issues of sex, gender, and learning and suggests that males and females might develop cognitively through different—yet similar—processes.

Hence, gender-based educational research represents an important literature-base for understanding why male students do and do not participate in study abroad, yet this domain is almost wholly absent from study abroad research. Even Shirley's study (2006), which emphasizes gender, does not use theories related to gender differences within its

literature review or conceptual framework. As such, his study and others have looked at differences between males and females in a gender-neutral context, not considering how concepts such as gender roles and masculinity might influence student behaviors. In an attempt to address this limitation within the study abroad literature, I use the next sections of this paper to summarize the issue of participation broadly and engagement, gender roles, and identity from a gendered perspective.

Participation in Adult Education

Although often associated with older students and working adults, the field of adult education has no strict age range or definition of "adulthood" it uses to bound its work; however, it does emphasize the voluntary nature of the educational pursuit, whether conduced formally, informally, or virtually (Merriam, Caffarela, & Baumgartner, 2006). Participation studies arose within this field as a means of describing why individuals pursue continuing education to provide understanding for funding and policy decisions related to adult education (Merriam et al.), as well as to understand better individual motivations to promote educational participation as a means of enhancing human capacity (Henry & Basile, 1994).

In the United States, the majority of participation studies use social science disciplines as their theoretical foundation, especially psychology and, more recently, sociology (Henry & Basile, 1994; Merriam et al., 2006). Most modern studies consider the potential barriers and motivations to participation based on individual characteristics using a psychological perspective. Newer research considers the social dimension of participation based on sociological theories and in some instances uses a critical

perspective to highlight how socio-economic, ethnic, and racial factors influence interest in and access to adult education.

Johnstone and Rivera (1965) conducted one of the first survey studies of participation in voluntary, adult education, and their initial findings have been confirmed over time by other studies (Henry & Basile, 1994; Valentine, 1997). They conducted their study with the National Opinion Research Center in Chicago in an attempt to describe and assess participation in adult education activities. They established that most adult learners are young, urban, and well-educated. Their study also indicated that the major emphasis for their participation was to learn a job-related skill (Johnstone & Rivera).

In 1997 the United Nations Education, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), conducted a large international survey related to participation in adult education, finding that about 41% of Americans participate in some form of voluntary education (Valentine, 1997). The study also confirms trends in participation cited in other studies, indicating that since the first studies conducted in the 1960s, participation in adult education has changed from: (1) being dominated by men to nearly equal participation rates by men and women and (2) a balance of professional and personaldevelopment orientated offerings to mostly career-related offerings (Valentine).

Using this data, Valentine (1997) analyzed participants' characteristics to identify some motivations and barriers to participation. His findings state that individuals who participated in adult education tend to be: young, well-educated, urban adults who are employed in larger, technical organizations or students seeking to improve their skills. Furthermore, he found that individuals who had highly educated parents and an interest in reading, social interaction, and cultural engagement were also more likely to participate.

As expected, non-participant characteristics mirrored the opposite of participants, with non-participants more likely to be older, less educated, rural, and unemployed. Nonparticipants are also more likely to watch a lot of television (Valentine).

In 2006, the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES, 2006) published its latest national telephone survey during which they asked people about their participation in adult education over the last calendar year. For the first time, this NCES survey distinguished between formal activities that included the presence of an instructor and informal activities pursued out of personal interest. The findings indicated that 44% of participants pursued formal educational activities, with most of the participation in formal activities related to work (27%). Of the participants involved in formal educational endeavors, 95% reported doing so to maintain or improve current skills, 83% stated that they wanted to learn new skills, 19% stated that they sought a raise or promotion, and 10% sought a new job entirely (NCES).

Like earlier surveys, the NCES data shows that participation in adult education is related to educational and socio-economic factors. Younger, well-educated, and higher income individuals with professional positions are more likely to participate in adult education (NCES, 2006). As reported for the first time in the 2001 survey (Merriam et al., 2006), the 2006 study showed a difference in participation between males and females, with females participating at a rate of 47% as compared to 41% for males. Both groups engaged more in formal opportunities—such as for credit courses—and males had a slightly larger gap in participation based on format. In other words, the study reports that males participated in formal versus informal at a rate of 24% to 18% and females participated at rates of 29% to 24% (NCES).

Motivation to Participate

When considering motivation to participate in adult education, most studies find that people participate for professional reasons (Henry & Basile, 1994; Johnstone & Rivera, 1965; Merriam et al., 2006; Valentine, 1997). Valentine's study indicates that 90.6% of U.S. respondents reported pursuing education for career and professional reasons and 9.4% responded that they chose to participate for personal interests. Of these respondents, 58% sought to upgrade or advance their career and almost 24% sought to earn a degree or educational certification of some kind. This data supports findings by NCES surveys, Merriam et al., and Johnstone and Rivera's studies. Valentine also states that adults who pursue adult education are more likely to have "unfulfilled learning goals" (p. 106) when compared to non-participants. He explains this finding as indicating that some individuals have a motivation to learn and improve themselves that leads to their continued participation in education, with other individuals not having any desire to learn.

Houle (1961) conducted one of the first motivational studies on adult learners, and he would classify this on-going desire for education as a learning-orientation. Using interviews, Houle established three motivational categories: (1) goals-orientation, which refers to someone in pursuit of an end-goal such as a new job, raise, or promotion; (2) activity-orientation, which refers to someone motivated by an interest to engage in an activity or social interaction related to an activity; and (3) learning-orientation, which refers to a person motivated to learn for the sake of self-improvement and knowledge. Boshier (1977) developed the Education Participation Scale as a means of studying Houle's theory by measuring participants' motivations for attendance. Boshier and others

(Boshier & Collins, 1985; Fujita-Starck, 1996) have since refined Houle's categories into sub-divisions, including the desire to conform to social expectations, the desire to serve the welfare of others, the desire to escape reality or be stimulated, etc. Although these studies indicate potential sub-categories to Houle's work that more precisely describe motivation, they generally support his original theory (Henry & Basile, 1994).

Barriers to Participation

Beyond understanding motivation to learn, several studies have also sought to understand barriers to participation, because "knowing why adults participate in informal adult education does not tell us why many do not" (Merriam et al., 2006, p. 65). In fact, understanding obstacles can be more important than understanding motivation because often institutional policies and services can help ameliorate potential obstacles (Henry & Basile, 1994) better than they can motivate individuals to participate. Johnstone and Rivera (1965) originally classified participation barriers as falling into one of two categories: external situational factors and internal dispositional factors. Situational factors include issues external to the individual such as time and money, whereas internal factors involve dispositional facets of the individual such as his or her interests and selfconfidence.

Johnstone and Rivera (1965) indicated that the most common barriers to participation were the external factors of cost (43%) and time (39%). Valentine (1997) found that based on these two categories, men tended to be more influenced by work, specifically that an activity interferes with their work, and women tended to be more influenced by family, such as the needs of their children. He also found that according to his data, when the learning activity is not associated with work or career, time barriers

rose from 45% to 60% and cost barriers actually decreased from 33% to 25% (Valentine). This finding shows a link between how individuals' assessments of barriers to their participation relate to their interests and motivations.

Cross (1981) added a third category to Johnstone and Rivera's (1965) framework, emphasizing institutional factors, which include issues such as the purpose of the course, length of the class period, location of the opportunity, amount of time and work required to complete the class, etc. Darkenwald and Merriam (1982) also revised the original binary classification by breaking the dispositional category into two sub-categories: informational and psychosocial. These authors distinguish between what individuals believe to be true about the opportunity (i.e., they think that they are too old to participate) and the actual access to or availability of information about opportunities (i.e., they did not know the opportunity existed).

Building from earlier studies, Valentine and Darkenwalk (1990) state that barriers to participation can be aggregated into six main categories, which they defined as: lack of confidence; lack of course relevance; lack of time; low personal priority; cost; and personal or situational problems (e.g., birth of a child, death of a parent). As suggested by the differentials in participation rate by participant characteristics, Cross (1981) and others (Hall & Donaldson, 1997; Henry & Basile, 1994) have linked such barriers to personal characteristics, showing that various individuals or groups of people experience these obstacles differently. For example, women and older adults tend to have less confidence in their ability to learn than men or younger people; single mothers tend to have more interest in pursuing formal education than married women, but often experience greater situational problems related to child care and cost; men tend to put a

lower priority on informal learning for personal interest than women; and low-income, poorly-paid individuals face more cost, information, and access barriers than white-collar workers. Interest in understanding how barriers might influence specific groups led to the increased use of sociological perspectives when studying participation.

Sociological Focus

Since the 1960s, participation studies have focused on the individual, psychological-level of analysis; however, newer research suggests that this emphasis limits understanding of the social nature of and obstacles to participation (Merriam et al., 2006). Prior to the modern studies cited above, researchers emphasized social nature of participation and its relationship to civic life (Courtney, 1992). Social participation refers to the extent to which an individual engages in civic and family groups, and studies suggest that if a person is active socially, they might also be interested in learning socially (Benn, 1997). This research vein has implications for how and where to market adult learning, suggesting that accessing existing groups might be more effective than contacting random people because it reaches individuals already interested in social participation.

In addition to linking educational participation with social participation, critical theorists have made connections between participation and sociological factors such as race, ethnicity, and socio-economic background (Merriam et al., 2006). As suggested already, many scholars have noted differences between participants based on certain demographic characteristics (NCES, 2006); however, using a sociological lens on the issue offers a more complete picture of the problem (Henry & Basile, 1994). For example, ethnic and racial minorities might not necessarily be less interested in

participation, but as a group they might face a lack of programming relevant to their needs, a lack of institutional support for their participation, increased barriers (e.g., lack of transportation or funding), or as McClenaghan (2000) suggests, a lack of social capital.

Generally, social capital refers to an individual's place within society based on their relationships with others (Kirpatrick, Field, & Falk, 2001). More expansive definitions describe social capital as both the resources and deficits experienced by a group as they seek to use social networks to achieve desired goals (Hibbitt, Jones, & Meegan, 2001; McClenaghan, 2000). Furthermore, Putnam (1993) states that the effects of social capital can influence both individuals within a group and the group as a collective. Highlighted in terms of its applicability to community development (Kirkpatrick et al.), collective benefits relate to how social networks help entire groups or demographics of people reach their goals. For example, beyond an individual learning a skill, the skill coming back into the community might improve the overall status of all people, not just the person who received the training.

Although not specifically related to social capital, Fouts conducted a survey of 1500 students at Western Michigan and Wichita universities to determine why students were not joining the institutions' fraternity and sorority system (Fouts, 2009; Moltz, 2009). The inquiry was an attempt to understand why some of these organizations were having difficulty attracting and retaining new members. Based on the data, these **Professionals** report three broad findings, each of which relate to sociological issues and **some** differences between males and females. First, the group found that many students had pre-conceptions about fraternities and sororities from friends, media, and former **members**. Interestingly, male students were more likely to receive information from

interpersonal sources and female students were more likely to receive information from television and movies (Fouts).

Second, when looking at the factors that lead to participation, the findings show that messages about peers, peers joining, and positive social interactions were important decision-making factors. In fact, 67% of students sought out a Greek letter organization to make new friends and 48% wanted to engage in the "social scene" (Moltz, 2009). Finally, Fouts (2009) reported that many students did not participate in fraternity and sorority recruitment because of time and money constraints, which they related to a lack of benefit (68%). When asked what could have changed their opinions, 36% stated that they needed more information about the benefits of membership (Moltz, 2009).

This study represents an interesting transition between the sociological and conceptual models of participation. It suggests that peer groups, social norms, and media all factor into students' decision-making regarding participation. Second, this study's findings relate to specific categories mentioned within participation studies as influencing students. For example, peer and media messages relate to the information students have about participation and shapes their attitudes toward the activity. Similarly, the concern over time and money can be equated to students' specific situations, with some students having less time and monetary resources than others. Finally, the perception of value is both an informational and dispositional concern, with different students desiring different outcomes. I discuss these issues in greater detail in the next section.

Conceptual Models of Participation

Over the last forty years, several authors have developed conceptual models as a means of explaining and testing participation theories. For example, Miller (1967)

created a force-field analysis model that depicts the positive forces supporting and negative forces opposing educational choices. Another model, the Psychosocial Interaction Model (Darkenwald & Merriam, 1982), emphasizes the influences of sociological forces, such as socio-economic and social pressure, on educational decisionmaking during phases of an individual's life. This theory argues that socio-economic status and social influences from pre-adulthood affect individuals' opinions about education during adulthood.

In the context of this study regarding males' decisions to participate on study abroad, Henry and Basile's (1994) Decision Model (see Figure 1, p. 10) offers a useful conceptual tool. They base their work on a survey of 138 student participants and 180 non-participants in a university adult education course as a means of understanding "the influence of factors expected to distinguish between" participants and non-participants (p. 69). In their design, they define non-participants as individuals who had inquired about participation and expressed an interest in participating, but did not enroll. Their model includes five categories that they thought would distinguish these groups: (1) motivation to enroll, (2) informational resources, (3) program (course) characteristics, (4) obstacles to participation—both situational and institutional, and (5) institutional support and culture. Within their model, they also account for individual and sociological differences between respondents—including age, sex, race, educational background, income, family background, etc.—as a potential influence on decision-making.

Their analysis indicates six significant differences between participants and nonparticipants, which they list in order of strength. In the following list, negative influences are those that "increase the odds of non participation" (p. 77): (1) a negative influence of

meeting people as a motivator; (2) a negative factor of general interest in the course; (3) a negative factor of paying course fees; (4) a positive factor of getting information sent through the mail to their work; (5) a negative influence of a major life change within the last year; (6) a negative factor of institutional deterrents, such as lack of parking, fees, registration method, etc.

The study also highlights important findings related to comparisons between the descriptive and interpretive data. First, although the analysis shows meeting people as a negative influence on participation, it was ranked highly by non-participants as an important factor for their interest. The authors state that this finding may indicate that although non-participants value the social interaction provided by their participation, this desire is not enough to get them to enroll (Henry & Basile, 1994). They go on to explain that non-participants can find other outlets for their social participation, including sports or social clubs. Similarly, the non-participants indicated a general interest in the course, a factor that included them in the original sample and an understanding of the course's relationship to career showed as weak motivators during analysis (Henry & Basile). The authors relate these differences to the influence of fees. Individuals who had their employer pay part or all of their course fees were more likely to participate. Hence, the cost barrier was an overriding factor, stronger than certain weak motivators.

Finally, regarding institutional deterrents and reputation, the authors report that information and setting are important variables to individual decision-making. In regards to institutional deterrents, they state that a lack of information or understanding about how to navigate the system can tip the scales toward non-participation. They write that:

the implication is that non-participants see the related costs and nuisance factors associated with participation as more of a burden than those who are participating....the differences again lie at the margin. Those who are marginally interested may allow potential inconveniences to lead them to not enroll (Henry & Basile, 1994, p. 79)

Related to the institutional barriers, the authors argue that, although not a significant factor in this study, institutional reputation should be accounted for in future studies. They believe that the generally positive perception of the institution used in their study did not allow for significant differences to emerge on this variable.

Participation in Service Learning

One of the more established areas of participation studies involves students' participation in volunteer and service learning programs. Like study abroad, these activities are known to provide many valuable learning outcomes for students, including increased satisfaction with school, decreased drop-out rates, increased empathy and civic awareness, as well as increased self-esteem, confidence, and emotional stability (Finch, 1991). Serow, Ciechalski, and Daye (1990) also suggest that service experiences as a youth lead to an attitude of service that stays with an individual throughout their lifetime, a factor that Marks and Kuss (2001) connect to fostering engagement in the greater demographic society.

Generally, the literature summarizes the motivations to participate in service learning using three main concepts (Allen, 1982; Finch, 1987 & 1991; Phillips, 1982; White, 1981):

1. Social obligation—owing something to society based on a sense of privilege;

- 2. Egoistic-volunteering brings personal and/or professional benefits; and
- 3. Altruistic—volunteering to help others.

Although service learning is a valuable learning experience, as with study abroad, service participation rates do not equal reported interest rates, and females are over-represented amongst the students participating in service (Finch, 1991). Hence, researchers seek to determine why the gap exists by understanding student motivation to participate.

Unlike study abroad, service learning researchers have conducted many empirical studies to determine the factors that motivate students to participate in service-learning programs, and generally, these studies build upon one another in coherent ways. In most cases, the studies have found that students participate in service for many different reasons based on the context and their background. Generally though, most studies state that students start or first-begin their service experience for primarily egoistic reasons: they want something of value from their participation, such as the feeling of helping others, gaining credit, making friends, meeting people, etc. Over time though, many researchers report that continued participation leads to altruistic and social obligation values (Ender, Martin, Cotter, Masteller-Kowalewski, & Defiore, 2000; Jones & Hill, 2003;Marks & Jones, 2004; Marks & Kuss, 2001; Marotta & Nashman, 1998; Serow, 1991; Serow, Ciechalski, & Daye, 1990).

Studies on Males and Gender

Typically, females have conducted most of the studies about gender, and these studies have focused on issues related to females (Connell, Hearn, & Kimmel, 2005; Kimmel, 2008; Weaver-Hightower, 2003). Recently, though, the purposeful study of males has gained increasing attention within education and the popular media (Connell et al.; Jacob, 2002; Sax, 2007; Sax, 2008; Sommers, 2000). Modern research about males recognizes that earlier studies conducted with or about male participants were genderneutral and thus not really studies about males or what it means to be a man.

This study seeks to investigate why males do not participate in study abroad at levels equivalent to those of females, so a broad understanding of the men's study field is an important aspect of the literature. In keeping with this literature, I have used the terms male and female to refer to individuals' sex roles and used the terms man and woman when referring to gender-related concepts. In Chapter 5, the reader may note that the students' quotes use the terms man and women to refer to both the sex group and gendered ideas. I have left their language intact. I also note that the purpose of this study is not to enter into the specific debates surrounding the conceptualizations of gender; therefore, in this section I summarize the discussions within the literature as a means of acknowledging them and situating this study within them.

In the following two sections, I provide an overview of the major areas of research about males according to how Weaver-Hightower (2003) has classified them. Although she discusses them as four groups, I collapse them into two groups. First, I discuss the more formal, theoretical studies about males, which she refers to as theory studies. These studies often seek to understand and define concepts such as gender, identity, and masculinity. Second, I present studies focused on analyzing educational data and offering advice public policy, which Weaver-Hightower describes as popularrhetorical, policy orientated, and feminist response areas. After these overviews, I delve more deeply into what this literature-base suggests about male engagement as related to study abroad participation.

Theoretical Studies about Gender, Gender Identity, & Gender Roles

Historically, gender has been thought about as an aspect of human evolution, identity development, and socialization (Connell et al., 2005; Messner, 1990), with more current studies describing gender roles as socially-constructed, non-static concepts (Buchbinder, 1994; Messner, 1990). Connell et al. state that the concept of gender originally became of interest to anthropologists during the colonial period as females began to receive more rights and researchers began to compare cultures based on their gender roles and norms. From this aspect, researchers considered concepts of gender as an aspect of a culture's evolution. Primitive cultures had strict, distinct roles for males and females. As cultures "progressed" over time, the lines between males and females blurred, yet each group still adhered to a specific set of gender roles.

Freud and other psychoanalysis researchers viewed gender identity as an aspect of an individual's psyche (Buchbinder, 1994; Connell, et al., 2005). Freud specifically thought that gender identity related to children's relationship to their mothers, especially early experiences, which influenced how males developed as compared to females. According to this line of research, different experiences as children led males to develop fears of intimacy and females to develop a fear of separation (Messner, 1990), and it defined distinct differences between males and females that lasted throughout life. From these perspectives, gender was often viewed as "self-evident, natural, universal; above all as unitary and whole, not multiple or divided" (Buchbinder, p. 1).

These earlier theories, whether anthropological or psychological, viewed gender identity as somewhat static and distinct and as a "thing" that individuals possessed (Messner, 1990). These earlier theories also tended to make a linear relationship between

dichotomous concepts. For example, an individual who is biologically male identifies as being a man who ascribes to masculine gender roles and has a heterosexual sexual orientation (Lev, 2004). Increased research efforts, especially those about homosexual and transgendered males and females, suggest that gender roles are neither static, universal, nor linearly connected to biology (Buchbinder, 1994; Lev). Over time, feminist, psychological, queer studies, and sociological studies of gender adapted this perspective, suggesting that gender roles are learned behaviors instilled in individuals by peers, families, and social institutions (Messner, 1990).

The earliest of these studies still considered males and females to have a core gender identity that distinguished the sexes and influenced the individuals throughout their lives. Gilligan (1982) related the theory of gender to an onion; males and females had many socially constructed layers of gender identity but still maintained a core identity related to their sex role. During life, males and females could add or dismantle layers to their identity as they developed. Modern studies often critique these earlier theories for lacking depth concerning sociological forces such as power and privilege in relationship to identity development and for maintaining a dichotomous distinction between male and female gender roles that failed to reflect the experiences of all people across time (Connell et al., 2005; Messner, 1990; Rhoads, 1995).

Beyond discussing the meaning and definition of gender and gender identity, various authors deal with gender roles—the concepts of masculinity and femininity differently. Brannon (1976) developed a common concept and measure of masculinity. He built off previous work about traditional male roles, and he was one of the first

sociologists to define characteristics associated with masculinity. His work serves as a basis for many discussions of masculinity to this day (Messner, 1990; Kimmel, 2008):

- (1) No Sissy Stuff--males should be strong and avoid behavior that equates with being feminine or gay, such as showing fear, sadness, weakness or emotion;
- (2) Be the Big Wheel—males should prioritize success, status, power, and wealth;
- (3) Be a Sturdy Oak—males should be reliable and steadfast;
- (4) Give'em Hell—males should live independently, seek risk and adventure, and disregard other's opinions.

Connell (1987) suggests that males' social contexts—the environments in which they live—influence their masculine development. Additional research by Kimmel (1997) suggests that males' definitions of masculinity may shift based on their physical environment. Hence, the newest writings about gender and masculinity suggest that gender roles are developed by the interaction between males' internal processes and thinking and their interactions with the external social world, including the media (Katz & Jhally, 1999; Tuss, 2004; Young, 2000), educational settings (Newkirk, 2002); parents, (Gleason, 1987), athletics (Messner, 1990 & 1992), college fraternities (Rhoads, 1995), and societal institutions (Connell, 2000; Mac an Ghaill, 1994). Within these domains, some theorists view masculinity as a basis for power that benefits males (Connell, 2000; Kimmel, 2000; Messner, 1990; Rhoads, 1995). Other writers view it as a repressive trap that harms males (Kimmel, 2008; Willis, 1977), and a third group recognizes that it can be both or neither depending on circumstance (Capraro, 2004; Connell).

These different perceptions about gender, gender identity, and gender roles fall into two major categories: essentialism and constructionism (Buchbinder, 1994).

Essentialism reflects the ideas discussed in reference to gender as an innate aspect of the individual and suggests that within each individual are naturally occurring traits associated with his or her sex, such as those theories discussed by Freud. Buchbinder suggests that modern researchers who seek to find biological and psychological rationales for behavior would fall into this category. For example, he refers to studies about males possessing natural skills inherited from their hunting and gathering ancestors and to studies that attempt to link homosexuality to biological differences within the brain. Within this literature-base, deviations away from congruence between male sex and masculine gender roles are aberrant.

Constructionist writers view gender identity as malleable and socially influenced. These writers point out that changes in society have led to changes in traditional notions of gender roles in terms of work, dress, play, behavior, etc.; therefore, gender roles and gender identity cannot be static on any level. Second, these researchers distinguish between males and females biologically—their physical sex—from their personal identification, beliefs, and actions—their gender identity and roles. In this way, a biologically male individual can identify as a woman and/or behave in ways associated with a feminine gender role (Buchbinder, 1994; Lev, 2004), suggesting that gender roles are not clearly linked to one's biological sex.

Finally, some post-modern scholars would also state that studying gender identity is impossible because identity itself is contextual (D'Augelli, 1994). They would argue that no universal gender identity or gender role definitions exist (Mac an Ghaill, 1994) and that any attempt to understand qualities related to "being male" would be bound up with many other factors such as ethnicity, religion, economic status, sexual orientation,

etc. (Abes & Jones, 2004; Connell, et al., 2005; Jones & McEwen, 2000; Martino & Pallotta-Chiarolli, 2003). These authors state that identity is complex and evolving; in any given context decision-making might be based on gender identity or be based on sexuality or ethnicity. Many theorists now use the concept of multiple male identities or masculinities within their work (Buchbinder, 1994; Capraro, 2004; D'Augelli).

I acknowledge that no definitive research exists about the source and evolution of gender identity and gender roles within individuals. Furthermore, I believe that some aspects of gender and identity could be purely dispositional, physiological, and in some ways innate, as suggested by Gilligan (1982), but I believe that, even if humans are born with some innate traits, social forces shape these traits in complex, unexpected ways. Hence, I align my study with the constructionist approach, which acknowledges that multiple, overlapping gender identities exist, change over time, and are influenced by societal structures, media, and relationships.

Popular Studies about Males

In addition to the more theoretical studies related to males, issues of masculinity are also featured prominently in social and public policy dialogues. Fueled in part by reports concerning male violence, increasing rates of male suicide, dropping male college enrollments, and increasing male high school drop-out rates, some researchers and policy makers have called for more attention to males within educational research (Davis & Laker, 2004; Kimmel, 2008; Pollack, 1998; Sax, 2008; Tyre, 2008). Most of these studies address the idea that males are falling behind in their educational achievement when compared with females, and in response to public and policy debates on this issue, the

authors and writers on this subject tend to align into three major genres (Weaver-Hightower, 2003): popular-rhetorical studies, feminist responses, and practice studies.

Even though each category contributes in its own way to understanding males and their issues, the first has captured the most media attention and politicized the discussion about males. Authors in the popular-rhetorical literature typically present statistical data from surveys to highlight the problems facing males (Kimmel, 2008; Weaver-Hightower, 2003; Tyre, 2008). They clearly believe that males are in crisis, and several prominent writers in this field, including William Pollack (1998), Christina Hoff Sommers (2000), and Peg Tyre (2008), suggest that young males are in a serious crisis and relate this crisis back to education. For example, Tyre states that even though females are gaining on males in math and science, males are falling behind females in reading and writing.

Although Tyre (2008) focuses on education and discusses feminization of school as an issue, she acknowledges multiple areas of influence on males from historic and cognitive perspectives. Other authors, though, such as Pollack (1998) and Sommers (2000), are stronger in their criticism and go so far as to state that society has declared war on boys and link the problems facing them to the feminist movement. As a group, these writers feel that feminization of the educational system has eliminated the outlets for boys' natural tendencies, leading to loss of motivation and increased discipline problems (Kimmel, 2008; Sax, 2007). Some individuals link this shift to efforts in the 1970s to improve education for females and suggest that reforms went too far in one direction, and they believe that by addressing girls' needs, reformers have hurt boys (Tyre, 2008). On the other end of the continuum though, feminist researchers have offered diverse critiques of the "boy crisis" (Tyre, 2008; Weaver-Hightower, 2003).

Some feminist and pro-feminist writers suggest that although males might be falling behind females on some academic measures, their advancement still outpaces females professionally (Collins, Kenway, McLeod, 2000). They view differences in achievement not as a negative for males, but rather as a sign of how well females are doing (Tyre, 2008). Also, they highlight that males falling behind females in education might be a natural outcome of female's equality gains: males are relatively in trouble when compared to females gains but not absolutely in trouble when compared to male's past performance. Kimmel (2008) states that females outpace males in college enrollment, yet both groups show an absolute growth. Yates (2000) has even called into question the way in which educational data has been used. Specifically, researchers believe that differences between males and females are in reality explained by socioeconomic and racial factors (Arnot & Gubb, 200; Cole, 1997). In the next section, I discuss how researchers have applied these studies about males and men to specific issues of participation and engagement in college.

Male Educational Participation and Engagement

Initially, theorists explained the gap in male engagement as a situation related to the civil rights movements and changes in society that provided females with more access to careers and educational opportunities (Frenette & Zeman, 2007). They associated females' relative gains in enrollments with the increasingly higher numbers of females returning to pursue college degrees as adults and higher numbers of minority females (King, 2000; Jacob, 2002; Sax, 2008; Tyre, 2008). The literature claims that large numbers of formerly disenfranchised females were claiming their right to an education, dwarfing male enrollment numbers in a surge that inflated differences; however, today

the difference in college enrollments by gender is increasingly disparate, with between 52 and 60% of college students being female depending on the year and school (Clayton et al., 2004; Frenette & Zeman; Sax; Tyre).

Some sociologists suggest that the increase in single-family homes headed by females and the decline in male educators has led to a deterioration of male role-models (Clayton et al., 2004; Frenette & Zeman, 2007; Sax, 2007). A lower number of visible, successful males in boys' lives can translate into less encouragement and support for them during decision-making about school (Clayton et al.). Foster and Peele (1999) also found that male teachers tended to be more tolerant and encouraging of young males' behavior than female teachers. Davis and Laker (2004) state that males' issues and their identity development are often overlooked when training student affairs professionals, making these professionals less able to support and understand males.

Related to the issue of role models, males are more likely to have behavioral problems and more likely to find themselves in trouble—or jail—than females (Clayton et al., 2004; Frenette & Zeman, 2007; Jacob, 2002). According to Sommers (2000) and Pollack (1998), the "natural behavior of men" is treated harshly in a feminized educational system, and punishments discourage males, causing them to dislike school. Sax (2007) suggests that, rather than being feminized, modern education is just boring for boys leading to lower motivation. Clayton et al. indicate that male behavior in high school often hinder students' ability to apply for college at a later date. Davis and Laker (2004) call for more attention on channeling males and their behavior toward appropriate, productive outcomes positively rather than punitively.

Beyond the social aspects related to male engagement, some experts claim that because males have more career options that do not require college than females, such as military service and blue-collar work, males are more likely than females to select a life path that does not include college (Davis & Laker, 2004; Frenette & Zeman, 2007; Jacob, 2002; Looker & McNutt, 1989). In addition, the males who do attend college tend to be higher achieving and of higher socio-economic status (SES) than average (Frenette & Zeman; Sax, 2007), so some scholars suggest that low-achieving and lower social economic status students may track out of college.

From this perspective, the achievement gains made by lower social status individuals should be attributed to females'—not males'—achievement gains (Clayton et al., 2004); therefore, scholars state that males of low socio-economic backgrounds skew the data on males in general (Cole, 1997; Tyre, 2008). If socio-economic status is accounted for by the research design, then some differences between males and females decrease, suggesting that males might be more sensitive than females to factors such as poverty, divorce, and living environment in relationship to their academic goals and achievement. This idea also circles back to the issue of absent fathers, who are often less present in lower socio-economic status (SES) homes.

Looker and McNutt (1989) conducted a longitudinal study to determine how earlier decisions influence individuals' educational outcomes based on work by Russell (1979) and Synge (1977) that suggested females maintained a more fluid academic career and that parents and educators tended to take females' education less seriously when compared with males' education. Although this study is dated, these ideas connect directly back to Gore's (2005) study related to study abroad participation and suggest that

females might participate more on study abroad because they are more open and flexible with the educational decision-making and have fewer expectations about their achievement than males. The findings from this study suggest that students' projected career decisions heavily influence their decision to enter post-secondary education, with "over half the respondents [saying] their occupational plans affect their educational decisions" (p. 357). The study also shows that males bounded their career aspirations by gender role stereotypes more than females.

Looking specifically at college, Jacob (2002) conducted one of the first empirical studies related to the issue of low male enrollment using the National Educational Longitudinal Study (NELS). Jacob shows that females had more incentive than males to return to school for white collar jobs (Murphy & Welch, 1992) because females traditionally "have had less success moving into skilled blue-collar occupations" (p. 590). He also found that males received less increased earning potential than females, 40% to versus 55%, for attending college. For these reasons, females have a stronger economic rationale to seek out higher education than males, who have more opportunities for high-paying jobs without it.

Next, Jacob (2002) found significant differences among males and females in relationship to their non-cognitive abilities. Specifically, he notes that, when compared to female students, male students were more likely to be retained in elementary school, have a behavior problem, spend less time on homework, report lower grades, be assigned or need remediation or special education, report less satisfaction at school, and believe that their teachers were less supportive of them—findings supported by other researchers (Kleinfeld, 1998; Sax, 2007; Tyre, 2008). Jacob relates these findings to non-cognitive

factors such as poor attention span, organization, and teamwork skills rather than actual cognitive ability because males and females score about the same on cognitive tests. He argues that males' inability to motivate and organize themselves leads to lower grades and poor attendance, which subsequently results in less interest in academics and preparation for college.

In total, Jacob's (2002) findings indicate that observable factors such as family background, SES, cognitive and non-cognitive skills, and job availability explain most of the gap in participation between males and females, with higher economic incentives for females and lower non-cognitive skills for males, explaining 90% of the difference between the groups' participation. Some of Jacob's other relevant findings include:

- Males are less likely to graduate from high school, but even accounting for high school graduation, males are about 5% less likely to attend college than females;
- Males are more likely than females to be employed or in the military;
- Males who attend college are more likely to be above average academically than their peers and thus more likely to attend a selective institution than females; and
- Males are more likely than females to claim that they dislike school (37% 26%), express a preference for work over school (49%-41%), or state they do not need more schooling for their chosen profession (23%-16%).

Frenette and Zeman (2007) completed a follow-up study in Canada based on Jacob's work (2020). They state that the largest reason accounting for the gender gap in higher education relate to the non-cognitive behaviors in high school. Their findings suggest that because males study less and have lower grades at age 15, they tend to get into more trouble and have a lower interest in school, which subsequently means they are

less likely to want to pursue a college degree. In total, this study associates almost 60% of the differences in college participation to males' lower non-cognitive skills and attributes an additional 8.5% of the gap to parents' lower academic expectations for males.

Most recently, Linda Sax's book (2008), *The Gender Gap in College*, used data from the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) database to look at patterns in relationship to understanding entry into college and how college affects students based on sex. Specifically, she used data from the Freshman Survey of entering college students between 1966 and 2006 and the College Student Survey cohort who entered college in 1994 and were re-surveyed in 1998 as a follow-up. Sax (2008) grouped her discussion by various demographic, academic, and social variables. I summarize relevant variables below:

- Age—Males are older than females when entering college by about one year on average, a factor researchers connect to the fact that males are more likely to be held-back for academic or developmental reasons during school or before starting kindergarten.
- SES—The median family income for males in 2006 was \$12,000 higher than that of females' family income. Males are also more likely to have parents with a college education, less likely to think that they will work during college, and less influenced by post-college career worries when selecting a college than females.
- Family Ties—Evidence suggests that males have weaker family connections than females, and related to this finding, males are less likely to select a

college based on being near family or family pressures. Parents seem to be more protective of their daughters than their sons.

- Academic engagement—Males report a higher academic self-confidence than females, yet they have lower academic engagement and achievement scores.
 Males are also less likely to join clubs, study for school, and speak with teachers outside of class and more likely to feel bored in school.
- Academic goals—Males are less likely to seek advanced degrees than females; however, females are more likely than males to seek sex-stereotyped degrees. Females are still more likely to select majors and careers in helping and service areas such as health care, education, and psychology, while males are more likely to be in business, history, political science, and scientific fields.
- Community and social values—Males report less interest in helping or serving others when compared to females, and they are less likely to engage in service, tutoring, or other community engagements. Politically, males tend to be more engaged in politics and more conservative than females.

In the next section of this paper, I summarize in more detail the issues of gender identity and roles. Previous studies suggest that males differ from females in terms of their maturity and identity development. If males' identity development and perspectives on education are different than females, then this might account for their lack of educational engagement and their focus on external motivations (Sax, 2008). Similarly, the degree to which males identify with masculine gender roles might also influence their participation decisions (Kimmel, 2008). If they view service or study abroad as feminine

activities, they could overlook or ignore opportunities in a quest to prove their manhood. In the next section, I review the literature related to male identity and gender roles as a way to inform the discussions regarding their participation in study abroad.

Gender and Development

Inherent in the previous discussions is the idea that males are slower to develop physically, cognitively, and emotionally than females, so they would necessarily be less likely to plan, be motivated, and handle adversity well during their youth. Some suggest that teenage males do not yet possess the necessary skills to achieve in school at the time when they must prepare for college, which influences enjoyment of school (Frenette & Zeman, 2007; Looker & McNutt, 1980; Sax, 2007).

In the early 1990s, many reports highlighted the problems young females face in school (Weaver-Hightower, 2003), including increased problems with self-esteem, depression, and eating disorder, as well as achievement gaps in math and less support from teachers (American Association of University Women, 1992). Some evidence exists that changing educational pedagogy could have negatively affected male students (Sax, 2007). For example, males tend to perform well in competitive environments and those featuring lectures (Astin, 1993; Clayton et al.; Sax, 2007), so increased use of discussion and collaborative learning practices within the curriculum has favored females (Zhao, Carini, & Kuh, 2005).

Also, males tend to have more tactile learning styles, need to experience their learning and put concepts to use in an applied way, and Sax (2007) believes that changes in the educational system have required young males to sit and listen more than interact, touch, feel, and play. These theorists argue that just as females have had trouble entering
into science and engineering curricula because of the "culture of who belongs" (Eisenhart & Finkel, 1998; Maher & Tetreault, 2001), males are increasingly being told explicitly and implicitly by educators that they are bad and broken (Sommers, 2000; Tyre, 2008). Despite these generalizations though, literature about gender suggests that not all male students develop a male identity or adhere to a traditional male gender role. To better understand this discussion, the next sections discuss masculinity and studies about males and their gender roles.

Development and Masculinity

Since these first pioneering studies about human development (Kohlberg, 1975; Perry, 1970), higher education and student affairs researchers have investigated identity development in numerous studies. Kegan (2000), Chickering and Reisser (1993), and Belenky and Stanton (2000), suggest that people develop across life in predictable patterns, and although the specific patterns vary individual to individual, transformation reflects the movement from one developmental stage to another. Kegan believes that cognitive development between life stages involves defining the "self" relative to an "other." Newborns do not distinguish between self and an external other: they are their needs, but as they age, they define the boundaries between themselves and the world. Ideally, this process leads to understanding that one's life is separate and distinct from the external world in increasingly complex ways, with self-authorship as a desired goal. For Kegan, the self-authored person thinks in ways consistent with their true self and has ceased to rely on external ideas about their identity.

Put together, these theories typically portray a staged pattern of human development that suggests humans experience external stimuli and learn from these

stimuli in such a way as to grow in predictable patterns; however, as Sax (2008) and Gilligan (1982) suggest, much of the foundational work on development was done predominately with males and thus reflect a male-centered view of development. For example, Belenky and Stanton (2000) have shown that not only do females develop at a different rate than males cognitively, but they develop somewhat differently. Females tend to prefer a process they termed "connected knowing," and their quest to learn is often characterized by asking questions and building relationships, with males' focus being more analytical (Kimmel, 2008; Sax, 2008). Gilligan (1982), Josselson (1987), and others refer to this as a care-orientation in females. Studies suggest that males tend to prefer "competitiveness and a studied objectivity that tends to suppress the legitimacy of subjective and connected ways of knowing" (Kimmel, 2008; Zhao, Cartini, & Kuh, 2005, p. 504).

Hence, the earlier, gender-neutral studies about development-based males' experiences have been increasingly adapted to study females' development (Gilligan, 1982; Josselson, 1987; Schenkel & Marcia, 1972). Each scholar found that females' development differenced in specific ways from that of males, and these differences included females' acceptance of subjective data, emphasis on building relationships, quest for balance between family and success, and value of identifying religious and sexual values (Davis, 2002). Similar research about males is only beginning because, although the early researchers studied males, the early studies did not consider sex or gender specifically (Sax, 2008). In other words, males were subjects thought to represent all students, so nuances of male development were often overlooked. More recent studies

suggest that, just as with females, more consideration of males' unique developmental paths is required.

Davis (2002) and other researchers have looked at issues beyond cognitive stages toward and understanding of how society socializes young males and how males cope with "the notion" of being "male." For example, Maccoby and Jacklin (1978) suggest that males possess greater desire for competition and aggression in work and play, and some theorists suggest that this difference is not based on differences between the sexes but rather is related to socialized gender norms; males are socialized to believe that aggression is more acceptable than females (Brannon, 1976; Kimmel, 2008). Although social ideas and norms evolve over time, many writers suggest that traditional gender role definitions still have some enduring power over males' lives, especially in relationship to how they behave in school (Kimmel; Nicolazzo & Davis, 2007; Tuss, 2004).

Thompson and Pleck (1986) conducted a survey based on Brannon's masculinity definition (1976). Unlike Brannon's original classification, which included four categories, Thompson and Pleck found three definitional categories, which state that males should seek to:

- 1. Achieve status and respect;
- 2. Be mentally, emotionally, and physically tough and self-reliant; and
- 3. Avoid stereotypically female activities and occupations.

Thompson and Pleck's (1986) research found a few important points. First, they found that Brannon's categories, although somewhat differently organized, still held together conceptually as traditional ideas related to masculinity. Second, they found that although young males still have these ideas to some degree, the relationships between the

concepts are weaker than expected based on earlier studies. In other words, males do not equally believe in all three categories and tend to have weaker affinity for each as a whole when compared to earlier studies. Finally, they found that males can still maintain a traditional perspective about male gender roles and have a more liberal view about females and their roles.

Building off the idea that males' attitudes about masculinity are malleable, Brooks-Harris, Heesacker, and Mejia-Millan (1996) randomly assigned student volunteers to three groups, with two groups assigned to one of two different videos and the third being assigned to no treatment. Based on the evaluation of the data, the authors report that the interventions did alter males' perceptions of traditional gender roles; however, the experiment failed to influence their personal gender role attitudes or gender role conflicts. The experiment also suggested that of all of Brannon's sub-scales (1976), the avoidance of all things feminine was more resistant to change than the other three categories.

Building off the work of previous scholars, Rhoads (1995) conducted an ethnographic study of fraternity members. Through observations, and interviews with about half of the members, Rhoads sought to determine how the fraternity's social structure, organization, and interaction patterns related to male attitudes about females. Based on his analysis, Rhoads discusses three major points:

 Males tended to describe and think about females as "less than human beings—as objects worthy of manipulation or distain," (p. 314) often referring to them as "whores" available for manipulation and discussing them as a means of attracting new members or marketing the House's name;

- 2. Males allowed females to participate in fraternity functions, but they controlled and limited females' participation on their terms, typically relegating females to the sidelines as observers; and
- 3. Fraternity life tended to strengthen ultra-masculine (i.e., macho) perceptions of gender amongst the members that led to devaluing of females and gay males. Activities such as dares, pranks, and rituals promoted this mindset by emphasizing "physical qualities, such as strength, fearlessness, and aggressiveness" (p. 318).

In his study, Davis (2002) interviewed 10 traditionally-aged college students using an adaptation of Josselson's study (1987) about females' identity development. Davis' (2002) study indicates that—unlike previous research, which suggests that males do not value intimacy as much as females—males do desire and seek out relationships with friends and peers; however, this relationship-building seems to occur under strict conditions modulated by males' concept of masculinity. For example, Davis found that:

- Males valued relationships and self-expression; however, they understood this behavior was not traditionally exhibited or valued by males and felt illprepared to express their emotions. Hence, they were overly aware of how their behavior might be viewed by other males;
- Males tended to feel more comfortable speaking and expressing emotions with females, and did so with other males only in special circumstances. Affection and emotional intimacy between males was indirect and often done in conjunction with another activity; and

• Males fear and attempt to distance themselves from behaviors associated with femininity, yet felt confused and confined by masculinity.

Edwards and Jones (2009) conducted a study of 10 traditionally-aged, male college students. They based their effort on an acknowledgement that the current literature on male gender identity development was limited (Davis & Lake, 2004), especially in the context of social identity groups (McEwen, 2003). Their analysis generated three themes related to a social justice theory of male gender identity development. First, they found that all the male students felt pressured to conform to certain masculine expectations and that these expectations became stronger and more rigid as they got older. Specific aspects of the male role included "being competitive, in control of emotions or unemotional, aggressive, responsible, the breadwinner, in a position of authority, rational, strong, successful, tough, and breaking the rules" (Edwards & Jones, 2009, pp. 214-215). The males also stated that they had learned these expectations early in life and felt that they had always known the "rules"; however, they could not describe how or when they actually learned them.

The second theme from the study involves the performance of masculinity, something Edwards and Jones (2009) refer to as "putting on the mask." The male students explained that they put on a performance to meet society's expectations of them, and they generally expressed a sense of insecurity and inability to meet social expectations of manhood. Finally, they found that over time male college students strive to find ways to "take off their mask." Building on the defense mechanism mentioned in theme two—finding places to escape from traditional expectations. In this sense, male

students begin to develop their own sense of their manhood and masculinity and begin to act more according to their nature and not social expectations.

These studies support claims by Pollack (1999) and other researchers who state that social expectations challenge males by providing rigid codes for behavior, yet offering little counsel for males on how to navigate these codes. Kimmell (2000, 2008) and Capraro (2004) agree, stating that males exist within a society that dictates "no sissy stuff." Kimmel believes that males' belief in a narrow definition of masculinity causes them stress and also influences their behavior as they strive to conform to perceived social expectations. In the extreme, this stress can cause males to behave in hypermasculine ways, exhibiting aggression, intolerance, and competition (Clayton et al., 2004; Edwards & Jones, 2009).

This disconnection causes males to experience gender role strain or conflict (Clayton et al., 2004; O'Neil, 1981, 1990). O'Neil indicates that when males experience gender role conflict, it can lead them to restrict their emotions; seek control, aggression, and competition; restrict sexual and emotional intimacy; and obsess over work, success, and achievement. Clayton et al. describes this concept as a situation in which males follow traditional concepts of masculinity that the general society finds outdated. Sources of this strain include an increased competition from females and minorities at school and in the workforce, an increase in the use of teams and collaboration at school and work, an increase in the tolerance for homosexuals, an increase in the concern over societal violence, an increase in the need for advanced education, and a decrease in the availability of manufacturing jobs. Each of these changes challenge males' traditional

predominance in society and their "traditional" ways of living within that society (Clayton et al.)

Kimmel (2008) suggests that males perceive academic engagement as un-cool, and thus they purposefully disengage to fit their perception of the male gender stereotype. This idea is supported by Edwards and Jones (2009), and if this idea is true, then helping males change their perspectives about the value of educational engagement is essential to increasing their success and participation. Gender role norms could be a major barrier for males as they try to navigate school and conform to their peer groups. Related to issues of gender role, the literature suggests that some males value independent, excitement, and adventure as well as status, success, and achievement. These two values might also influence their educational behavior and engagement, and I explore both in the final sections of this chapter.

Males and Risk

Dessof (2006) suggests that one reason why males participate less in study abroad is that they take fewer risks than females; however, major studies about male engagement and behavioral risk suggest that males take more risks than females (Byrnes, Miller, & Schafer, 1999), especially during college (Clayton et al., 2004; Davis & Laker, 2004). Ferby and Beyth-Marom (1992) define risk behavior broadly as an action with the potential for multiple, unknown outcomes, some of which might be negative. Hence, one can consider risk in terms of its degree (e.g., the risk of swimming with sharks versus the risk of swimming after eating); value system (e.g., getting an abortion vs. not going to church); technical requirements (e.g., movie stunts performed by a teenager vs. a trained professional); and context (e.g., golfing in the rain versus golfing in general), with each

of these factors contributing to how a "risk" is considered (Byrnes, 1998; Ferby & Meyth-Maron; Miller & Byrnes, 1997).

According to Lopes (1987), studies tend to define risk in one of three ways, with each study's results differing based on its method and purpose (Byrnes et al., 1999). First, studies that investigate people who seek out regular risk behavior and risk aversion report that males are more likely to engage in regular risk behavior because males have a "naturally lower level of arousal" (Byrnes et al., p. 368) and have been socialized to connect risky behaviors with masculine identity (Kelling, Zirkes, & Myerowitz, 1976; Zuckerman, 1991). Second, studies that look at situational risk-taking, the difference between choosing the more risky option over the safer option in a given context, indicate little difference exists between males and females (Lopes). Third, some studies look at a blending of the first two areas of study: investigating how specific people react in specific situations. This area of study indicates that males and females would vary by context in their risk behavior, with each seeking out risk if they believed they could be successful or valued success within the given context (Byrnes, 1998; Wigfield & Eccles, 1992).

In terms of context specific risk, Wilson and Daly (1985) suggest that for most cultures, males would tend to take more risk than females because risk is an aspect of the male identity. As suggested in earlier sections, males are typically characterized by a greater need for competition and a desire to win (Belenky & Stanton, 2000). Following this characterization of males in many modern cultures, Byrnes, et al. suggest that:

Competition forces dominant individuals to engage in risk taking to gain their position of power. The greater the spread in rewards between winners and losers, the greater the incentive to take risks. This account suggests that men would only

be more likely to take risks than women when a context involves both competition and a large spread in rewards between winners and losers (p. 369). Based on the broad definition of risk and this general model for looking at how risk is studied in the literature, Byrnes et al. conducted a meta-analysis of 150 studies on the subject of risk as related to gender.

Their results show that across study designs, males tended to exhibit more riskoriented behavior on all measures, which included situational studies, self-reporting, and direct observation. On 60% of the measures, the researchers reported effect sizes significantly greater than zero with about half of the effect sizes scoring as medium or high. Specifically, the measures scoring the highest effect score between males and females were three direct observation behaviors: physical skill, risky experiments, and intellectual risk-taking. Further analysis showed that over time, the effect sizes changed based on the respondent's age. Looking at the category associated with traditionally-aged college students (ages 18 - 21), all three of these risk areas were still high.

Given these findings, Dessoff's (2006) statement that males might be risk-averse seems unlikely; males generally clearly seem to have a higher tolerance for and an interest in risky behavior. This finding could be a reflection of socialization as connected with the male gender role related to being independent, self-reliant, and aggressive. Whatever the underlying reason, further research on males' perceptions of study abroad as a risk is needed. Some writers suggest that study abroad is a risk, while others talk about it as an academic vacation. In the end, given the diversity of program models and locations, as well as the diversity of males' thinking about risk, risk may be an influence or obstacle in relationship to participation. Beyond males' desire for risk, evidence often

suggests that males are more pragmatic, seeking money and success in lieu of personal development. The next section will explore how males' perceptions of career and success might influence participation.

Male Careerism and Success

In addition to Wilson and Daly's (1985) theory that risk is an aspect of male psychology, research indicates that males are more career-focused and tend to define success differently than females (Dyke & Murphy, 2006). Given the dominant discourse around study abroad (Gore, 2005), understanding how males view success might relate to their study abroad participation. If males do not view study abroad as contributing to their academic or career advancement, then they might select other opportunities in lieu of studying abroad.

Reports suggest that males and females feel conflict between work and family life and report that family responsibilities negatively influence career advancement (Trost, 1987 & 1988). Males and females also both perceive work as interfering with their desire to see their families, but females report this issue to a greater extent than males (Covin & Bush, 1991). Even though males and females face similar pressures related to work, studies suggest that males face specific social expectations in terms of their role. Since the time of the industrial revolution, social norms have expected males to support their families (Deutschendorf, 1996). Although gender roles have changed considerably over time, this perspective on male success is still a powerful, pervasive underlying message within the popular media (Tuss, 2004). England (1992) reports that, of all the stereotypes associated with men and masculinity—including males' roles related to being assertive males serving as financial provider to their families was the strongest belief across all

individuals (England, 1992). Many males learn these expectations about career and success at a young age and carry these gender expectations with them from childhood into adulthood, so males often equate success with salary, title, rank, and achievement (Dyke & Murphy, 2006), ideas directly connected to Brannon's description of males as "big wheels" (1976).

Research also shows that males with traditional concepts about masculine roles make career success central to their lives (Covin & Brush, 1991; Deutschendorf, 1996) and have higher expectations in terms of salary and job advancement (Sumner & Brown, 1996). Even when controlling for professional position and status (i.e., comparing individuals within job classifications not across them), males are more likely to define their success on salary and personal achievement compared to females, who focus more on work-life balance (Dyke & Murphy, 2006). Hence, despite greater parity between males and females at home—in terms of housework and childcare—and more females in the workforce, studies continually indicated that females bear the greater responsibilities at home and face more challenges at work related to childcare issues due to traditional gender role stereotypes (Covin & Bush, 1991).

Covin and Brush (1991) conducted a survey with 240 undergraduate and graduate students enrolled in upper-division business courses at a southern state college. The purpose of the study was to look for differences related to males' and females' attitudes about work, career, and family responsibilities. Using the survey data, these researchers identified seven themes, four of which showed significant differences:

- Public policy—respondents believed that the government should play a strong role in helping parents deal with work-family issues; however, males expressed significantly less support for government intervention;
- Parent roles—respondents disagreed that being a parent means someone needs to be at home with the children, yet males were significantly more likely to believe that females should stay at home and be "a mother";
- Work-life balance—respondents thought that family life should not necessarily negatively influence work life; however, males were more likely than females to believe that home life negatively interferes with work life; and
- 4. Gender roles—respondents generally eschewed the notion of stereotypical gender roles related to work and home, yet males were significantly more likely than females to believe in traditional roles for women.

These findings did show that generally, the survey respondents felt that family was more important than work, that work was not necessarily a bad thing for parents, and that males were preferred as managers or supervisors. Beyond this general consensus though, males seemed to have a greater degree of internalized stereotypes related to their gender role. Regardless of the exact connects between the variables and gender or sex, males' focus on career offers another important area for investigation as related to study abroad participation and deserves greater attention.

Strengths and Limitations of the Literature on Males

Unlike the study abroad literature, the literature about males and masculinity encompasses a diversity of conceptual frameworks and instrumentation that has built a strong, continuous research agenda studying diverse aspects of gender and gender

identity, and the connection between an individual's biological sex and gender role. The benefit of reviewing this literature is that it helps me put ideas related to male study abroad participation in perspective. Specifically, this literature-base adds depth and understanding as to why males might report less support from friends and relatives regarding study abroad, why males seek out risky and career-orientated activities, and why study abroad's marketing is considered feminized.

As such, even though gender was not used as a primary aspect of the conceptual framework and survey design, it provides an important lens for analyzing the interview data. First, general studies about study abroad participation are helpful, but they fail to adequately address potential reasons for differences between males and females because they are conceptually gender neutral (Davis, 2002). Hence, having literature about males embedded within this study helps put the findings in a better context. I also believe that the initiation of a study about male participation in study abroad does not detract from the work being done on other groups within study abroad, nor do I attempt to place the blame for low male participation in specific philosophies or practices (Capraro, 2004).

Second, isolating and relating males' decision-making about study abroad to their gender identity alone is overly simplistic and ignores the complexity of the relationships among different aspects of self (Jones & McEwen, 2000). Although this study is not specifically about male identity and does not seek to define what it means to be "male," the study does seek to understand male students' actions and thoughts. Taking the literature into account, one step this study will use is to employ a mixed methods design. The large survey that includes both males and females of different religious, ethnic, and

socio-economic backgrounds helps to account for other aspects of an individual's identity and the interviews help me to better understand individual males' experiences in context.

Some weaknesses of this literature include the fact that economics and social forces change rapidly, so the reliance on demographic data in many studies makes their application limited (Frenette & Zeman, 2007). In other words, the social and economic forces shaping males perceptions, values, and aspirations change over time. I must be aware of how I use and interpret studies as I move forward with the analysis of my data. Even studies conducted 10 years ago might not be valid given rapidly changing social structures. Second, I highlighted that within gender studies some disagreements exist about the nature and definition of identity and gender. Also, some scholars and policy-makers might consider lower male participation on study abroad not to be a problem at all, but a correction of past educational imbalances based on issues of access.

In the next chapter, I discuss the methodology used for this study, which includes discussions about a pilot study I conducted as a basis for my personal interviews. In Chapters 4 and 5, I then report the findings from my study design, first discussing the survey data and then the interview data. Finally, Chapter 6 presents my analysis of the findings based on literature reviewed in this chapter.

Chapter 3: Methods

With male participation in study abroad ranging between 30 and 35% of all students, clearly there are some factors that, when compared with females, either make males less motivated to study abroad, provide additional or different barriers for their participation, or both. Unfortunately as shown in the review of literature in Chapter 2, few studies have actively studied study abroad participation with a focus on differences between males and females, and although a plethora of studies exist about male students in general, no clear theoretical links have been made between the studies about males and study abroad participation.

This chapter outlines a design and methods for addressing the problem of low male participation by applying Henry and Basile's (1994) model of participation to the broader studies of study abroad and male engagement. To broadly understand the role of potential participation motivators and obstacles and to deeply understand the role of gender-related theories on male students' decision-making, this study used a mixed methods approach, which Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004) recommend for research questions that cannot be fully or substantially answered using a single method design. Specifically, I employed a sequential explanatory design, which included a qualitative pilot study, a quantitative analysis of existing survey data during the first research phase, and the semi-structured interviews of male students during the second research phase.

Ideas about Male Study Abroad Participation

Although the literature consistently describes the core obstacles to study abroad as cost and academic integration, these issues do not fully explain differences in participation between males and females (Shirley, 2006), so some study abroad

professionals have begun to postulate additional obstacles specific to low male participation (Dessoff, 2006). Thus, the study abroad literature-base illuminates key motivations and barriers to study abroad participation, but it provides little empirical evidence to evaluate these ideas. Studies about males should provide insight about these issues, as neither literature-base alone can provide an adequate conceptual model to address the problem. This section begins to address this concern by bringing the literature-bases together.

The dominant idea presented in the study abroad literature suggests that because more males pursue science majors with rigorous, sequential curricula, they have fewer international study opportunities than other majors (Dessoff, 2006; Gore, 2005; Shirley, 2006). The fact that science and engineering students tend to study abroad less frequently than those in other fields supports this assertion (Davis, 2006); however, the trend for science and engineering majors' participation has been upward while the number of males studying abroad has been stagnant or declining (Davis; Shirley; Redden, 2008). Related to this trend, the increase in short-term, summer programs should also facilitate a larger number of majors and students going abroad. Also, no empirical study has statistically analyzed the connection between participation, sex or gender, and academic major. As suggested by Looker and McNutt (1989), the differences might not actually be based on majors specifically, but more broadly on intended career outcomes.

Second, some professionals believe that males are more likely to pursue internships, jobs, or athletics opportunities, which hamper their ability to travel (Dessoff, 2006; Shirley, 20006). As with science students, athletes are less likely to study abroad. Historically, females may have not participated in some of these activities at the same

rates as males, yet overall female participation rates in sports and other professional activities continues to rise (Sax, 2008), but so do their participation rates for study abroad. Taking into account the information on gender participation and engagement in higher education (Davis & Laker, 2004) and Shirley's findings related to females and internships also suggests that this area might fail to fully account for male participation. As with the disciplinary background idea, the concept that males are more engaged in other activities has not been empirically studied, and based on the general information on male engagement, seems to lack validity.

Third, several authors suggest that males tend to be less adventurous with their education than females (Dessoff, 2006; Gore, 2005) and generally participate less in higher educational programming (Davis & Laker, 2004). This idea may also hold some answers to low male participation in study abroad because it reflects a broader pattern in male engagement; however, the risk literature indicates that males are generally more adventuresome than females (Byrnes, Miller, & Schafer, 1999). This literature and more recent discussions about study abroad (Redden, 2008) state that males might not study abroad because they view it as overly organized, while females flock toward study abroad because they view it as a safe way to travel. Study abroad would seem to be a highly risky activity in some cases, yet perhaps one that males do not value (Byrnes, 1998; Wigfield & Eccles, 1992) or one that males do not find risky. A pilot study conducted for this study, interviews of eight undergraduate males, suggested that males find study abroad overly safe and stifling.

Finally, a prevailing rationale relates low participation to historic gender roles, which make study abroad participation more socially acceptable for females, whereas

males are encouraged by their parents to find work, gain professional experience, and earn a salary (Dessof, 2006; Gore, 2005). This theory relates to Dyke and Murphy's study (2006), which suggests that males have historically been associated with supporting their families and equate success with career advancement, money, and status. As discussed by Gore, the dominant discourse on study abroad implies that the activity is frivolous so parents and peers may push males to engage with activities deemed more professionally "beneficial" to them; therefore, male career development theory supports this idea by suggesting that male conceptions of success might not encompass a desire to study abroad.

In addition, study abroad participation studies suggest that students' parents and friends have a strong influence on their decision to study abroad (Gore; Shirley, 2006), yet males reported lower support than females and were less likely than females to express internships and work as a barrier (Shirley). This finding conflicts with findings from studies by Valentine (1997) and Sumner and Brown (1996), which suggest that males are more influenced by external factors such as career advancement and success than females. Thus, as with the other ideas presented in this study, the link between males' career focus, definitions of success, and the role of parental and peer support have not been well studied in relationship to study abroad.

Given the state of the problem and the available literature, the issue of male participation is clearly a problem both practically and theoretically. Considering the range of ideas discussed by the literature, a quantitative or qualitative study alone could not account for the range of potential factors discussed. A quantitative study can provide the sample size and statistical control needed to understand better some potential obstacles to

study abroad such as academic major, athletics, internships, and peer and parental support; however, as suggested by Carlson et al. (1990), quantitative studies fail to account for the complexity of issues such as males' conceptions of gender roles, risk, and success, which are also prominent rationales related to the research question. For these reasons, this study employed a mixed methods approach in an attempt to investigate multiple rationales for lower male study abroad participation.

Grounded Theory Pilot Study

Before starting this investigation, I conducted a pilot study related to the issue of male participation in first-year study abroad programs at the same institution used for the larger study. For the pilot study, I used a grounded approach as suggested by Strauss and Corbin (1998), with a semi-structured interview process to investigate participants' perceptions about study abroad. Grounded theory melds the data collection and analysis stages, with the researcher taking advantage of new insight to reform working theories and interview protocols (Creswell, 2007); therefore, this design provided me with the flexibility to change direction during the study to account for new information and insight (Ary, Cheser-Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1990; Creswell, 2007; Creswell, 2003).

Based on the data from eight male volunteers, I used the constant comparative method as suggested by Strauss and Corbin (1990) to refine the interview protocol and analysis. The initial questions posed to the students asked broad information about the students' thoughts and expectations about college and special opportunities—including questions about how they decided to attend the university, why they attended the university, and what messages they heard about the university and getting involved. Eventually, based on the responses and direction of the conversation, I asked all

volunteers more pointed questions about study abroad--including what they knew about study abroad, the messages they heard about study abroad from the university and others, and their perceptions of the value of study abroad. As the interviews progressed, I asked increasingly specific questions to probe categories that emerged from earlier interviews, such as questions about marketing messages, costs, and peer support.

Based on the data collected during the personal interviews, three broad themes emerged as related to differences between male and female participation on study abroad:

- 1. Male participants and nonparticipants felt that the way study abroad was communicated to males was unappealing and should change.
- 2. Male participants indicated support and encouragement from family or friends who facilitated their interest and motivation to apply.
- 3. Male nonparticipants who felt that study abroad detracted from their ability to work or pursue academic interests were less likely to participate.

Although these themes fit with the literature and existing ideas about male participation, the small sample size and methodology of this pilot study limits my ability to develop a general theory about male participation; however, the findings helped me clarify several factors related to the current study.

First, I decided that I would only interview students about to graduate for the larger study because after interviewing first- and second-year students for the pilot, I realized that some students who were "nonparticipants" during the pilot intended to participate later in their academic career. As such, getting the opinions of "true" nonparticipants proved difficult with younger students. Second, I expanded the interview questions related to the peer support and marketing messages themes due to the

prominence of the data collected during the pilot study. Finally, the experience with the pilot study helped me become more comfortable with collecting and analyzing qualitative data and helped familiarize me with some of the literature related to the issue.

Mixed Method Design

From the original pilot study, this dissertation study employs a mixed methods design as suggested by Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004) who define mixed methods "as the class of research where the researcher mixes or combines quantitative and qualitative research techniques, methods, approaches, concepts or language into a single study" (p. 17). They suggest using mixed methods when a quantitative or qualitative study alone would be insufficient to answer the research problem and when the mixing of data collection strategies is likely to strengthen results and ameliorate the weaknesses of a single design (Patton, 1990), a concept Johnson and Turner (2003) call the fundamental principle of mixed research (Johnson & Onweugbuzie). Creswell and Plano Clark (2006) state that mixed methods represent an important modern research tool, as many contemporary problems require data inherent to both strategies. Using this mixture "researchers can situate numbers in the contexts and words of participants, and they can frame the words of participants with numbers, trends, and statistical results" (p. 13).

This mixed method study uses an explanatory sequential design (Creswell, Plano Clark, 2006; Gutmann, & Hanson, 2003) as depicted in Figure 4. Explanatory designs use a two-part data collection strategy starting with quantitative strategies followed by qualitative strategies, and this specific form of explanatory design uses the results from the study's quantitative phase to inform the data collection during the second, qualitative phase. Although Creswell and Plano Clark (2006) suggest that the dominant philosophy

used during data interpretation is quantitative because the study starts with quantitative data and strategies, Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004) state that mixed designs can emphasize either research paradigm as long as both forms of data are reflected in the interpretation of the findings. Given the nature of the research question and the paucity of qualitative research on male study abroad participation, I emphasize qualitative paradigms during my data analysis and interpretation. Although both quantitative and qualitative strategies are employed throughout the study, the qualitative paradigm will provide the basis for the discussion and organization of the findings.

Strengths and Limitations of this Design

Given the mixed method design selected, this study has a quantitative and qualitative phase during data collection with the quantitative survey data informing or explaining some of the design decisions for the qualitative interviews. With this design, it will be important to acknowledge the uses, strengths, and limitations of each phase of data collection, as well as discuss how the entire design works together to address the main, qualitative research question of why male college students study abroad at lower rates than female college students (Johson & Onweugbuzie, 2004). In this section, I discuss the quantitative phase, the qualitative phase, and mixed methods design in relationship to these considerations and how each contributes to answering the primary research question. Later, I also present additional information related to research questions, hypothesis, and limitations of the specific data collection strategies.

The first data collection phase involved statistical analysis of survey data to look at significant differences between male and female students regarding study abroad and to account for the influence of certain variables on participation, such as race and

academic major. The strengths of using this quantitative method are: (1) a large sample size can be analyzed providing statistical significance and potential generalizability to other settings; (2) statistical methods allow the researcher to control for and potentially eliminate some intervening variables influencing male participation; and (3) numeric data from a large sample allows for comparisons between groups that are relatively independent from the researcher's analysis, which helps provide validity, triangulation, and independent confirmation of qualitative results.

The primary weakness of this data collection strategy is that the concepts being studied are abstract, so a survey instrument might not reliably measure the intended concepts and the discrete responses are based on individual students' interpretations of the questions' meaning. For example, when asking a student about parental support, the concept of support lacks a single definition and different students might have different options about what a supportive behavior is or is not. Similarly, when a student reports that a parent was "very supportive," I do not have a clear idea of what the student means by the response. A second weakness is that, given the static nature of a survey, I am unable to probe new ideas, ask follow-up questions, and remain open to new ideas that are relevant to the respondent but not included on the survey directly.

I address these weaknesses in part through the use of a qualitative second phase, which uses interviews to follow-up on the findings from the survey. Through interviews, I probed for deeper understanding of students' responses and remained open to potentially important concepts not included on the survey. Also, I gained understanding about the problem from the view of the individuals themselves, in context, and in comparison with the broader data set. Although the quantitative study provided the

breadth of information across respondents, the survey is not sufficiently detailed to investigate some key concepts. Thus, the qualitative phase allowed for depth of understanding using a smaller group, which did a better job explaining potential synergies between abstract concepts such as male engagement, careerism, and identity. In the end then, the survey and interview approaches are mutually beneficial. The survey is not sufficiently detailed to explain certain concepts, and the case study interviews rely on small samples and have uncertain generalizability to other groups and settings. Also, qualitative methods are more easily influenced by my bias and interpretation than quantitative methods.

The synergies explained between design phases one and two support the fundamental principle of mixed research (Johnson & Turner, 2003), which states that aspects of a mixed design study reinforce each other's strengths and lessen weaknesses (Patton, 1990). Despite this fact, the study must also consider the strengths and weaknesses of the overall mixed design. The main strengths of mixed methods are its flexibility and adaptability to using multiple sources of data, which adds validity, corroboration, and insight to the findings. Figure 3 (see p. 82) graphically represents the connection between the potential barriers to participation and the design, as well as the relationship between the design's phases.

The major weaknesses in a mixed design include managing the complexity, time, and cost associated with doing two or more data collection strategies; situating the design within a philosophy that brings seemingly disparate paradigms together; and converging the data appropriately in data analysis and interpretation stages (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2006; Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004). As this design made use of an existing set of

survey data, the time and cost issues were lessened; however, I need to situate this research design within the literature, an issue I address in the next section. The tactic used for reporting the data also incorporates the relevant literature as suggested by Creswell and Plano Clark, who address a third major challenge inherent to mixed methods.

Rationale for Mixed Methods: Pragmatist Philosophies.

Although still rooted in the quantitative and qualitative methodology and rhetoric, several writers discuss mixed methods as the "third wave" in the paradigm wars (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2006; Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998). These methodologists believe that mixed methods research is not merely the cobbling together of the two major research paradigms, but rather that it represents its own, unique ontology based on pragmatist philosophies (Rossman & Wilson, 1985). Specifically, pragmatists reject the purists' dichotomy between research traditions (Rossman & Wilson) and offer a very practical epistemology that advocates that researchers use "what works" (Creswell & Plano Clark, p. 24).

Hence, pragmatists emphasize the versatility of inquiry to provide insight and offer realistic practice and solutions for modern problems. Johnson and Onweugbuzie state that pragmatists are "interested in examining practical consequences and empirical findings to help in understanding the import of philosophical positions and, importantly to help in deciding which action to take next as one attempts to understand real-world phenomena," (2004, p. 17). Thus, pragmatists welcome the use of diverse, creative, and eclectic methods as means to gathering the needed information to understand an issue. They recognize that complex research questions, especially within the social sciences, often necessitate combining methods.



Motivations and Barriers to Participation

In terms of their value stance, pragmatists do not seek an absolute truth, nor do they necessarily state that it does not exist. They instead seek relative truths as matters of degree, recognizing that the truth is not stagnant and the absolute truth is something that can only be known in hindsight. For a pragmatist, truth is ultimately about what works: if it works, then in that specific situation something was "true" and good. Thus, pragmatists are not objectivist, they value practical solutions based on their cultural relevance and explicitly espouse liberal ideals such as democracy, freedom, and progress (Johnson & Onweugbuzie, 2004). They want to make the world a better place and use research to better practice and understanding, yet this emphasis is also a major weakness of the paradigm. Often, pragmatist researchers' practically focuses their work too specifically, eschewing broader-based knowledge for specific changes; therefore, researchers basing their work in this philosophy must remember the "bigger picture" when reporting their results and provide clear recommendations related to broader understandings (Johnson & Onweugbuzie).

Institutional Setting

The setting for this study is a large, research-intensive, Midwestern university. The university used for this study is a leader in the field of study abroad, serving about 2500 student participants per year and offering a wide-range of study abroad programs including exchange programs, internship programs, faculty-led programs, and service programs. Selection of this site assists with program design for several reasons. First, the institution sends a large volume of students abroad, which allows for sufficient sample sizes and participant diversity. Second, the institution offers over 260 programs ranging in length from one week to an academic year on every continent, which helps address

variables related to program characteristics. In other words, many different program models exist at this institution with different course offerings, timings, and durations, so the rationale for low male participation should not be that no programs exist for specific majors or that the programs are too long and interfere with other summer experiences. Third, this institution leads the country in faculty-led programs, meaning students earn credit for their university requirements from their own faculty rather than relying on transfer credits, which lessens the challenge of obtaining credit that counts toward their degree.

Considering some of the suggested rationales for low male participation including limited site location, inability to take required courses, potential to delay graduation, and program timing—this institutional setting provides some built-in controls. For example, a male engineering student at a small institution without engineering study abroad programs might not go abroad because of lack of knowledge, their curriculum, personal characteristics, or because there are no programs available to him. Conducting the study at an institution with a culture of study abroad and that offers a range of program topics, locations, and lengths narrows the reasons for not going abroad considerably.

Research Question and the Sequential Design

As stated in the first chapter, my primary research question is "Why do traditionally-aged college males not participate in study abroad programs as often as females?". Based on the literature, a number of ideas exist within the study abroad community in response to this question; however, few empirical studies address it directly. This study uses mixed methods to address this broader question of male

participation using complementary strategies: first by analyzing a secondary data source using an institutional survey of male and female students and second by conducting semistructured interviews with traditionally-aged college males. This section provides an overview of the types of questions and variables related to each strategy, and the subsequent sections deal directly with each strategy's design and implementation.

For the quantitative phase of the study, I analyzed data from an existing survey to investigate barriers to participation that can be quantified. Such variables include the following (see Figure 3 for graphical representation):

- Programmatic characteristics: length of program, timing of program, courses offered on the program, and cost;
- Institutional characteristics: availability of courses and programs in a student's major;
- Situational factors: students' perception of study abroad as conflicting with internships or work, athletics, student involvement, and graduation timelines;
- Dispositional characteristics: fun, safety, and health factors as motivators or barriers; and
- Information factors: students' knowledge and perception of the institution's, parents', and peers' messages concerning study abroad.

For each of the factors identified by these points, the institutional survey provides largescale, quantitative data that I analyzed and compared based upon characteristics such as sex, race/ethnicity, grade point average, and participation status.

During the second phase, I used interviews to investigate variables not fully explainable or included in the survey. This qualitative study delved deeper into the

problem of male participation by looking at some of the issues presented above and also by emphasizing some dispositional barriers best understood qualitatively. Specifically, this design phase emphasized:

- Factors related to family background and social capital, such as family educational and economic background as suggested by McClenaghan (2000) and previous travel experience;
- Informational factors such as messages about and support for study abroad that they receive from their institution, peers, and others;
- Dispositional factors related to male development, maturity, as well as their sense of risk and safety; and
- Additional dispositional factors related to males' opinion of careers and work, goals, and motivations (or lack thereof) for participation.

Based on the literature and a pilot study conducted for this dissertation, the issues of male careerism, risk-taking, and identity development are of primary interest during the qualitative phase of the study; however, the design for the second phase allows for other factors in addition to those analyzed in Phase 1 to be included as needed (see Figure 3, p. 82).

Phase 1: Quantitative Survey

Three of the major limitations of the study abroad literature are that (1) few studies have directly studied the influence of gender on participation, (2) studies have typically had small sample sizes with inherent selection bias and low response rates, and (3) studies have not reported data using inferential statistics. This phase of the study addresses these limitations by using a large-scale survey distributed to traditionally-aged,

و موجود بالمنطقة isser. riz نور میں مالاند фТ. 0. Że I.3 रीश ह (ang) 1212 <u>-</u> 1 1272 a ba УĽ. æd st U.S. 2210 25.26 undergraduate college males and females who attended, withdrew from, and did not attend a study abroad program at a large, Midwestern university. This section of the dissertation describes aspects of the survey, including the development, implementation, and analysis of the survey as related to this study.

Instrument Design

A committee designed the survey as part of an institutional effort seeking to understand student perspectives on study abroad, especially as related to motivations and obstacles to their participation. I participated on this committee and assisted in the design of the survey, and although the survey design did not directly target sex as a major focus in its design, it accounted for sex as a variable and included many of the same rationales often suggested in the literature as relating to low male participation. The majority of the questions on the survey gathered either categorical data related to respondents' demographic characteristics—such as academic major, sex, and ethnicity—or Likert-style data related to students' ranking of various factors as contributing to or hindering their interest and participation in study abroad. For example, respondents ranked factors such as parental support, length of program, safety concerns, cost, and academic rigor on a sixpoint Likert-style scale ranging from "not an influence" to "strongly influenced."

A campus research institute designed and distributed the survey over the campus email system using stratified random samples obtained from the institution's registrar's and study abroad offices. The sample from the study abroad database supplemented the institutional list to ensure that the response pool contained enough respondents who had participated in study abroad for analysis. The institute cleaned the names on the list to ensure that no students pulled from the study abroad database overlapped with names on

the institutional list. The institute then emailed the survey during the institution's spring semester in April 2007. The institute offered students incentives to return the survey, which included coupons to local eateries and stores, as well as a drawing for a gift certificate to a local store. The survey elicited 2,047 respondents with a 65% return rate. Response rates by sex approximated institutional enrollments, with 55.3% of the respondents identifying as female and 44.7% identifying as male (institutional enrollment for the same year was 56% female and 44% male). Content and theoretical validity of the study were established by using study abroad professionals and the available literature during its design to ensure that the proper concepts were included in the questions. The committee also tested the survey to ensure that the electronic version worked correctly and flowed logically to limit response errors.

Survey Analysis

I obtained the survey data from the research institute cleaned and transferred into SPSS. Using SPSS, I tested for relationships and statistical significance between males and females on variables related to the literature's reasoning for low male participation rates. As the survey design collected primarily nominal and ordinal data, the traditional statistics for the data are non-parametric; however, modern statistical processes do allow for the use of more powerful, parametric tests using ordinal data when it is in the form of a five- or six-point Likert-scale. After consulting Dr. Phil Gardner on the statistical methods, I proceeded with using chi-square and contingency tables to compare males and females on nominal variables such as participation or transfer student status, and I used a parametric analysis, ANOVA, to compare males' and female's mean scores on the ordinal scales such as family support. For the purposes of comparison, I used a *p*-value of

.05, setting a 95% confidence level limit. The quantitative data analysis procedures also included factor analysis of the variables related to the common influences and obstacles associated with study abroad participation.

Survey Limitations

This survey has two main limitations. First, I did not design it specifically to study the issue of male participation, and the committee did not conduct a rigorous review of literature prior to writing the survey. Thus, the survey fails to include some information that could have been useful for this specific study—and the question of study abroad participation in general. Specifically, additional information related to students' opinions about study abroad as valuable to their career goals would have provided more insight into their decision-making. Background information related to socio-economic status would have also helped for the analysis. Second, the survey design and implementation limited my ability to analyze the data using statistics. Most of the survey data gathered were nominal and ordina, so the scope and type of inferential statistics available for analysis is limited. Also, the manner in which the survey asked questions limits analysis using regression, which I discuss in Chapter 4.

Phase 2: Interview Design and Implementation

The study abroad literature suggests using a qualitative strategy to better understand the complex issues of student learning and participation in study abroad (Carlson et al., 1990); therefore, I also used a qualitative research phase to better understand male student participation and provide depth to the findings from the survey discussed above. Qualitative methodologies arose from anthropology and sociology (Kirk & Miller, 1986) to better understand a particular person, group, occurrence, or interaction

(Locke, Wyrick-Spirduso, & Silverman, 2000). Unlike quantitative research—which measures factors to find an objective truth divorced from subjective perceptions and context—qualitative methods seek understanding in a natural setting (Ary, Cheser-Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1990). From a pragmatic perspective (Rossman & Wilson, 1985), this additional phase to the research design is necessary, as it helps answer the main research question more fully than the survey could alone.

Researcher's Role

The primary instrument in qualitative research is the researcher (Creswell, 2003; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Through direct observation, interviews, and subjective analysis, the researcher offers his or her interpretations of the studied occurrence. To promote trustworthiness, Creswell (2003) recommends that the researcher clarify personal values, assumptions, and biases that may affect interpretation of the findings, so their contributions to theory can be useful (Locke et al., 2000). Influences that affect my interpretation and reaction to the student interviews include my experience as a male who both participated on a study abroad program as an undergraduate student and who currently leads study abroad programs.

As a male, majority student, I participated in a semester-long study abroad and internship program in Australia. Living and working abroad for sixth months helped me to better understand my culture and frame my worldview. Until I lived in Australia and was confronted by my otherness, I had never reflected upon or challenged my assumptions about the world. This experience shaped my career and life aspirations, and I developed a stronger commitment to social, environmental, and global issues. Until I left my home culture, I could not have articulated this desire; I, like many Americans, had
been socialized to understand the United States to be a powerful, righteous nation. I had no idea what "being American" meant or what people around the globe thought about Americans, because I had never experienced anything beyond America. Through international travel to Fiji and Australia, I was able to think about myself and my country from different perspectives. Now, as a faculty member who has led 15 short-term study abroad programs (i.e., programs under six weeks in length)—and who views these short programs as an important facet of international programming because not all students have the confidence, time, or money to travel for an extended time—I want to make sure as many students as possible can and do travel abroad.

Beyond these personal interactions with study abroad, I have formal academic and professional experience in student affairs and development, teaching and learning, career and academic advising, and marketing communications. My work with these theories influences my thinking related to this problem, which I reflect upon during the analysis and communication of my data. Finally, one of my current job responsibilities involves administering study abroad programs, so I have a professional interest in understanding male participation. For very practical reasons, I want more males studying abroad.

Interview Population and Setting

For this study phase, I interviewed 24 traditionally-aged, senior male students who are at the end of their undergraduate degree program. This decision ameliorated the issue of selecting male volunteers who are study abroad nonparticipants at the point of contact but who intend to participate later in their academic career. By picking senior study abroad nonparticipants, I ensure that the volunteer will remain a nonparticipant and decrease the likelihood that his age or year in school influenced his participation status.

In other words, a first-year student has three or more years of college during which to participate in a study abroad program, and his perspective on study abroad might be more influenced by his age and year in school than by his sex.

To elicit volunteers for the study, I recruited a purposeful sample of eight students from three disciplinary cohort groups. I selected the cohorts from disciplines that maximized the diversity of the sample as related to the problem. In other words, I picked a field of study—such as science and engineering (STEM)—that has low levels of study abroad participation and a field of study that has moderately high participation levels such as the liberal arts and social sciences. For the third cohort, I selected a unique field with very high participation at the institution—a residential program related to international relations and public policy. By selecting three major cohorts of eight students each, I was able to consider potentially confounding findings between the groups on factors that emerged from the first phase. For example, major is an important variable determining study abroad participation, so I wanted to have males representing both high and low participation majors.

Once I identified the cohorts, I obtained a list of names from the Office of Study Abroad and the academic advisors affiliated with the majors associated with my cohort groups. I then contacted the students via email and Facebook to request an interview (see Appendix B on p. 272). None of the volunteers were current students of mine or students who worked for me in any capacity. All interviews occurred on the institution's campus, with locations and times selected with the student's and my mutual consent. Getting study abroad nonparticipants to respond to email and Facebook requests proved difficult, especially for nonparticipants. To reach my goal of 12 male nonparticipants, I used

referrals from my volunteers and campus personnel who had a personal relationship with the potential study volunteer to make the introduction and vouch for my credibility.

Data Collection Strategy and Instrument

With interviews, the researcher uses direct questions, probes, and observations to understand factors contributing to a specific behavior, especially human behavior; therefore, qualitative interviews are most useful in generating theory and understanding complex concepts not easily measured quantitatively (Ary et al., 1990; Creswell, 2003). This investigation used a structured 45 – 60 minute interview protocol with probing questions to investigate traditionally-aged male college students' perceptions about study abroad. I designed the interview protocol with consideration to the first study phase, the pilot-study and literature, especially as related to Henry and Basile's (1994) model of participation in formal educational opportunities and the relevant characteristics related to students' social capital as suggested by McClenaghan (2000).

As part of the interview process, I also had each student watch the institution's study abroad video on-line. This video represents one of the primary marketing tools used by study abroad, as it is on the office's homepage and used at most orientation events for incoming students. The video includes photos from students' study abroad experiences set to music, with students' quotes intertwined with the music. After each student watched the video, I asked him to offer his suggestions about whether he found it appealing, what he thought it "said" about study abroad, and how he might make the content more appealing to a male student audience.

I collected all the interview data from one interaction, using a protocol that included open-ended questions and probes as suggested by Minichiello, Alexander and

Timewell (1997), but my design allowed for follow-up contact if needed. On a few occasions, I emailed students as a follow-up to ask additional questions or for clarity around their original interview (see Appendix D on p. 276). During the actual interviews, I digitally recorded each conversation to ensure accuracy. Also, to assist with the data collection, I used a field log to take notes on their comments, the interview setting, their behavior, and other factors (Minichiello et al.). This log would have supported the digital recording in case of technological malfunction and provided another source of data for my analysis. At the conclusion of each interview, I reviewed my notes and understandings with the volunteer, and after the transcriptions, I shared the written record of our conversation with the volunteer, giving them the opportunity to provide feedback. These techniques help to ensure the accuracy and dependability of my understanding (Creswell, 2003; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Minichiello et al.).

To start each conversation, the interview protocol used broader questions related to male's knowledge of and their thoughts and expectations related to campus international activities. Starting broad allowed the males to talk freely about what they knew—and in many cases did not know—about international opportunities in general, and it avoided biasing the nonparticipants toward the interview by making them feel uncomfortable about their status as nonparticipants. I am especially sensitive to the fact that this study could have made a nonparticipant feel guilty or somewhat "less studious" because he decided not to participate, and I further understood that such sentiments could bias the interview discussion. I tried to frame my questions and my interactions with the males in a way that avoided blame. I used this method during the pilot study, and it

worked well to eliminate any feelings of accusation or negativity around the students' decision to not participate in something this study obviously deemed important.

Based on the responses and direction of the conversation, I then asked all volunteers more pointed questions about study abroad based on the conceptual model and research design—including what they personally knew about study abroad, the messages they hear about study abroad from the university and others, and their perceptions of the value of study abroad. As the interviews progressed, I posed increasingly specific questions to probe categories that emerged from the literature review and quantitative phase of the study, such as questions about marketing messages, costs, and program characteristics. By conducting the interviews in this manner, the data obtained for each interview question did not directly link to the research question or questions that I had pre-associated with the interview protocol. As such, I spent considerable time reviewing all the interviews in their entirety during my analysis.

Data Analysis Procedures

Qualitative research is an inductive approach to inquiry. During data analysis, qualitative researchers code their data into categories that reflect the purpose of the study (Creswell, 2003); they seek to describe and then understand themes (Agar, 1980). During this analysis, I first coded the data into categories based on my four research questions. When categorizing this data, I sought patterns among the individuals' comments as suggested by Miles and Huberman (1984), which involved noting the frequency and intensity of the participants' comments. Although I used the various hunches about male participation from the literature as a basis for my interview protocol, the open-ended questions allowed themes to emerge from the answers throughout the conversation rather

than in direct relationship to a specific question or set of questions. Hence, my conceptual framework provided the basis for my analysis; however, I recognized that answers to specific themes were sprinkled throughout the entire interview, not only associated with specific interview questions. Also, I realized the need to remain open to new ideas and themes that emerged from the data.

I had the interviews transcribed by a professional service, which provided me with verbatim MS-Word documents of each interview. I then used an iterative process to analyze my data around my research questions. After this initial coding, I then outlined each research questions, identifying associated sub-themes. During this second analysis phase, I recoded data into more specific categories and in some cases moved themes and data between research questions. After the sub-themes were identified and organized, I then began to write each section of the qualitative findings by research question. For each of the four questions, I reviewed all the data again, continually moving data and themes around as I clarified my understanding and analysis. In the end, I reviewed, (re)coded, and analyzed the data seven times.

Limitations of the Interview Data

As with most qualitative research, my prior experience represents a potential source of bias to the study. I sought to minimize this bias by constantly referring back to the literature to guide my analysis, by communicating with professionals in study abroad during the research process, and by validating my field notes and transcriptions with the volunteers. Despite these efforts, another limitation inherent to this study is the number and type of students interviewed. Finding volunteers, conducting interviews, and analyzing the data are time consuming tasks. With 24 interviews, my findings are limited

in scope and perspective; however, this limitation is balanced by the first phase of this study, which used a survey to achieve the breadth of information needed to address aspects of the research question.

Related to the student volunteers, a fourth limitation is that there could be something about the students who volunteered that make them different than students who did not volunteer. To address this limitation, I situated my findings in the context and purpose of the quantitative data and the literature review. Qualitative researchers investigate a topic in-depth at the sacrifice to external generalizablity; however, they can take efforts to maximize their ability to generalize to theory (Ary et al., 1990; Creswell, 2003; Maxwell, 1992). By taking the literature-base into account, using tapes and field notes with member checks, applying my own experience, and relying on the experience of other professionals in the field, this study still achieves a high degree of creditability and accuracy (Creswell, 2007; Maxwell).

In the next chapter, I present the quantitative findings from the survey mentioned earlier in this chapter. This chapter includes discussion of study abroad participation based on demographic variables, comparisons of male and female participants and nonparticipants, and a factor analysis of influences and obstacles to participation. In Chapter 5, I then return to the qualitative data, discussing the interviews and phase two of the research study. Chapter 6 summarizes and interprets the finding from the study, suggests some conceptual ways to think about the issue of male participation, and provides my recommendations for future action and research.

Chapter 4: Quantitative Findings

This chapter reports the findings of the student survey as described in Chapter Three; reporting about the qualitative findings begins in Chapter Five. Within this chapter, I summarize the descriptive and inferential statistics used to analyze the 2047 respondent survey conducted by the institution that served as the setting for this study. During this analysis I pay specific attention to comparing responses between males and females on factors framed in this study's conceptual model and highlighted by the literature review in Chapter Two. To the extent allowed by the survey's design, this section also uses factor analysis models to better understand how these individual variables might interact to influence the decision to study abroad. Due to the nature of the survey's design, I could not conduct a quality regression analysis of the data, and under direction of my statistical consultant, I limited this study to correlation and factor analysis techniques. As a reminder to the reader, for the purposes of clarity, I refer to the students who took the survey as volunteers or respondents so as to avoid confusion with their status as study abroad participants and nonparticipants in Chapters Four and Five.

Survey Overview

Analysis Methods

I analyzed the survey data according to the four areas suggested by the conceptual model in connection to the survey design, and this section follows these areas to report the findings. Before launching into these areas though, I first compared male and female respondents on some basic demographic information provided by the survey such as racial, transfer student, and participation statuses. Second, I compared male and female responses to survey questions that linked with the four research questions developed for

this research phase based on conceptual model. In doing so, I collapsed the variables related to programmatic and institutional factors into a single category:

- Programmatic/institutional factors: cost, length of program, timing of program, courses offered on the program, and courses offered;
- Information such as support factors: students' campus, family, and peer support systems.
- Situational factors: students' major, time and financial conflicts, and potential to delay graduation;
- Dispositional factors: students perception of fun, safety, health, and cultural
 - factors as motivators or barriers; and

To compare different groups based on demographic and other factors, I used SPSS Version 16.0 to analyze the findings using chi-square and ANOVA techniques. For the purpose of this study, I consider differences between groups to be statistically significant if the p value is less than .05.

If both the independent and dependant variables for a test are categorical in nature (e.g., comparing males and females on transfer student status), then I used the chi-square test for independence as the appropriate technique. When comparing categorical groups based on categorical data, the dependent variable's average has no statistical meaning: A student either is or is not a transfer student. In this case, I used a contingency table, which compares the observed number of students in each dependent category to the statistically expected observations for each category, and the chi-square statistic, which indicates the degree to which the differences between the observed values and expected values are statistically significant or based on chance. If the chi-square is significant, then the contingency table suggests how the dependent variable (e.g., transfer student status) differs based on the independent variable (e.g., sex).

If the dependent variable is ordinal, then a more powerful comparison of the independent variable can be run using a t-test or ANOVA test (one-way ANalysis Of VAriance). The ANOVA test copares the mean value of the dependent variables for two or more groups. If the ANOVA is statistically significant, then a significant difference exists between the groups for that particular variable. ANOVAs are typically used to compare the means of multiple groups and t-tests are used to compare two groups, but given the power and current usage of ANOVA, my statistician recommended using an ANOVA for all the comparisons. When comparing two groups, an ANOVA is mathematically the same as a t-test.

In addition to this consideration, traditional statisticians would state that ordinal data should be computed using non-parametric methods (Stevens, 1946 & 1951); however, given advances in computer statistical programs and the nature of the data, ANOVAs are commonly used to compare ordinal data in social science and applied research (Davison & Sharma, 1994; Velleman & Wilkinson, 1993). When using an ANOVA to compare ordinal data, the interpretations must be limited to ordinal statements. For example, I can say that males are more or less likely than females to be influenced by cost, a statement based on the order of the data, but I cannot say that males are twice or half as likely as females to participate on study abroad, a statement that relies on ratio data. Also, given the nature of my scale—a six-point Likert scale versus a three point agree or disagree scale—my survey data does have meaningful means that I can compare.

Second, I used a factor analysis to analyze (1) the influences on the decision making related to study abroad and (2) the obstacles to studying abroad. I used this analysis to determine if the variables used on the survey clustered into categories related to the factors suggested by the conceptual framework and research questions (i.e., programmatic, institution, situational, etc.). This technique also provides insight into how males and females might prioritize difference variables and the strength of the variables or components on decision-making. I discuss additional information and detail related to the factor analysis design within that section, later in Chapter 4.

Survey Design and Sample

In spring 2007, the institution serving as the setting for this study embarked on a review of its study abroad programs, and as part of the evaluation, the faculty and staff professionals worked with a research unit on campus to implement an on-line survey for students. This survey employed a stratified random sample, pulling student emails from both the study abroad and registrar's offices' records to ensure a good mix of participants and nonparticipants. The research unit then distributed the survey over campus email, and it provided incentives in the form of coupons for all students who completed the survey as well as a lottery for gift certificate. The data analyzed in this chapter represents responses from 2047 students, and according to the research office, this survey received the highest response rate of any survey conducted on the campus, about 65%.

The survey respondents fell into three participation status groups, 712 (34.8%) participated on study abroad or were about to leave for study abroad at the time of the survey, 578 (23.3%) indicated an interest in study abroad and intent to sign up in the future, and 755 (36.9%) did not and do not plan to participate on study abroad. The

percentage of respondents who studied abroad (34.8%) is higher than the campus participation rate of 30% because of the stratified-random sampling used for data collection. For clarity and consistency, this study only analyzes and reports differences between students who participated on study abroad and students who did not participate on study abroad. Given that the primary research question is "why males are not studying abroad at the same rate as females," I decided—based on my experience with the pilot study—to compare only participants and nonparticipants because potential participants do not have a clear participation status and thus may confound the results.

Demographically, the survey volunteers mirrored the general institutional population in terms of their sex, with 1113 (55%) females and 910 (45%) males, when compared with the institution's undergraduate enrollment of 53% and 47 % respectively according to institutional planning data; however, the study participants were not as racially diverse as the institution's campus population. The survey data indicate 1728 (84%) majority and 320 (12%) minority student respondents, and according to the institution's planning office, the campus's undergraduate split for domestic students is about 76% majority students and 17% students of color (non-international).

As with ethnicity, the survey volunteer population was skewed toward academically advanced students, with more students toward the junior and senior range in comparison to the overall campus, with 14.4% first-year, 20.1% second-year, 27.5% third-year, 28.4% fourth-year students, and 9.3% fifth-year and above. Their ages ranged from 18 to 54, with an average of about 21 years of old, and the average GPA for the volunteers was 3.29 on a 4.0 scale. In terms of transfer status, 345 (16.9%) students transferred to the institution and 1698 (83%) were non-transfer students. Finally, when looking at the major categories for the students, 817 (40%) of students reported majors within the STEM fields, 767 (37.5%) reported majors within the liberal arts, 407 (19.9%) reported majors in business, and 67 (3.3%) students reported no major or had not declared a major. For an overview of the survey respondents, see Table E1 (p. 278). *Participants and Nonparticipants*

I started the analysis by comparing participants and nonparticipants based on sex. The contingency table for this analysis (Table F1, p. 279) indicates that when the observed values are compared to the expected values, males are underrepresented as participants and overrepresented as nonparticipants. The inverse is true for females, suggesting that females are more likely to go abroad, and the Pearson chi square test (Table F2, p. 279) indicates that this participation difference by sex is significant (p =.000). In addition to participation status, I compared males and females on five variables related to participation status that could confound the finding that males participate less than females: minority status, major, transfer student status, GPA and previous travel.

For the major analysis, I recoded students' self-reported majors as being STEMfield, non-STEM field, business field, or no major. I defined STEM-field using the National Science Foundation classification system, and I included fields housed within the institution's College of Business to distinguish that category. I then coded all other majors as non-STEM. I coded any student with a dual-major that included a STEM-field as STEM major and similarly with business majors. My rationale for this decision being that if major fields impose specific limitations on students' ability to study abroad, then students should fall into the most "rigorous" major category as suggested by the

literature, which in this instance suggests that STEM-majors face the most obstacles and non-STEM, liberal arts students face the fewest obstacles.

From these analyses, I found significant differences between males and females as related to major, transfer student status, and GPA, with no significant difference based on minority status (see Tables F3 and F4, p. 280) or previous travel (see Tables F5 and F6, p. 281). Comparing these findings to the review of literature, one could attribute male's lower observed participation to their major status, transfer status, or lower average GPA, as the literature suggests that these areas are characteristic of non-participation. Due to this situation, I then compared participants to nonparticipants based on major, transfer status, and GPA to determine if these other variables could potentially account for differences between sex groups as related to participation. As suggested by the literature, demographic variables of the population did influence participation status. I summarize these findings below:

- Major Males were significantly (p = .000) more likely than females to be STEM and business majors and less likely than females to be non-STEM majors (see Tables F7 and F8, pp. 282-283). Non-STEM majors were far more likely than expected to study abroad and STEM majors were slightly less likely to study abroad than expected to study abroad (p = .000), with business majors' observed values being about equal to the expected values (see Tables F9 and F10, p. 283).
- Transfer status Males were also significantly (p = .001) more likely to be transfer students than females (see Tables F11 and F12, p. 284), and transfer students were significantly (p = .000) more likely to be nonparticipants than expected (see Tables F13 and F14, p. 285).

GPA – Males have a significantly lower average GPA than females (p = .000), with males having an average of 3.26 and females having an average of 3.32. The ANOVA results also showed a significant (p = .000) difference between the average GPA of participants (3.37) and nonparticipants (3.21), suggesting that participants on average have a higher GPA (see Tables F15, p. 285).

In the subsequent sections, I discuss the obstacles and influences for study abroad based on sex; the organization follows the outline discussed in the introduction to this chapter. The initial investigation of the survey sample resulted in my identification of several demographic characteristics that could be intervening variables. To account for these differences between participants and nonparticipants, I compared males and females regarding participation status separately. In other words, instead of looking at differences between male and female groups based on participation, the following sections state the differences between sex groups within participation status groups. This technique allows me to make some statements about differences between males and females while accounting for the confounding differences between participants and nonparticipants.

Comparison of Male & Female Participants' & Nonparticipants

Using one-way ANOVA tests, I compared male and female responses to survey questions based on variables specifically related to the conceptual model. I present the findings based on differences between males and females below by research question: (1) programmatic/institutional variables, (2) situational variables, (3) dispositional variables, and (4) relational and information variables. Following the presentation of these findings, I present a discussion of the factor analysis findings. These quantitative results provided an estimation of the significant differences between males and females on specific variables and served as the basis for some probing questions during the second phase of the research design, described in Chapter 5. I then provide a summary of the quantitative findings.

Research Question 1: Programmatic Variables

The first research question focused on the influence of programmatic variables, which the conceptual model suggests as a major domain influencing the decision to participate. Variables in this category represent features inherent to the institutional or administrative nature of study abroad, such as program cost, duration, timing, location, and coursework. The survey asked study abroad *participants* to rank the influence of these five variables on their decision to study abroad using a six-point Likert scale, with six being "influenced a lot" and one being "not at all influenced". Nonparticipants did not respond to questions related to these five variables. Each variable is discussed below in terms of the descriptive and inferential statistics from the survey (see Table G1, p. 286).

Location ranked highest amongst students in terms of its influence on the decision to study abroad, with 84.6% of participants claiming it was highly influential. By sex, 80.4% of male and 86.6% of female participants ranked this variable as highly influential, with males reporting an average ranking of 5.16/6 and females reporting an average of 5.44/6, a significant difference at the .00 confidence level. This finding implies that males are significantly less influenced by the study abroad program's location than females. This finding could relate to the literature that indicates that males are more risky than females and the literature and findings that indicate females are generally more concerned NI SAR <u>::</u>:::5. , St.C.C 12:20 <u>Titi</u> **R** () 1000 ļ. 12. ad j)IC 1 1 I. Ŵ. de; İ. with safety and health than males and seek out programs in large, Westernized urban city centers.

Within the program category, timing of the program (semester offered) was the second highest ranked influential variable, with 68.5% of participants ranking this variable as highly influential to them. By sex, 61.5% of males and 72.5% of females ranked this variable as highly influential, with males reporting an average rating of 4.63/6 and females reporting an average of 4.92/6, which represents a significant difference at the .008 confidence level. This finding suggests that males are significantly less concerned with timing of the study abroad program as a consideration for their participation in study abroad. On face value, this finding seems to contradict the literature, which implies that males might be very time sensitive due to their academic and personal obligations; however, it could also relate to the fact that the literature indicates that males are less likely to plan ahead than females.

The third ranked programmatic feature related to the length of the student abroad program (duration), which 59.4% of participants ranked as highly influential. Looking at this variable by sex, 50.2% of males and 64.3% of females ranked this variable as highly influential. Males reported an average rating of 4.33/6 and females reported an average of 4.70/6, a significant difference at the .000 confidence level. This finding implies that males are significantly less concerned with the duration of the study abroad as a consideration for their participation in study abroad.

Along with this question, the survey asked participants to rank the duration of their first study abroad experience on a scale of one to four, with one being "less than three weeks" and four being "more than 16 weeks" (more than a semester). I used a

contingency table to analyze the responses by sex because the scale was not even in its time distribution across the four ordinal ranks, and according to the table, males did show a significantly higher (p = .004) representation than expected in the "3 – 9 weeks" and "9 – 16 weeks" categories, with females slightly less represented in the "9-16 weeks" and over represented in the "3 weeks or less" categories. This finding suggests that males who participate on study abroad go on longer programs than females. Again, these findings related to duration are somewhat counter-intuitive given the literature, but as with the timing and location variables, they could reflect the fact that males are more risk-taking and less likely to plan ahead than females (see Tables G2 and G3, p. 287).

The fourth variable related to the programmatic factor, coursework offered, was ranked as highly influential by 59% of participants. Comparing responses by sex, 60.4% of males and 58% of females ranked this variable as highly influential, with males reporting an average rating of 4.43/6 and females reporting an average of 4.61/6 on this scale. No significant difference existed between male and female participants on this variable.

The final variable in the programmatic factor category is cost. In this instance, cost refers to the extent that the cost of a program influenced the decision to participate; additional questions related to cost and money are discussed in the situational factors section. As one might imagine, cost was not ranked as a major influence toward participation, with only 29.9% or participants ranking it as highly influential—the lowest ranking in this grouping of variables. Looking at this variable by sex, 24.7% of male and 32.6% of female participants ranked cost as highly influential in their decision to participate. For this question, males had an average rank of 3.27/6 and females had an

average rank of 3.59/6, a significant difference at the .014 level. This difference insinuates that males are less influenced by cost than females. This situation could indicate that males are less cost sensitive than females, or it might mean that males are less likely to use cost as a determinant for their participation.

Research Question 2: Situational Variables

A second factor suggested by the conceptual model as an influence related to participation encompasses variables particular to students' unique situations. This area includes variables such as students' ability to finance a program, time constraints, academic situations, and other personal obligations. Situational variables are unique to individual students not the program itself; therefore, for any given program, what might be a positive characteristic for one student could be a negative to another student. For example, as discussed previously major is a situational variable often discussed as an influence on study abroad. As shown by this study, STEM majors often study abroad at lower rates than liberal arts majors because of the nature of their coursework and the relationship between study abroad programmatic content and the major's curriculum.

Unlike programmatic features, which the survey posed as positive influences for participation to study abroad participants, the survey framed these situational factors in a negative context as potential obstacles to study abroad participation. Hence, the survey asked study abroad *participants and nonparticipants* to rank the degree to which these variables were an obstacle to their decision to participate using a six-point Likert scale, with six being a "major obstacle" and one being "not an obstacle at all". See Tables H1 and H2 (pp. 288-289) for a ranking of these obstacles for males and females by participant and nonparticipant status.

linh Looki partic Tarix. С. С. С. 107.5 61.6 aver: 101 T.2. 13 уľ 0b; . ili . Lo fj 02 33 M_{L} As suggested by the literature, finding the money to pay for study abroad was the number one obstacle reported by both participants (45.5%) and nonparticipants (22.8%). Looking at participants by sex, 40.2% of male participants and 48.6% of female participants ranked this variable as a major obstacle. With males reporting an average ranking of 3.27/6 and females reporting an average of 3.59/6 on this scale, a significant difference at the .014 confidence level, which suggests that amongst participants females consider cost more of an obstacle than males. For nonparticipants, 54% of males and 62.6% of females ranked this variable as a major obstacle, with males reporting an average ranking of 4.16/6 and females reporting an average of 4.60/6 on this scale. This difference is significant at the .004 level, suggesting that as with participants, female nonparticipants consider their ability to fund study abroad as more of an obstacle than males.

Related to one's ability to finance the program, the survey asked students about the potential to lose wages while aboard. In other words, the survey asked students to what extent the loss of the ability to earn money from a job at home while abroad was an obstacle to their participation. This variable is distinguished from the previous variable in the sense that students may have the money to fund a program, but their absence from home may cause them to lose the opportunity to earn additional money needed for the future. The literature suggests that for some students, the opportunity cost of participation—not necessarily the direct cost—could be the larger concern.

Concern for lost wages was rated as a major obstacle by 23.7% of participants and 23.4% of nonparticipants. Looking at this finding by sex, 26.3% of male participants and 30.3% of female participants ranked this variable as a major obstacle. With males

:001..... sale, a i mngs imaies rusio ar. ave î.Çê stady jog द्याः are r abour ior s 823 I Look Partic nonpe ojsiac! average reporting an average ranking of 3.03/6 and females reporting an average of 3.32/6 on this scale, a significant difference at the .034 confidence level. This result suggests that amongst participants, males consider the opportunity cost less of an obstacle than females.

For nonparticipants, 24.1% of males and 22.2% of females ranked this variable as a major obstacle, with males reporting an average ranking of 3.5/6 and females reporting an average of 3.88/6 on this scale. This difference is significant at the .022 level, suggesting that as with participants, male nonparticipants consider the opportunity cost of study abroad as less of an obstacle than females. Combined with the finding related to program cost and ability to pay, it seems as if males might be less cost sensitive than females when considering study abroad. This finding could relate to the fact that males are more independent financially than females or that they merely care less than females about the financial aspects of participation.

Beyond financial concerns, factors related to time are typically major obstacles for students. Generally, the ability to find time to participate—regardless of rationale was rated as a major obstacle by 15.7% of participants and 21% of nonparticipants. Looking at this variable by sex, 14.2% of male participants and 16.6% of female participants ranked this variable as a major obstacle, with males reporting an average ranking of 2.72/6 and females reporting an average of 2.75/6 on this scale. For nonparticipants, 51.6% of males and 54.7% of females ranked this variable as a major obstacle, with males reporting an average ranking of 4.27/6 and females reporting an average of 4.29/6 on this scale. Neither group showed a significant difference for this

12.220 iz loni) Ą 11....) 14666 :aj...: 100201 330 £ 3/ . 113 of 3 101 <u> Şi</u> (b); 125 .c.;; <u>(3)</u> <u>1</u>31. . 41. j 10C) variable based on gender, which is interesting given that the literature associate male's tendency to favor STEM majors as giving them less time to participate than females.

Academic constraints are often the reason that students cannot find time to participate on study abroad (Dessoff, 2006). For some students, their major and/or degree requirements are such that students' participation would hamper their ability to take needed coursework and thus lead to a delay in their graduation. In terms of finding required coursework on a study abroad program, 18.3% of participants and 11.2% of nonparticipants ranked this variable as a major obstacle. Looking at participants by sex, 18.8% of male participants and 17.7% of female participants ranked this variable as a major obstacle, with males reporting an average ranking of 2.77/6 and females reporting an average of 2.62/6 on this scale. For nonparticipants, 26.4% of males and 31.5% of females ranked this variable as a major obstacle, with males reporting an average ranking of 3.25/6 and females reporting an average of 3.34/6 on this scale. Neither participants nor nonparticipants had a statistically significant difference for this variable based on sex.

In relationship to delaying one's graduation due to study abroad participation, 9.8% of participants and 12.2% of nonparticipants ranked this variable as a major obstacle. By sex, 10.9% of male participants and 9.2% of female participants ranked this variable as a major obstacle, with males reporting an average ranking of 2.17/6 and females reporting an average of 1.92/6 on this scale. This difference is significant at the .032 confidence level and suggests that males are more concerned about delaying their graduation than females, which aligns with what the literature review predicted and the fact that males' majors are predominantly in the STEM fields for this survey. For nonparticipants, 30.8% of males and 30.8% of females ranked this variable as a major

6.750
زسور ۱۰ مربا الی
ing :
ne :
idi
scat
LONT
3.33
RE
1.69
et m
50°
X2.3
the .(
PC750
ופלאו

obstacle, with males reporting an average ranking of 3.19/6 and females reporting an average of 3.07/6 on this scale, although males are higher the difference is not significant.

For the final variable related to academics, the survey asked students the extent that their inability to meet the program's academic requirements would be an obstacle. At the institution used for this study, an inability to meet program requirements would typically involve a student's lack of language ability or—more likely—a student's poor academic record (i.e., low GPA). Results show that 3.5% of participants and 3.15% of nonparticipants ranked this variable as an obstacle. Considering this variable by sex, 3.3% of male participants and 3.6% of female participants ranked inability to meet academic requirements as a major obstacle, with males reporting an average ranking of 1.69/6 and females reporting an average of 1.62/6 on this scale. For nonparticipants, 7.9% of males and 7.9% of females ranked this variable as a major obstacle, with males reporting an average of 1.88/6 and females reporting an average of 1.87/6 on this scale. The differences between males and females on this variable were not significant at the .05 level.

The final grouping of situational obstacles on the survey related to students' personal and professional obligations, including their lease, family duties, extra-curricular responsibilities, and athletic schedule. Each of these areas is discussed below:

 Concern over housing and/or a lease agreement was ranked as a major obstacle by 10.3% of participants and 6.1% of nonparticipants. By sex, 7.5% of male participants and 11.7% of female participants ranked this variable as a major obstacle, with males reporting an average ranking of 1.89/6 and females reporting an average of 2.08/6 on this scale. For nonparticipants, 12.7% of

males and 19.6% of females ranked this variable as a major obstacle, with males reporting an average ranking of 2.56/6 and females reporting an average of 2.72/6 on this scale.

- Results show that 5.5% of participants and 4.7% of nonparticipants ranked family obligations as an obstacle. Considering this variable by sex, 4.7% of male participants and 6% of female participants ranked this variable as a major obstacle, with males reporting an average ranking of 1.75/6 and females reporting an average of 1.82/6 on this scale. For nonparticipants, 12.1% of males and 11.7% of females ranked this variable as a major obstacle, with males ranked this variable as a major obstacle, with males ranked this variable as a major obstacle, with of males and 11.7% of females ranked this variable as a major obstacle, with males reporting an average ranking of 2.24/6 and females reporting an average of 2.24/6 on this scale.
- Concern over extra-curricular involvements was ranked as a major obstacle by 6% of participants and 5.77% of nonparticipants. By sex, 5% of male participants and 6.6% of female participants ranked this variable as a major obstacle, with males reporting an average ranking of 1.86/6 and females reporting an average of 1.97/6 on this scale. For nonparticipants, 14.1% of males and 15.5% of females ranked this variable as a major obstacle, with males reporting an average ranking of 2.44/6 and females reporting an average of 2.41/6 on this scale.
- Finally, concern related to athletic obligations (e.g., training, practice, or matches) was ranked as a major obstacle by 2.5% of participants and 1.87% of nonparticipants. By sex, 2.5% of male participants and 2.6% of female participants ranked this variable as a major obstacle, with males reporting an

average ranking of 1.33/6 and females reporting an average of 1.25/6 on this scale. For nonparticipants, 5.7% of males and 3.3% of females ranked this variable as a major obstacle, with males reporting an average ranking of

1.63/6 and females reporting an average of 1.40/6 on this scale. Of these four variables, the only significant difference between males and females exists for nonparticipants' athletic obligations. This finding suggests that male nonparticipants view their athletic obligations as more of an obstacle than female nonparticipants. This could relate to the fact that males are more likely to be athletes than females, males take their obligation to athletics more seriously than females, males' athletics—which include revenue generating sports such as football—pose more barriers to their participation than females' athletics, or male coaches are less supportive of international travel (Dessoff, 2006; Redden, 2008; Sax, 2008).

Research Question 3: Dispositional Variables

The third factor related to the decision to participate involves students' individual dispositions, including their perceptions of study abroad's value and concerns they might have about their personal involvement. Dispositional factors differ from situational factors in that they relate more to students' perceptions, values, and beliefs rather than their specific status. Unlike the variables discussed for research questions one and two, dispositional variables encompass questions phrased as both influences and obstacles. For clarity, I first discuss issues related to potential influences on the decision to participate for participants (see Table I1, p. 290), then discuss potential obstacles for participants and nonparticipants (see Tables I2 & I3, pp. 290-291), and conclude this section with other dispositional factors (see Table I4, p. 291).

The survey asked study abroad participants to rank the influence of four dispositional variables on their decision to study abroad using a six-point Likert scale, with six being "influenced a lot" and one being "not at all influenced." These variables included the idea that study abroad represents a fun experience, an investment in the future, an opportunity to use a second language, and an opportunity to interact with a host culture.

Related to the concept of study abroad as "fun," 68.3% of participants ranked this variable as highly influential to their decision. Organizing this variable by sex, 86.3% of males and 89.5% of females rated this variable as highly influential, with an average of 5.38/6 for males and 5.50/6 for females. In terms of the perception that study abroad is an "investment for their future," 68.3% of participants rated this factor as highly influential. Breaking it down by sex, 66.5% of males and 69.6% of females ranked future investment as highly influential to their decision, with males having an average of 4.82/6 and females having an average of 4.97/6. These findings are interesting, as one would typically associate the desire for fun with male students (Kimmel, 2008; Sax, 2007); however, neither factor had a significant difference between males and females at the .05 confidence level.

Similarly, the factors related to language and culture showed no significant differences between males and females. In relationship to the desire to use second language, 33.7% of all participants, 34.7% of males, and 31.7% of females rated language as highly influential, with the average ranking for males 3.21/6 and for females 3.31/6. For interaction with another culture, 49.7% of all participants, 45.8% of males, and 51.7% of females ranked this factor as highly influential. In terms of averages, males ranked this variable 4.01/6 and females rated it 4.06/6. This lack of significant difference is interesting because the literature review suggests that males study abroad at a lower rate than females because they are less interested in learning about other cultures and/or that their majors are less likely to require language or intercultural ability than females. Given the findings related to non-STEM, liberal arts majors on this survey, one might have expected to see a difference for these variables.

The second set of questions framed dispositional variables as obstacles to participation using a six-point Likert scale, with six being "a major obstacle" and one being "not an obstacle at all." The survey asked study abroad participants and nonparticipants to rank their concerns about health, safety, homesickness, and poor academic performance and the degree to which each factor was an obstacle related to their decision-making. Another dispositional factor posed as an obstacle, but posed only to nonparticipants, was the idea that the student "had no interest" in studying abroad.

In relationship to health, 6.3% of participants and 2.2% of nonparticipants ranked health concerns as a major obstacle. By sex, 2.5% of male and 8.3% of female participants ranked health as a major obstacle, with males having an average score of 1.69/6 and females having an average of 2.14/6. The difference between males' and females' averages is statistically significant at the .00 level, suggesting that males perceive their personal health concerns as less of an obstacle to participation than females. Looking at nonparticipants, 2.5% of males ranked health as a major obstacle, with an average score of 1.91/6, and 8.3% of females ranking health as an obstacle, with an average score of 1.93/6. Health concerns are not significantly different between male and female nonparticipants.

A second question asked respondents about their concerns related to safety abroad, and 9.1% of participants and 3.2% of nonparticipants ranked this factor as a major obstacle. Looking at differences by sex, 4.2% of male and 11.7% of female participants ranked safety as a major obstacle; males had an average score of 1.82/6 and females had an average of 2.44/6. The difference between males' and females' averages is statistically significant at the .00 level, suggesting that—as with health—males perceive their personal safety as less of an obstacle to participation than females. Looking at nonparticipants, 9.5% of males ranked safety as a major obstacle, with an average score of 2.04/6, and 5.6% of females ranking safety as an obstacle, with an average score of 2.13/6. Safety concerns are not significantly different between males and females for nonparticipants.

Third, participants and nonparticipants ranked their perception that missing friends and family at home would prove to be an obstacle to their study abroad participation. Missing family and friends was ranked as a major obstacle by 17% of participants and 9.1% of nonparticipants. By sex, 12.1% of male participants and 19.7% of female participants ranked this variable as a major obstacle, with males reporting an average ranking of 2.24/6 and females reporting an average of 2.89/6 for this factor. This difference between males' and females' average ranking is statistically significant at the .00 level, which implies that males are less concerned about missing their family and friends than females. For nonparticipants, 22.5% of males and 23.9% of females ranked this variable as a major obstacle, with males reporting an average ranking of 2.76/6 and females reporting an average of 2.90/6 for this factor. This difference is insignificant.

The fourth variable relates to participants and nonparticipants ranking of their perception that they might not perform well academically while on study abroad. Concern over academic performance was ranked as a major obstacle by 6.5% of participants and 3.6% of nonparticipants. Comparing findings by sex, 6.7% of male participants and 6.4% of female participants ranked this variable as a major obstacle, with males reporting an average ranking of 1.92/6 and females reporting an average of 1.87/6 for this factor. For nonparticipants, 9.8% of males and 7.9% of females ranked this variable as a major obstacle, with males reporting an average of 2.00/6 for this factor. The differences between males and females for both participants and nonparticipants are not significantly different for either group at the .05 level.

The final dispositional question posed as an obstacle was the degree to which nonparticipants lacked interest in study abroad, and findings indicate that 7.9% of all nonparticipants, 22.7% of males, and 15% of females ranked this factor as a major obstacle. Males had an average score of 2.89/6 and females had an average of 2.22/6. This difference in averages is significant at the .00 level, which suggests that male nonparticipants are generally less interested in study abroad than female nonparticipants. This finding is interesting as related to the literature that suggests that males might not be interested in study abroad due to gender norms and stereo-types that equate studying abroad with female interests. I discuss this issue in more detail in Chapter 5.

In addition to the questions about influences and obstacles to participation, participants answered survey questions about the degree to which they thought study abroad was more interesting and/or more challenging than campus-based courses. The

sta si ing **1**." staten For it ni 1 and t)). D 527. 20:0 Ľx(â, ĉ 1 . Ef. 520] 520] ie, Var. 01. 1 to i .][] survey posed these questions as a six-point Likert scale, with six being "strongly disagree" and one being "strongly agree." In terms of study abroad as more interesting, 74.7% of all participants, 70% of males, and 77.5% of females agreed with this statement. The average scores for males and females were 1.91/5 and 1.87/5 respectively. For the idea that study abroad is more challenging, 26% of all participants, 30% of males and 23.6% of females agreed with this statement. The average for females agreed with this statement. The average for females was 3.15/5. The difference between males and females for both of these questions were insignificant at the .05 level.

Research Question 4: Informational and Relational Variables

The final factor suggested by the conceptual model and incorporated into the survey is the concept of how students learn about and receive support related to studying abroad. This domain includes variables such as receiving parental support and discouragement, knowing faculty or students participants, getting support from offices and professionals, and receiving messages from peers. Based on the survey design, and as with the dispositional variables, some of these variables were phrased as positive influences, while one "parental support" was phrased as an obstacle. For clarity, this section will report the influencing variables for participants (see Table J1, p. 292), then the obstacles for participants and nonparticipants (see Tables J2, p. 292), and finally other variables related to support that the survey did not phrase as an influencer or an obstacle but rather in terms of "helpfulness."

The survey asked study abroad participants about four interpersonal variables as to the extent that they influenced the student's decision to participate. These variables included: peer messages about study abroad, knowing a faculty member going on study
abroad, having friends going on study abroad, and receiving encouragement from one's family/parents. As with earlier questions, the survey asked study abroad participants to rank the influence of these factors on their decision to study abroad on a six-point Likert scale, with six being "influenced a lot" and one being "not at all influenced". Each of the four factors is discussed below and summarized in Table J1 (p. 292):

- Of participants 33.1% ranked parental encouragement as highly influential to their decision to participate, the highest value of all the variables in this grouping. Looking at this variable by sex, 29.1% of males and 35.9% of females ranked it as highly influential, with males reporting an average of 3.32/6 and females reporting an average of 3.71/6. This difference is significant at the .004 confidence level, suggesting that males are less influenced by parental support than females. Note that this finding aligns with earlier findings by Shirley (2007), but may be confounded by the fact that males might have less supportive parents. In this way, males might not receive as much support thus they rank the concept of positive encouragement less than females. I discuss this issue in more detail in subsequent sections of this dissertation.
- Participants ranked peer messages second in this domain, with 32.4% of participants saying that hearing about the study abroad from peers was highly influential to their decision to participate. Breaking this variable down by sex, 25% of males and 36.4% of females found this variable highly influential, with males reporting an average ranking of 4.22/6 and females reporting an average of 4.29/6 on this scale. This difference is significant at the .028

confidence level, suggesting that males are less influenced by messages from their peers. As with the previous variable, one must be careful when considering this finding. Males may receive less information in terms of quantity, less positive information from their peers, or might be less influenced by their peers than females, all of which could lead to males ranking this item lower than females. I also discuss this finding more in Chapter 5.

- Participants ranked knowing a faculty member on a program third in this domain, with 19.2% of participants saying that this knowledge was highly influential to their decision to participate. By sex, 19.2% of males and 19.4% of females found this variable highly influential, with both reporting an average ranking of 2.60/6 on this scale. No significant difference exists between males and females for this variable.
- The fourth area of influence posed by the survey was knowing friends on a study abroad program, which 14.9% of participants ranked as highly influential to their decision. Breaking this concept down by sex, 15% of males and 14.9% of females found this variable highly influential, with males averaging 2.30/6 and females averaging 2.16/6. No significant difference exists between males and females on this variable. This finding is interesting because the literature and factor analysis suggests that males might be more influenced by having their friends participate than females.

As stated above, family support is an elusive concept because support from one's family can be positive, negative, or neutral and if given, students react to the support

differently. One student might receive negative support and choose to ignore it or the student might be highly influenced and chose not to participate. As such, in addition to asking a question about the degree to which parental encouragement influenced them to study abroad, the survey asked both participants and nonparticipants the degree to which a lack of family support posed an obstacle to their participation. As with other obstacle questions, the survey asked respondents to rank the degree to which lack of family support was an obstacle to their participation using a six-point Likert scale, with six being "major obstacle" and one being "not an obstacle at all" (see Table J2, p. 292).

The results indicate that 5.9% of participants and 4.3% of nonparticipants ranked a lack of parental encouragement as a major obstacle. By sex, 8.4% of male participants and 6.9% of female participants ranked this variable as a major obstacle, with males reporting an average ranking of 1.53/6 and females reporting an average of 1.78/6 on this scale. This difference is statistically significant at the .015 level indicating that males perceive a lack of family support as less of an obstacle than females. This finding may be related to other factors within the family dynamic that differ by sex or gender roles (i.e., males are treated as—and thus behave —more independent from the family than females), so I discuss it more in the qualitative findings section. For nonparticipants, 10.9% of males and 10.7% of females ranked this variable as a major obstacle, with males reporting an average ranking of 2.08/6 and females reporting an average of 2.18/6 on this scale. This difference is not significant.

A third set of questions related to this factor asked participants about their perceptions of support from official institutional offices and individuals such as teachers and mentors in their personal life. Participants ranked these variables using a six-point

Likert scale, with six being "very helpful" and one being "not helpful at all" (see Table J3, p. 293). In relationship to institutional offices—which included the offices of financial aid, study abroad, athletic support, advising, etc.—no significant differences existed between male and female participants, and generally participants ranked their institutional support systems highly, with faculty members rate as the most helpful and the athletics staff rated as the least helpful relative to the other offices and personnel. When considering these ratings, one should be mindful that the number of respondents for some offices—such as athletics—were quite low because not many of the students surveyed used them specifically when making a decision about study abroad participation.

Unlike the institutional offices and personnel, significant differences did exist between student participants' perceptions of support from individuals in their lives (see Table J4, p. 294). For these questions, participants ranked individual support using a sixpoint Likert scale, with six being "not supportive" and one being "very supportive" (*NOTE: this scale is opposite of all the other questions, with one effectively being the high, positive label*). Specific differences existed between males and females in relationship to the following individuals:

- Males rated their friends significantly less supportive at the .00 confidence level, with an average of 1.44/6 compared to 1.21/6 for females.
- Males rated their spiritual leader significantly less supportive at the .004 confidence level, with an average of 2.23/6 compared to 1.63/6 for females.

• Males rated their high school teacher/counselor significantly less supportive at the .001 confidence level, with an average of 1.92/6 compared to1.39/6 for females.

Other individuals, including parents, family doctor, and employer showed no differences based on sex. As with the other findings related to information, interpersonal support, and helpfulness, these differences lack context. Males might get less positive support than females, might perceive less support than females, might simply get more neutral support (i.e., they receive no positive or negative encouragement), or they might just not be as influenced by other people's opinions as fermales. The issue of interpersonal messaging and support is covered in more depth in the qualitative phase of this design.

Factor Analysis of Influences and Obstacles

For the next phase in the analysis, I used SPSS Version 16 to conduct an exploratory principal components factor analysis (PCA) of the influences and obstacles questions from the survey. To maximize the clarity of the components and assist the interpretation of the results, I used a Varimax rotation, which is the most common rotational method used for a factor analysis. To determine the suitability of the data to factor analysis procedures, I used three techniques: inspection of the correlation matrix for values of 0.3 or higher, a significant value on Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, and a value of .6 or higher on the Kaiser-Meyer-Oklin (KMO) value.

For the purposes of investigation, the number of components extracted was **calculated** using Kaiser's criterion eigenvalue set at one and further refined by comparing **the** scree plots. I also tested the reliability of the resulting components using alpha. One Ioratory, I considered values at 0.60 or higher as meaningful for this specific study.
Ioratory, I considered values at 0.60 or higher as meaningful for this specific study.
Image: Image:

As previously discussed, the survey format divided respondents into participation **status** groups, which influenced the questions they answered. For this reason, I ran the **factor** analysis for influences and obstacles separately, and as stated in the previous **section**, I looked at the variables by participants and nonparticipants separately. First, I **conducted** the factor analysis for participants on all influences to participate. This **analysis** included 13 variables: cost, location, duration, timing, coursework offered, **language**, home stay, peer messages, knowing faculty, knowing friends, parental **encouragement**, fun, and future investment.

Second, for the obstacle variables, I did two factor analyses: one for participants and one for nonparticipants. This analysis procedure included 14 variables: time, money, lost wages, courses for degree, academic requirements, academic performance, safety, health, lease, clubs, family support, family duties, missing family, and athletics. Nonparticipants also answered an additional question related to "interest," which was included in the analysis for this group but not for participants. For both sets of analysis, I also compared the findings by sex.

ctor Analysis of Influences

Before conducting the exploratory PCA for the influences on study abroad, I **tested** the data for suitability. The correlation matrix contained coefficients with a value **of 0.30** or higher, the KMO value was .717, and the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was **significant** (p=.000). With the data's suitability determined, I ran the PCA, which resulted **in four** components with an eigenvalue of more than 1. These four components explained **a total** of 48.54% of the variance. The screeplot for this PCA showed a clear break **between** the first and second component, suggesting that only the first component be **retained** for further investigation (Catell, 1966). This finding was common to all the **PCAs**, but I report the full range of components for the sake of discussion.

I also ran a reliability test on the variables for each component using Cronbach's **alpha**. None of the alpha's showed a value higher than 0.60, suggesting that the **relationship** between the individual variables within each component is weak. Given that this **analysis** is exploratory, I also report these values even though the relationships are **weaker** than typically used and briefly describe each factor, as it may provide some **valuable** insights for this and future studies. I outline the full data for this factor analysis in **Table** K1 (p. 295).

The four components as suggested by the first factor analysis:

 The first factor accounted for 13.80% of the variance and consisted of five different variables: cost, duration, timing, and coursework offered. The reliability for these five variables was only .518. This component is consistent with the programmatic features category from the conceptual model, and it suggests that characteristics related to the program design are an important—

perhaps the most important—influence on the decision to study abroad by participants.

- 2. The second factor accounted for 13.17% of the variance and consisted of three different variables: peer messages, knowing faculty, and knowing friends going on the program. The reliability for these variables was only .574, the highest alpha for all of the components. These three variables all related to the relational category suggested by the conceptual model. This component suggests that relationships are an important aspect of the decision to study abroad.
- 3. The third factor accounted for 11.10% of the variance and consisted of two different variables: language and culture. These two variables connect logically, and they both relate to dispositional variables; however, the reliability for these variables was only .468.
- 4. The fourth factor accounted for 10.44% of the variance and consisted of two different variables: fun and location. The relationship between these variables was only .385, and they do not connect according to the conceptual model. This finding does suggest though that the study abroad participants might associate fun with the location they select, and it also could suggest that "having fun" is of lower importance than one might expect.

A final variable, future investment, did not clearly load on any component at a value of 0.40 or higher. This factor analysis suggests that the strongest variables related to a student's decision to participate consist of programmatic features and that the I = positional interest related to fun is not as influential as the literature might suggest;

I conducted the same factor analysis procedure again for male and female **participants** (Tables K2 and K3, p. 296). For males, the correlation matrix contained **coeff**icients with a value of 0.30 or higher, the KMO value was .685, and the Bartlett's **Test** of Sphericity was significant (p=.000). Using the eigenvalue of 1, five components **resulted** from the PCA, accounting for 57.60% of the variance. As with the other analysis, **the screeplot** suggests that only the first component be retained, but given the exploratory **nature** of this study, I describe this analysis and compare it to the one done for all **participants**. The five components from this PCA are:

- The first male factor accounted for 13.64% of the variance and consisted of three variables: peer messages, knowing faculty, and knowing friends going on the program. This component is the same grouping as the total group; however, this grouping loaded first instead of second.
- The second male factor accounted for 11.95% of the variance and consisted of two different variables: duration, semester, and parental encouragement.
 Parental encouragement does not make logical sense with this group, and it loaded almost as well on component four.
- 3. The third male factor accounted for 11.86% of the variance and consisted of two different variables: location, home stay, and fun. This finding is also different from the other group in that males seem to associate a "home stay" with fun and may account for the poor reliability from the previous PCA. During various methods of factor analysis for this study, I found that males

consistently link "home stay" with location and fun, which could potentially relate to males' sense of risk and adventure.

- 4. The fourth male factor accounted for 10.68% of the variance and consisted of two different variables: coursework and future investment. This component is interesting in that "future investment" did not load on any component for the PCA of all participants, and it may mean that male participants associate study abroad courses with their future.
- 5. The fifth male factor accounted for 10.06% of the variance and consisted of two different variables: cost and language. These two variables have seemingly no logical relationship, and it may just be that they are of lowest importance to males.

Although the relationships between the variables are sometimes illogical for these components, it is interesting to find that males' variables divided into more components and differently than that of the full group. Specifically, males seem to place more value on relationships, as these variables loaded for the first component, and fun, which loaded third instead of fourth for males when compared to the full group.

For female participants, the correlation matrix contained coefficients with a value of 0.30 or higher, the KMO value was .698, and the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was ^{significant} (p=.000). Using the eigenvalue of one, four components resulted from the PCA, accounting for 48.43% of the variance. As with the other analyses, the screeplot ^{suggests} that only the first component be retained, but given the exploratory nature of this study, I describe this analysis and compare it to the one done for all participants and for males. As with the full group PCA, this analysis resulted in four components:

- The first female factor accounted for 14.26% of the variance and consisted of four variables: duration, timing, coursework, and future investment. This component is similar to the grouping for the total group; however, this grouping includes future investment and does not include cost. Cost did load on this group at a value of .39, just under the cut-off value for this study.
- 2. The second female factor accounted for 13.30% of the variance and consisted of two different variables: peer messages, knowing faculty, and knowing students who are participating. These variables and the loading rank are similar to the full group.
- 3. The third female factor accounted for 11.05% of the variance and consisted of two different variables: language and home stay. This finding the same as the PCA for the entire group in terms of the variables and loading rank.
- 4. The fourth female factor accounted for 9.81% of the variance and consisted of two different variables: fun and location. This component is the same for females as it is for the entire group in terms of the variables included within it and loading rank relative to the other components.

Generally, females' components grouped in the same manner as the full group's components. As with the full group, one variable did not load on any component; however, for this PCA the variable that had an inconclusive loading was "family support." This finding is interesting because one would assume that females would factor in family support as an important part of their decision to participate given the literaturebase's theory that safe travel is a primary concern, but this finding might mean that females view family primarily as a negative rather than positive influence.

Factor Analysis of Obstacles for Participants

The second set of main survey variables related to obstacles to participation. I ran exploratory PCA for both participant and nonparticipant males and females. First, the PCA for participants as related to obstacles showed adequate coefficients in the correlation matrix, a KMO of .83, and a significant Barlett's Test (p=.000). For this factor analysis, four components explained 57.79% of the variance. As with all the other PCAs, the screeplot indicates a large difference between the first and second component, suggesting that only the first component be retained; however, reliability tests for the obstacle components show much stronger relationships well above 0.60 than those obtained from the influence PCAs. The four components are (see Table K4, p. 297):

- The first component explained 16% of the variance with three variables: health, safety, and missing family. These components related to dispositional issues, and they have a reliability score of .702.
- The second component explained 15.18% of the variance with four variables: time, required courses, degree requirements, and academic requirements. The variables for this component all relate to situational variables, and they have a reliability score of .69.
- 3. The third component explained 14.73% of the variance with five variables: academic performance, clubs, athletics, family support, and family duties. Academic performance and family support do not necessarily make logical sense with this component, but the reliability score for this component was .757. Both of these variables load with similar strength on other factors.

4. The fourth component explained 11.87% of the variance with two variables: finding the money and lost wages. These two variables had a reliability of .74 and make logical sense together.

The variable "lease" did not load on any component, and generally, the strongest variables seem to relate to safety and emotional well-being, followed by academics, obligations, and cost.

The male PCA for participants showed adequate coefficients in the correlation matrix, a KMO of .85, and a significant Barlett's Test (p=.000). For this factor analysis, three components explained 56.27% of the variance. As with all the other PCAs, the screeplot indicates a large difference between the first and second component, suggesting that only the first component be retained. The three components are (see Table K5, p. 298):

- The first component explained 28.07% of the variance with nine variables: academic performance, health, safety, lease, clubs, athletics, family support, family duties, and missing family.
- The second component explained 16.92% of the variance with four variables: time, degree coursework, delaying graduation, and meeting academic requirements.
- The third component explained 11.27% of the variance with two variables: finding the money and lost wages.

Male participants' variable loading was much simpler than the full group. They lumped many variables into one larger issue of concerns, followed by concerns related to academics, and finally related to cost. The female PCA for participants showed adequate coefficients in the correlation **matrix**, a KMO of .79, and a significant Barlett's Test (p=.000). For this factor analysis, three components explained 56.10% of the variance. As with all the other PCAs, the screep lot indicates a large difference between the first and second component, suggesting that only the first component be retained. The four components are (see Table K6, p. 299):

- The first component explained 17.10% of the variance with six variables: academic performance, health, safety, family support, family duties, and missing family.
- 2. The second component explained 16.63% of the variance with three variables: required courses, delaying graduation, and academic requirements.
- The third component explained 12.79% of the variance with two variables: finding the money and lost wages.
- 4. The fourth component explained 12.58% of the variance with three variables: time, clubs, and athletics.

Lease did not load clearly on any component for females just as for males, and unlike the influences PCAs, the females' components loaded fairly closely to the males' for this group. Females had an additional category that seemed related to extra-curricular time, which the males put in to the first component.

Factor Analysis of Obstacles for Nonparticipants

As earlier findings indicated significant differences between participants and ^{non}Participants, I conducted a second set of factor analyses on obstacles for ^{non}Participants. The PCA for nonparticipants as related to obstacles showed adequate coefficients in the correlation matrix, a KMO of .79, and a significant Barlett's Test (p=.000). For this factor analysis, three components explained 57.79% of the variance. As with all the other PCAs, the screeplot indicates a large difference between the first and second component, suggesting that only the first component be retained; however, reliability tests for the obstacle components show much stronger relationships well above 0.60. The five components are (see Table K7, p. 299):

- The first component explained 15.19% of the variance with four variables: academic requirements, academic performance, safety, and health. Some of these components are related to dispositional issues according to the conceptual model, but the variable "academic requirements" does not necessarily fit with this group. Collectively, they have a reliability score of .794.
- 2. The second component explained 14.75% of the variance with four variables: lease, family support, family duties, and missing family. The variables for this component all relate to students' family situation except for lease, which may load here because students view their leases as related to their family responsibility. These variables have a reliability score of .68.
- The third component explained 10.23% of the variance with two variables: degree requirements and delay of graduation. Although they make logical sense together, the reliability score for this pairing was only .58.
- 4. The fourth component explained 10.15% of the variance with two variables: finding the money and lost wages. These two variables had a reliability of .64 and make logical sense together.

5. The fifth component included three variables—time, clubs, and athletics—and explained 8.71% of the variance. The alpha value for this paring was only .43.

The variable "no interest," which the survey only asked of nonparticipants, did not load on any component. The nonparticipants seemed most concerned with issues related to their academic abilities and safety, which seem like an unlikely coupling conceptually. Second, they rated issues related to family and obligations, followed by academics, then cost, and finally extra-curricular activities.

The male PCA for participants showed adequate coefficients in the correlation matrix, a KMO of .80, and a significant Barlett's Test (p=.000). For this factor analysis, five components explained 60.14% of the variance. As with previous PCAs, the screeplot indicates a large difference between the first and second component, suggesting that only the first component be retained (see Table K8, p. 300). As with the full group, males had five components:

- The first component explained 17.51% of the variance with five variables: no interest, lease, lack of family support, family duties, and missing family. "No interest" did not load for all nonparticipants.
- 2. The second component explained 14.08% of the variance with four variables: academic requirements, academic performance, safety, and health.
- The third component explained 9.45% of the variance with two variables: finding time and graduation delay.
- The forth component explained 9.41% of the variance with two variables: finding the money and lost wages.

5. The fifth component explained 9.18% of the variance with two variables: time and athletics.

Males' loading of the obstacle variables was very similar to that of the full group; however, they swapped the first and second components, loading the safety and ability variables first. Their results also loaded the "no interest" variable on the first component, when the full group did not have this variable load at all.

The female PCA for participants showed adequate coefficients in the correlation matrix, a KMO of .74, and a significant Barlett's Test (p=.000). For this factor analysis, five components explained 58.74% of the variance. As with all the other PCAs, the screeplot indicates a large difference between the first and second component, suggesting that only the first component be retained. The five components are (see Table K9, p. 300):

- The first component explained 19.48% of the variance with six variables: academic performance, health, safety, lease, family duties, and missing family.
- 2. The second component explained 12.36% of the variance with three variables: required courses, delaying graduation, and academic requirements.
- The third component explained 10.89% of the variance with three variables: family support, finding the money, and lost wages.
- The forth component explained 8.91% of the variance with two variables: finding the time, clubs, and lost wages.
- The fifth component explained 7.09% of the variance with one variable: no interest.

Athletics did not load clearly on any component for females and females' ratings placed "no interest" much lower than males' ratings; however, females' obstacles generally loaded similarly as the males' group.

Summary of Factor Analysis Findings

Although exploratory, the factor analysis findings provided some important general insights on the decision to participate. First, in relationship to influences, the variable fun loaded in the final component for the full group and females and the third group for males. This finding suggests that fun might not be the major motivator for students, but it might factor into males' decision-making more than it does for females. Related to this idea, a second important point from the factor analysis is that males seem to prioritize variables differently in terms of the influences to participate. The factors load differently for males when compared to females or the total sample, with males ranking their relationships quite high in terms of their collective influence on the decision to participate. This observation carries over to the obstacle variables as well.

Third, nonparticipants and participants—and males and females within these groups—seem to make decisions differently; however, the sex differences do not seem as strong for the obstacles as with the influences. Interestingly, both groups tended to put health and safety in the first component, yet the other variables loaded into this component changed group to group. Also of interest, the obstacle variable related to cost tended to load later, and generally, dispositional variables tended to out-rank the programmatic costs. This finding might indicate that program features are not as important to students as other factors related to their personal life and their belief in their ability to travel abroad safely and securely. Finally, and most importantly, the stronger reliability coefficient and consistent loading of the obstacle variables suggests that both participants and nonparticipants consider obstacles as more important to their decision-making than influences. Even though the data for the entire group was incomplete, I followed-up on this idea by running a final factor analysis for participants using both the influence and obstacle variables together in a single analysis(see Table K10, p. 301). I was unable to do this for the entire sample—negating my ability to run a regression—because the nonparticipant group never responded to questions about influences related to their decision-making.

As I predicted based on the separate PCAs presented above, the obstacle variables loaded on the first components with stronger results than the influence variables, which loaded on as the last and weakest components. Generally, the component make-up mirrored the results from the tests presented above in terms of the individual variables, but this step was important in that it suggests that students might start with a general interest in study abroad, then think through the obstacles and barriers to their participation, and then consider the influences in relationship to specifics regarding program selection or value. It also suggests that dispositional and relational variables might be more important than programmatic features of the study abroad experience.

Concluding Thoughts

The quantitative analysis I conducted revealed some consistent results that ^{supported} ideas presented in the literature, yet it also presented some data that run ^{count}er to current discourse related to low male participation rates. For example, the data ^{suggest} that males might be less cost and time sensitive than they are generally given ^{cred}it for by study abroad professionals, and males seem to value relationships more than one might assume. As a summary of these ideas, I present the major ideas discussed in this chapter in Table 1 (p. 141), but this summary provides only a starting point. As mentioned throughout Chapter 4, the statistical results lack clarity.

To better understand this idea and others found during the quantitative analysis, I conducted a qualitative phase of my study. As suggested by the literature, the reliance on surveys has led to some broad generalizations, but little depth and understanding about male study abroad participation. As this and previous studies have suggested, the decision to participate is complex and hard to understand. Chapter 5 provides details related to the qualitative interview design and results. To assist the reader, I provide brief introductions to each research question as a means of linking the pilot-study and quantitative survey to the qualitative inquiry process. I present a richer, in-depth analysis and interpretation in Chapter 6 by connecting all the findings back to the literature.

			Males Compared to Females	
		Variables	Participants	Nonparticipants
Influences	1	Cost	Less	N/A
	2	Location	Less	N/A
	3	Duration	Less	N/A
	4	Timing	Less	N/A
	5	Coursework		N/A
	6	Language		N/A
	7	Home stay		N/A
	8	Family encouraged	Less	N/A
	9	Peer messages	Less	N/A
	10	Know faculty		N/A
	11	Know students		N/A
	12	Future		N/A
	13	Fun		N/A
Obstacles	14	Finding time		
	15	Finding money	Less	Less
	16	Lost wages	Less	Less
	17	Delay graduation	More	
	18	Finding courses		
	19	Meet requirements		
	20	Acad. performance		
	21	Health	Less	
	22	Safety	Less	
	23	Lease		
	24	Clubs/leadership		
	25	Lack family support	Less	
	26	Family duties		
	27	Miss family	Less	
	28	Athletics		More
	29	No interest	N/A	More

Table 1. Summary of Significant Quantitative Findings (p<.05)

Chapter 5: Qualitative Findings

In this chapter, I describe the qualitative findings from the personal interviews conducted with male, senior study abroad participants and nonparticipants from three disciplinary backgrounds—a residential public policy program, liberal arts/social science fields, and STEM fields. These interviews probed more deeply into issues highlighted in the literature and the survey as factors of significant interest influencing participation. For the purpose of reporting, I present the findings in sections organized around the four research questions: (1) males' familial background and the influences of this background on the decision to study abroad; (2) males' perceptions of and access to information about study abroad; (3) males' dispositional characteristics related to risk and motivation; and finally, (4) males' perceptions of the value of study abroad in relationship to their career.

Within each of these four sections, I remind the reader about relevant findings from the literature, pilot study, and phase one of this study as a starting point for the presentation of the interview findings. This reminder summarizes ideas from previous chapters to assist the reader in understanding the context and purpose for the interview questions and their presentation in this study. Before discussing each of the major ideas, I start this chapter with a brief overview of phase two of the research design and additional information about the data analysis. As a reminder, for clarity, I refer to the students whom I interviewed as volunteers to avoid confusion with their status as study abroad participants and nonparticipants in this chapter.

Background on Phase 2

The second phase of the research design involved interviewing male seniors who participated and did not participate on study abroad programs. Conducting this qualitative

inquiry to supplement the survey was important for several reasons. First, I did not design the survey for this study, and although the survey gathered important information related to the research questions, the overall survey content lacked some conceptual variables important to the study, such as students' socio-economic background. Second, the survey's implementation and format did not lend itself to the use of advanced statistical procedures like regression modeling. Finally, the survey's results were mixed and lacked statistical strength in many instances. Although valuable as a starting point and for highlighting some specific issues, phase one had limited success for truly understanding the complex issue of male study abroad participation.

This survey did produce some statistically significant findings, yet these findings lack depth in their meaning. Specifically, the issue of peer and parental support lacks clarity. On this survey and the one conducted by Shirley (2006), males indicated a lower influence in relationship to family support; however, the wording of these questions does not lend itself to clear interpretation of the difference. For this reason, qualitative studies are needed to assist researchers with understanding males' (and females') thinking about the issues related to their decision to participate. In the end, some variables—such as their opinions about study abroad in relation to their personal and academic life—require a richer understanding than is often obtained from a survey alone.

Sample and Analysis

To explore some of the ideas related to lower male participation on study abroad, I interviewed 24 male students, eight from three different academic programs: a residential program in public policy known for its international engagement, a set of STEM majors, and a group of students in the liberal arts (for a listing of the volunteers by

participation status and major, please see Table L1 (p. 302). Each of these students volunteered for a personal one-on-one interview that lasted about 60 minutes. I digitally recorded these interviews and had them transcribed into an MS-Word document. I then reviewed the transcripts for themes by research question, coding the data line-by-line using the highlighting function. Then working within each question, I further divided the data into sub-themes and, at times, moved data between major themes and sub-themes during this process. Overall, I sifted through the data approximately nine times—once overall and twice within each of the four categories—to arrive at the themes I present below.

Family Background and Perceptions of Support

The first category relates to males' perceptions of support received from their families and communities regarding study abroad and the degree to which their decisions relate to previous experiences with their family or their familial background in terms of education and socio-economic status (SES). Within this research question, three subthemes developed: first, males who studied abroad each talked about a personal experience that influenced their interest in international issues or travel; second, although family background did not necessarily equate with the decision to participate, the family's comfort and experience with international travel influenced their reaction to their son's interests; and third, males seem to have a sense of duty to their family that may inhibit their participation. I discuss each of these ideas in subsequent sections.

Previous Research and Overview

As suggested by the literature and the pilot study, one rationale for lower male participation in study abroad might be that males' parents are less supportive of the idea

or push their sons toward jobs and internships more than they do their female children. This idea relates to broader sociological trends discussed by Dessoff (2006), Kimmel (2008), Sax (2008), Gore (2005), and others, who suggest that gender role stereotypes allow females more flexibility in their pursuits because females are not in "serious" fields of study relative to males. In other terms, because females' educational attainment is not as important as males' attainment in terms of preparing for a high-paying career, females have historically been allowed—and often encouraged—to participate in activities that made them more worldly and cultured.

The quantitative findings from the first phase of this study also indicated some potential differences between males and females based on parental support and encouragement. According to these data, male participants and nonparticipants seem less influenced by family support and males tend to see family support as less of an obstacle. As with earlier surveys though, these findings lack some meaning in that I cannot directly distinguish between various interpretations of these findings. For example, males might be less influenced by family encouragement because they receive less positive encouragement, no encouragement, more negative encouragement than females, or that males are more independent of their family in terms of their decision-making.

Based on the qualitative data, few differences seem to exist between male participants and nonparticipants on this specific issue. One might have expected students' parents' economic and educational backgrounds to influence support and encouragement; however, nearly all students reported similar support despite differences in background. Similarly, over three-quarters of the males had previously traveled with family, and no clear link existed between this previous travel experience with family and the desire to

study abroad. Generally, males seemed to distinguish between travel for pleasure or family versus travel for school. Despite the lack of clear differences between male participants and nonparticipants, I did notice some themes from the interviews. *Theme 1: Study Abroad and Personal Connections*

Family social and economic background did not seem to influence the actual decision to participate, with males of all backgrounds found in both the participation and non-participation groups. Family background seemed to influence students' interests related to study abroad and, as found in the pilot study, males who had a personal interaction or connection to international ideas tended to study abroad. Along these lines, family history and culture led to an interest in international travel for about half of the students. For example, Danny, an engineering student, described his interest in going to Germany as related to his "learning about [his] heritage at a young age." John, an English major with a French minor, discussed his first study abroad experiences as a means of connecting with his father's heritage:

My dad is French and my whole family is French, and I think it's—for me—it was really important just to be able to like talk to my relatives because a lot of them don't speak English... Now that I've gone, like I can talk to my dad. I talk to him in French now, and he really appreciates that so it's definitely more a familial bond.

For Chris and Andrew, both international relations majors who studied abroad, the decision to study international topics and travel abroad related to time abroad with family. Chris said his parents "are very international thinking people," which in his opinion contributed to his decision-making because his mother "certainly has her own

ideas about the world, the way things work, and how her sons should experience it, and they coincide with my father's, which pushed us all to travel." Andrew summed the point up well in saying that international travel "runs in the family."

Speaking of more expended relations, Matt, a science student and study abroad participant, did not hear about study abroad from his parents, but rather his grandmothers. He explained:

Both my grandmas used to travel together a lot since my parents have been married, so my one grandma, who is still alive, was really encouraging. She's really like financially supportive, as well; she just thinks it's absolutely great that I do it. My parents think it's great too, but like it's just like my grandma's thing is traveling and so I've always had a lot of support from her.

Similarly, Frank, an engineering and ROTC student, discussed how his decision to go on a church trip to China was influenced by "an uncle who has been working in China for the last 10 years...I got put into a political science class about politics in Asia, and it was just kind of like a recurring theme my freshman year. So I was already kind of like interested in China and then this trip came up so it was kind of like a perfect match."

Beyond the family, students from smaller towns related how experiences within their larger community influenced their interests. Jake, an international relations student, credited his first international experience and his international interests to a high school program run by the 4–H program. Shaun, an international relations and African studies major, described his journey to college and study abroad as also influenced by his experience in his community:

I wanted to go out of the state so I could meet students from different areas--non-Michigan people. But in my eighth grade year, I met a guy from Ghana and got involved in the work that he was doing in Ghana, and then the next summer, I went to Ghana...It's pretty intense, and so that really got me interested in international.

Shaun's friend Oscar, an international relations student, first went abroad with his high school band, an experience that gave him the "traveling bug." Since that time, Oscar has sought out international experiences, a factor he related to his experiences within his local community:

The unique thing about my hometown is that even though it is rural and poor, the town has attracted a lot of unique individuals that have been abroad because it's kind of like this small town feel that has some good community...I had mentors who had international careers that really gave me an example to look towards.

As these examples describe, many of the males who eventually choose to study abroad—and make international topics an aspect of their studies—had some influence prior to college. For almost all of the males who participated, this prior experience led to the decision to study abroad, yet for other students, it led to an interest they fulfilled in other ways, such as campus opportunities or internships. In the end, most males attributed previous experience and family background as a spark to their international interests, but not specifically as the major factor leading to their decision to study abroad.

Theme 2: Family as Watch-guard

Almost all the males reported a *general* support related to the idea of studying abroad. For example, Danny, an engineering student who studied abroad, felt that his

parents were very supportive because "they thought it looked great on a résumé." Kenny, an engineer who went to Australia, had more active support: "My parents were actually the ones who suggested it...They agreed with the university that it's just a way to diversify yourself." He attributed this encouragement to the fact that both his parents had studied abroad themselves. Just as parents' background with travel could promote an openness to travel, Kenny's comments illustrate that parents' backgrounds can also facilitate the active encouragement to participate.

Corey, a liberal arts student who went to Australia on study abroad, traveled extensively before college for sports and personal reasons. Even though he had previous travel experiences with his family, Corey described his parents as only somewhat supportive and also jealous of his "international globe-trotting." In the middle of his college career, though, his father's personal experiences abroad changed this dynamic and provided a better connection between himself and his father by facilitating his father's ability to relate to Corey's desire for international travel:

My father has never traveled abroad until two years ago when my mom and him both went back to Finland to visit her family. That was actually really moving, very moving for him. He's not a very emotional guy and not as intellectual either, very administrative type I think. So that sort of component had never been a big deal for him. Traveling abroad really opened his eyes to what I study and what I am going to do and why I studied abroad.

Generally, all the males interviewed felt that their parents would support their decision to go abroad, but their parents might not support them financially. In this way, family support seemed to be somewhat neutral, neither strongly encouraging nor overtly

discouraging. Taylor, a liberal arts nonparticipant, said his parents would "be neutral...They would rather I go abroad and get the experience, but they wouldn't be able to help out with the finances." Sam, also a liberal arts nonparticipant, had a similar sentiment, saying that when he "talked about it with [his] family they were like that would be very good, if we could do that [pay for it]."

Despite this generic support, building on Kenny's example, family background often influenced the degree to which males needed to convince their family that study abroad was a viable, valuable opportunity. In some instances, family experiences abroad eased the participation conversation, but in other cases, males had to do more convincing. During these conversations, the issues of *safety and value* were consistently named by the males as concerns, especially for students traveling to exotic locations. Frank, an engineering student who went to China through church but did not study abroad, discussed his parents' concerns:

My parents just tend to be really supportive as long as I have an action plan and you know they find out how it fits into the grand scheme of things. They tend to be pretty supportive of pretty much whatever I aspire to do...They just wanted to make sure that we'd have like translators and that we weren't gonna like end up in a Chinese prison or something.

Other students who traveled to such locations encountered similar questions from their parents. For those going on study abroad, though, good planning and research helped them convince their parents, as Shaun explains relative to his first trip to Africa:

I had done the research paper on development in Ghana before I went so, and so it was easy to tell my parents and my family: Ghana is one of the most stable

African countries, la, la, la; their economy is doing well, whatever; I'm going to be staying in university; I will be staying in a hostel that has air conditioning... I think doing it through the university also has a degree of security for people.
As he looked toward travel in Egypt, Oscar had a similar experience with his parents, and he needed to provide different rationales for his father and his mother:

A lot of things I had to put into those terms why it's important to my life in the future. With my dad, I had to sell it as a step in my career, that study abroad was a component of my education and my career that would take me places afterwards, and then I can show him how they've taken me places...To my mom, I had to first convince her it was safe, and then there were several components like it was both the pragmatic, 'This is my career. Look where I'm going to go with it,' Jason, an engineering student who studied in Russia, described his experience taking to his parents about safety. His mother was concerned about his safety abroad, and he laughed as he talked about addressing his mother's concern:

Well, I told 'em I'd call 'em all the time...I didn't really call my dad. He felt secure about it. I talked to my mom a lot; and I told 'em that I'm a grownup; and I can make these decisions on my own; but, also, my brother, he had traveled before a lot; and I got to use him as an example about how he got to see the world and was all right from it.

Eric, a social science major who went abroad, considered two different study abroad programs: one to Africa and one to Europe. For him, his parents' support was somewhat of a challenge because they tried to direct him toward the "safer" destination. He explains in regards to his father:

Whenever I talked to him, I would mention both, and he would always talk about the European study abroad, and not really give much attention to the Africa one. I mean, he was supportive of me going to a place that he approved of...He thought

it was given that Europe would be a better place, just from his perspective. When Eric eventually decided on Africa as the location for his program, he had new issues to work with his parents on prior to departure. Recent media reports about troubles in part of Africa had alarmed his mother, so he "told them, 'Well, just because one country in Africa is dangerous doesn't mean all the countries in Africa are dangerous."

The degree to which students had to convince their parents and their perseverance in doing so seemed related to their participation status and family background, with those males who had more interest seeming to push harder to participate. For example, Corey stated that while parental support helped him, he "was going to do it either way." Regardless of background, safety was a big concern for males' parents, and as I discuss in the next section, money was another major factor.

Theme 3: Males' Silent Duties

For some students, money was the greatest barrier to participation. For nearly all nonparticipants, this concern prohibited them from even considering talking to their parents about study abroad. David, an agriculture science student and nonparticipant felt that his "parents might have said, 'Oh, wow, how are you gonna pay for it?'" Along similar lines, Eli, a public policy nonparticipant, said he would have "dreaded that conversation. Like, 'Dad, we need to pony up some money for that.' Just knowing my father that it would have been: 'We're paying for school, why pay for this in addition?'."

For some nonparticipants then, just the thought of asking their parents about study abroad stopped them from pursuing the option, which led to a third theme related to the influence of family. Although males and females had no significant differences based on family obligations on the survey, males did seem to carry a sense of obligation to their family relative to time and financial resources, which affected their decision to study abroad. Many nonparticipants used their family as a rationale for not participating or not even actively considering study abroad. Often, these male students believed their time away would negatively affect their parents and siblings in terms of a loss of financial, human, and time resources.

Jack, a history and geography major who did not study abroad, never even considered study abroad because of his financial situation, stating "if I was more comfortable monetarily I'd probably definitely go for it, but I mean, my parents are covering loans right now. I've got to cover all that and I don't know. There's no way." Eli, Sam, and Greg had similar concerns related to finances based on their backgrounds. Eli explains that his family:

... owned a small furniture manufacturer, and we got out –if we'd got out a year earlier, we'd be rolling in money now, and if we'd got out a year later, I would be panhandling on a corner now...My father would just view it as, 'No, we don't – this isn't something that's necessary. It's necessary to get a college education, it's not necessary to get your college education abroad.'

Sam, who works in the study abroad office, traveled abroad in high school, but he was unable to participate on study abroad in college due to his mother's death and the effect of that event on his family's finances. He was concerned about taking on additional debt:

We just don't have the money to do it. So, it doesn't get addressed as much as it needs to be, and it's hard to address that [*with his father*] when money is the issue. When you have funding issues, and you're just barely getting by with student loans in order to go to college.

A public policy nonparticipant, Greg's concerns related not so much to the loss of income, but his parents' expectations. The eldest child and the only son with a stay-at-home mother, he explained that growing up in his home, he had a clear idea about his responsibilities: "You kind of grow up with that sense of your job when you grow up, once you get out, is to support yourself, support your family—if you choose to have a family—and just kind of get out and make a living for yourself."

Other males echoed Greg's concern over their role and achievement. Bill, a public policy nonparticipant, discussed his need to get out of school in as close to four years as possible. As a transfer student, he felt beholden to his family to work hard and get the degree done before his siblings entered college. David, also a nonparticipant, spoke from his own experience with males in the agricultural sciences:

Some guys have jobs here [*at school*], and they go home on the weekends and help on the farm. The idea that you would be on a study abroad when your dad expects you to be home to plant and spray—there are guys in our house that say, 'My dad says to get home,' and the next thing you know, they're packing a bag and jumping in the pickup five minutes later.

This concern by some of the males to succeed and work hard relates back to the male gender role, especially as related to careerism, discussed later in this chapter.

Although family duties seemed to weigh mostly on the minds of nonparticipants, about a third of participants also discussed ways that their family obligations influenced them pertaining to finances. For example, Chris paid for his study abroad program on his own. He explained that his parents "couldn't really help out. I actually have three siblings, two of whom both go here as well, and so the burden fell on me financially but in other areas they were certainly supportive." John had similar concerns. With a supportive father, he still needed to consider the financial ramifications for himself and his two siblings, who are also in college. Unable to help financially, John's father pushed him to figure it out for himself:

He said, 'well, if you can go, it would be awesome, but we can't pay for it, so I had to go through like all the financial aid stuff and find ways to get loans specifically to pay for this' and I had to like work in the small space before and after it [*the program*], so I could pay for everything.

Regardless of their participation status, males interviewed for this study seemed highly aware of their family's financial situation. Often, financial concerns also involved the student's role within the family related to helping with the family business or their siblings. For about a third of the males, their sense of duty to their parents, siblings, and family finances prohibited them from even considering study abroad as an option, but as with concerns over safety, some males pushed forward the with their interests despite these obstacles.

Conclusions on the Role of Family

Clearly the role of family and family background has an influence on males' interest in and decision to study abroad. Although the role of family background did not

show a pattern based on family educational and economic standing, having a family or community experienced with or supportive of international travel facilitated male students' movement toward a decision to participate. Also, the data indicates that males tend to use their unique family background as part of their decision-making process. For those males with strong interest or greater experience, the path toward participation seems easier than for those with less interest or less experience. For these students, family support and background often caused them to not even consider discussing study abroad with their families.

This evidence supports the finding in Chapter 4 that students might consider the obstacles to study abroad before the benefits. In other words, if males perceive the obstacles as too great, then they do not even try to consider how they might make it work, as Chris and John tried to do with their parents. Going back to the factor analysis of obstacles and influences, I ran all the influence and obstacles variables for participants using several different rotational techniques. In all cases and for all students, the obstacles variables loaded more strongly and consistently than the influence variables. This statistical finding further suggests that students first consider obstacles to study abroad and second consider the potential benefits to study abroad; therefore, for students with low family support and little international experience, the idea of study abroad might never even be considered.

Reputation and Peer Messages

The second research question for phase two related to the messages and information students' hear about study abroad at the institution and how students interpret this information in terms of its reputation or value. Ian's story about his mother's
encouragement suggests that a supportive family and prior travel experiences cannot fully explain the decision to study abroad. In addition, not all of the males who participated on study abroad had international experiences before coming to college, so why then did a student like Andy decide to participate on study abroad while a student like David decided to stay at home?

This section summarizes issues related to study abroad marketing efforts and the role of peers in relationship to this question, and unlike the other section, which was relatively straight-forward, this section presents a number of themes seemingly filled with contradictions. To summarize, I begin by exploring the idea that students have broad knowledge about the importance of international learning and study abroad, but limited depth of knowledge related to this topic, with most students unaware of the diversity of opportunities available to them. Related to this theme, I explore what students know about study abroad itself. Many students know that study abroad is important and respected, yet they have many misconceptions about what study abroad is and is not.

Second, and related to these ideas, I also explore the idea that the general buzz around study abroad—despite being known as valuable—is that students feel it is a vacation. Within this area, I discuss the messages students hear about study abroad and the sources of these messages. Again, the sources of information seem to be multiple; however, the messages that are getting through seem quite limited in their content and appeal. Third, and again building on the previous theme, the students discussed their perceptions related to how males and females communicate and think differently about study abroad, leading to a final theme: males seem to have different peer groups, some supporting and some hampering study abroad participation.

Previous Research and Overview

A second finding from the pilot study suggested that males receive and react differently to messages and marketing materials than females. Male first-year students who participated in study abroad reported that their friends highly encouraged them to study abroad, but those who did not study abroad tended to report little connection to other study abroad participants and a sense that study abroad was a frivolous, feminine activity. This idea suggests that males might receive fewer or less positive messages about study abroad from people in their lives and/or that study abroad messages from offices and promotional materials are highly feminized because people generally view study abroad as a female-orientated activity (Gore, 2005). Also, because fewer males are participating and thus talking about study abroad, the male perspective on the activity is lacking in both formal and informal communication networks.

The quantitative findings from this survey tend to support the literature on this topic. Although male and female participants rated the institutional support and informational systems relatively the same, males perceived significantly less support from peers and high school teachers and reported a significantly lower influence on participation related to peer messages. Also during the factor analysis, the influence of peer messages and friends participating loaded more strongly for male participants than for female participants and the general population. These results suggest the literature may be accurate in its assessment about the importance of messages males receive—or more accurately need to but do not receive—and how they perceive these messages, yet without deeper qualitative analysis, one cannot fully understand this issue. Males may

receive less support from friends, they may receive more negative support, but they may also just not talk about study abroad with friends.

Theme 4: Broad Knowledge, Little Depth

Henry and Basile (1994) suggest that nonparticipants lack knowledge about the opportunity or that the opportunity itself is thought about poorly. Based on the qualitative data, all the males interviewed for this study knew about study abroad and, as found with the quantitative findings (on which all students reported the institutional offices and resources positively), had a generally positive opinion of it. When asked to describe the international opportunities available at their institution, 100 percent of the males named study abroad, and most of them knew that study abroad was a priority. Frank's statement characterized his peers by saying, "I know there's a very large abroad program here."

Some males even knew that the institution was ranked nationally for its study abroad programs. Corey believed that his school "has one of the best ones in the nation," and Eli echoed this idea, "we were number one for a while. I know that whatever your major is, you can find something." Chris understood that "we were pretty famous for study abroad," and even Greg, a nonparticipant, understood the priority of study abroad at the institution:

I know [the university] has a phenomenal study abroad, going abroad program, and from what I've heard we're one of the nation's leaders as far as sending students abroad and I've seen a lot of cool opportunities. I just haven't been able to take advantage of them personally.

The institution's reputation for study abroad, international opportunities, and language study was so strong that Shaun named these factors as his draw to attend the

institution, yet for knowing about opportunities beyond study abroad, Shaun found himself in the minority. Of all the males, he was the only person who knew about the institution's international office and that it included programs in addition to study abroad. Few of his peers—especially nonparticipants—knew about other international opportunities at their university. For example, Chris was the only student who mentioned the institution's campus in the Middle East; Eli and Eric were the only students who mentioned the institution's international service-learning programs; and Oscar was the only person to discuss the institution's freshman seminar abroad efforts. Andrew, Matt, John, Oscar, Jason, and Corey mentioned the school's international students, yet few students could discuss all or even most of these activities holistically.

Cleary the males I interviewed knew about study abroad, so I then asked them to discuss what they knew specifically about study abroad. From the data, students had two clear ideas about study abroad: first, they thought study abroad is a good activity, and second, that study abroad is a fun activity. In terms of the popularity of study abroad, many students responded as Will did, explaining that when they heard their peers talk about their experiences, "they love it." Eli made a similar statement, saying "I very rarely hear people having negative experiences about it…I've like heard almost all positive experiences. So I have not heard someone say, 'Oh, I just had a terrible time.' I've heard universally positive experiences."

Beyond the general sense of positivity about study abroad, students indicated that they knew study abroad was a priority at their institution. Students like Danny knew that study abroad was a priority because he saw flyers about it in the engineering building and

advertisements in the school newspaper. David made a similar observation about the marketing:

At orientation they did a whole session about it...Your college talks about it, you get pretty bombarded by it, and they did their job putting it out there. I get e-mails like all the time about it. You always know it's coming up; you know the meetings that they have. You can't miss it.

The institution's early and consistent emphasis about study abroad not only ensured that all the males knew about the activity, but it also gave them the impression that study abroad was valued. Andrew explained:

When I was looking at different schools to go to, there was a much higher premium placed on international study here than any other places I was looking at going. And they had some stat, it was something like 80% of students or 70% of students study abroad at some point during their time here.

Corey received a similar impression when he said, "I know that almost all students at least do one study abroad if not more."

Limited and Imperfect Understanding

Beyond the common understanding of study abroad as a priority at their school, about half of the males had a very limited, and often incorrect, idea about what study abroad was or could be in terms of program models and options. In general, most of the males, especially nonparticipants, believed that study abroad only included studying and taking classes overseas. Only a few males had a good idea about the diversity of program options in terms of format and timing. As Greg described, he had "heard everything from people going over winter break or a spring break, alternative spring breaks go abroad sometimes, your traditional study abroad, a lot of internships abroad." Corey knew that the school had "programs on all seven continents." Finally, Sam, who did not go abroad but works in the office of study abroad, had the best knowledge about programs because he knew about the different types of opportunities including internships, direct enrollment, and faculty-led opportunities.

Beyond these students, many of the males lacked concrete knowledge about study abroad, and in some cases, they had incorrect ideas about study abroad. Taylor admitted his lack of knowledge, stating that all he knew "is that some people will take courses abroad in another country." Similarly, Frank said he had limited knowledge of the opportunities beyond his college: "I don't know all the countries but apparently it's a lot and then I know there's specifically ones for engineers, so engineering especially like Russia and Ukraine. Those are the two I know for sure."

Several students stated that their knowledge of study abroad was based on what they had heard from their friends and college advisors. Eli felt that this situation limited his understanding. Until the interview, Eli did not know that he could have traveled abroad to fulfill his university general education classes:

This is self-replicating, especially being a residential college, you live with the people [in your college], so the people in my college that have gone on study abroad tend to do the study abroad for my college...I never met someone who's done a general education study abroad, and I think that's part of it. The college obviously promotes itself, and then part of it's that if you live with those people that have never done it, it's just self-replicating, and you don't find out about it.

Eli believed that if he had known about options beyond his college, then perhaps he would have had more interest in going abroad. In this way, the limited messages about study abroad hindered participation.

About half of the students commented about only hearing or knowing about programs for their own colleges, and for some students, this idea made them not pursue study abroad because they were not interested in going on programs in the locations that their specific major sponsored. For example, Eric believed that he could only go on programs sponsored by his college: "I was more concerned with location, when I was first searching, but that's also constrained by the college that you're in, because you have to go on a study abroad that is within your college, supposedly, it's what I read." Will had a similar impression, saying that he would have gone on a program if he could have done an internship or research experience, but he never found the right information about such opportunities:

Maybe a co-op so you can get experience with that, but I mean, if there was, and I'm sure there is, through somewhere, I'm pretty sure there is something out there about doing research and going to a different country and doing research. And that would definitely be my cup of tea.

In addition to having limited or incorrect information about study abroad, the males seemed to have a model of what study abroad was and was not. For example, when I asked Shaun about his second study abroad in South Africa, he replied, "No, it was an internship. It would never be a study abroad program." Shaun and other students seemed to believe that study abroad was only about taking classes overseas, and in many cases they did not know about or consider field-based programs, service learning programs,

research opportunities, and internships to be study abroad. Jason, who works for study abroad as peer advisor, explained the lack of knowledge and misunderstandings as a lack of student effort:

The information is readily available; but a lotta times students don't utilize it to the maximum amount... There are like 200s of programs that we have, and so they'll think that you just choose a country and choose what you wanna study. Sometimes they might think that they can go to any country to take anything they want to, so that part is kinda hard to tell people it doesn't work that way.

Theme 5: Message Disconnect

Although the students interviewed felt that study abroad had value, many of them also felt that study abroad was an academic vacation. The sense that many people participate in study abroad and that the institution values the activity translated into a general sense that the activity had value, as exemplified by Sam's comments:

It's been an eye-opening experience...It really gives students a time to be an integral part of a different culture, and it kind of makes them go out of their comfort zones, which is very important because you don't learn unless you are a little maybe shocked at times or challenged.

Shaun shared this sentiment, and when asked about the buzz on campus in relationship to study abroad, he stated that "the big one is to go and see something different... being able to go and study the way things are—not what you are used to—is a great opportunity." Beyond this general impression that study abroad could be a valuable activity to learn about the world though, the most consistent and pervasive message about study abroad was that *it was all about fun*.

All the males consistently reported that many students think about study abroad as more of a vacation than as an academic activity. For example, Jason stated, "I guess from my experience, from what I picked up from students, they think a lotta study abroad is like a vacation during the summer." Danny said that he was told "'you'll never have to study and pretty much get drunk every day,' and like, you won't have to do any work." Shaun had a similar experience, stating that students with whom he interacted did not put academics first: "They'd be more concerned about where they were going to go drink the next night as opposed to submerging themselves in the culture, talking with people, learning the language, talking about the issues that the people face."

Even though the males stated that they heard about study abroad from other students, the male participants also felt that many of their peers did not want to hear an in-depth report about their experience. Eric felt this friends were "more interested in the activity and the location," than the academics and "unless they're the same major, they can't necessarily relate to what I'm learning about, and even if I do tell 'em about it, they're not interested." After hearing this theme from many students in both the pilot study and this study, I started asking students more pointedly about the institutional messages about study abroad and students' perceptions and messages. Frank had this to say on the issue:

A lot of students go on study abroad just to travel and to be in countries where they can drink ... I'd say that you kind of get the general opinion from a lot of people just around campus and stuff that study abroad is kind of like a just for fun thing.

The more I spoke with the males, the clearer the differences became. Even though all the males could articulate the importance of study abroad for cultural learning, they uniformly stated that most of their peers thought about study abroad in terms of fun. John recounted this experience from his reentry experience, stating that his "friends they always want to know like oh, where'd you go, what you did. Like how much did you drink while you were there?" Eric summed up his peers statements in saying "people who go on study abroad want more of a vacation out of it, or more of a travel opportunity than a studying opportunity."

Pervasive Information, Limited Messages

To better understand issues related to the messages and perceptions of study abroad as fun, I asked students to discuss how they learned about study abroad, where the messages came from, and what they thought about these messages. The males identified a myriad of communication channels from which they heard about study abroad, which included the campus newspaper, emails, posters, classroom presentations, orientation events, website, and the study abroad fair held twice each year in the campus Union. In general, most students felt confident that they knew about study abroad opportunities and that they knew how to pursue the possibilities of participation. Danny explained his path:

They advertise it around the engineering building a lot, and I went to talk with [my college study abroad coordinator], and she gave me a list of programs, told me to come to the fair. So I went to the fair, talked to a couple people, and I narrowed it down to one or two programs I'd like to do, waited for a date that I could sign up for it, and just went.

Will had a similar story:

I took a class freshman year about like, about what you should do in college and how you should like prepare yourself to graduate and get a job and one of the things, one of the coordinators of study abroad came and talked to us about it... [this] is a really big university, but I think if one really wants to like seek out something there is like so many people that will help you ... I know my counselor, she'll know and she'll put me in the right direction.

Several students discussed the need for help or support when investigating the options related to study abroad, as George discussed at length in relationship to the study abroad and international opportunities fairs:

Both of them had a lot of opportunities—just the amount of programs—like it's almost overwhelming because you go in there and you see all the countries but you realize there's another room that has the same countries but different colleges and programs...It's definitely tough finding one that is just like exactly what you want. It's probably out there but there's so many to pick from, and you just feel like you're in over your head.

When asked what could have made his investigation less overwhelming, George recommended that the information be available by country and by major or topic, which is actually how the fairs are run at the institution. The point of George's comments, though, was that the amount of options is daunting for students, and in the end, he felt it was up to him: "If you really want to do it, the information is definitely out there. It's just that you need to do the research. That's the toughest part, doing the research."

From George's perspective, the massive amount of choice was overwhelming, something that other students mentioned during their interviews too. For many students,

the availability of the information was not the only issue, though. The quality and source of the information also factored in to their interpretation and/or use of the information. Taylor commented about his experiences, highlighting this idea:

I saw advertisements from the school that said you're missing out if you don't go abroad. You can't afford not to, things like that. They have an entire career fair just for study abroad so I think they do emphasize it and I know a lot of people that utilized it ... It's already advertised quite a bit. The only thing I could suggest is that maybe if they went about it in a different way, maybe if they did it through the classroom as opposed to maybe advertisements in the cafeteria.

This statement suggests that the source of the information influences how seriously or closely males pay attention. This idea reoccurred throughout the interviews, with some males paying more attention to more formal, academic messages and others relying more on personal, peer messages.

From my conversations, the males clearly believed that peer and institutional messages (e.g., the institution's study abroad video) emphasized fun. Although some males liked the video, almost all of the males found it lacking in concrete, academic elements. The males generally described it as a "photo blog," and I provide just two examples of the nearly uniform comments on this topic:

• It sends a message more I guess of an experiential kind of like a vacation theme to it. It doesn't seem like there's a whole lot of mention of academics. I mean it definitely may seem appealing to most, Study Abroad just for the experience...If there was something to do with hitting on how you could take

like major applicable courses I think that would be definitely, like peak my interest. (Frank)

They send out a positive message but the way they go about it constantly telling you about study abroad it's - it makes it almost too commercial... *That's a vacation commercial; all you're showing is people having a great time.* You're not showing any of these students in a classroom...I'm going to go on study abroad; the value of going on study abroad is the studying part. Not I could go on my own and have a vacation. I could go to Mexico on my own and have a vacation. (Jack)

Generally, the males I interviewed felt that the information messages were quite pervasive, but limited in their depth and diversity. For example, Sam stated that the study abroad web site was confusing and lacked search features that would help a student connect his academics to a program. In other words, the general peer and institutional messages seemed to emphasize fun and lacked concrete facts about program options or the benefits of study abroad, and even though some of the males knew that the information related to their interests was available, searching for and interpreting it seemed difficult to them. This difficulty directly connected to the value of personal relationships. As highlighted already throughout this study, some males made use of their professional networks to find out more about study abroad. Other students used their peer networks as an important source of information.

Theme 6: The Personal Connections and the Male Voice

The importance of personal connections was another reoccurring theme. Just as the students expressed the influence of their family and communities, they also expressed

the value of messages from faculty, staff, and students with whom they associated. Corey continually mentioned the need for more discussion and interpersonal interaction around study abroad, and he suggested ways to facilitate this interaction:

They have the photo competitions and stuff, but it'd be beneficial if people sat down and got together. Maybe another study abroad fair or instead of another study abroad fair maybe not even a speaking competition, but a lecture where kids could come up and talk about their experiences to kids who are thinking about studying abroad.

Oscar, who had previously mentioned his community mentors in relationship to his international interests, also sought out peer advice; he "talked to two people who had gone to MSU before me who had studied abroad—one to Italy and one to Ireland, and they had had amazing experiences and just raved about it." He was "paying this help forward" by advising a younger male student related to studying in Egypt.

Beyond the vague sentiments, most of the student volunteers and nearly all of the participants discussed messages from within their academic units and friends as important to them. Regarding messages from the academic units, students suggested that the messages from their faculty framed their perspectives about study abroad. Unlike Jack, who found classroom presentations annoying, Jason found one in his engineering class to be inspiring:

One of the professors came—from my major—came and talked to us. I thought about it for a little bit, and summer was approaching. I was like, 'Well, lemme think about that.' I'd like to take some classes over the summer, and so I didn't wanna necessarily take 'em here on campus. So I looked more and more into the

study abroad. I went on the Website and searched, and I went to the Study Abroad Fair that we had in the spring and got to talk to some of the faculty at one of the programs; and, from there, I said, 'Wow, this looks pretty cool'; and so I signed up for the program from there.

The idea that a faculty member from his college encouraged him to go was important to Jack because he felt it made him feel that study abroad was more valued. Chris felt similarly about his college and faculty members, saying that his college:

...really promotes study abroad. I mean, they have the list serve where they send you the study abroad fairs and everything. That's where I found out about the particular program I went on was a study abroad fair. They obviously promote it pretty heavily with the field experience and allowing you to substitute [study abroad] for it. They have fliers up about all their programs all the time all around [our residence] hall.

For Kenny, his first messages about study abroad came from a faculty member at a recruitment event:

The first time is when I came to [campus] when I was in high school for [an engineering event] and they gave a presentation on study abroad programs, an—I forget the professor—but someone came and he just had pictures of him at all these famous places around the world with the [school] flag. They talked about the program and just how many places and all the different opportunities. So, I mean, before I even was enrolled here, I was interested in study abroad.

Based on the conversations, some students associated the emphasis on study abroad to the way in which the activity enhanced the value of their major. For example, Andrew felt:

It's pushed in a lot of the French classes that I was in because it does help so much. And at the time I was applying for the program I was in the class of the faculty who came along with us and so he obviously placed a pretty big – I think he said he'd been going for 50 years.

Yet Frank, an engineering major and nonparticipant, felt differently about how his unit prioritized study abroad. He said that, "they don't push Study Abroad as much, but they do tend to push a lot of co-ops a lot more just 'cause, I think it gives them more corporate attention." Bill, an international relations student and also a nonparticipant, seemed to agree that although faculty talked about study abroad, they did not push it:

It's brought up from time to time. They'll say, 'Oh, we're having study abroad opportunity fair or there's this program if you guys are interested.' Like if that particular professor let's say works with Eastern European Studies, they'll say, 'Hey, there's something in Room A or something like that you should check out if you're interested in.' That's usually in passing...But nothing very formal.

Despite some nuanced differences amongst the volunteers, the males generally found faculty members to be an important, powerful source of information, but as Greg's comments described, the males did not find the faculty voice to be the most important, rather he thought that "the main influence is probably friends." Chris agreed, stating that "other students are a big factor. I didn't talk to anyone that had went on Australia, but I

had a lot of friends who'd gone to other programs before and they said they had a blast," as did Eric who simply said "friends is a big one."

George actually went on his program to Australia because a friend suggested they attend together, and Jake participated due to a similar recommendation:

I had a friend and the program I want is offered every other summer and I had, a friend went two summers before and he'd told me about it and then I figured out that it fit perfectly as far as getting my 300-level Chinese [classes] taken care of for my degree. I found out about it through him, and then I just researched it more in the study abroad office and went from there.

Corey also followed the advice of a friend and former participant when deciding to travel to Australia. He had several friends who had studied abroad, one who specifically went to Australia, and based on these stories, Corey thought: "Wow I could do that too."

Although David did not participate in study abroad, he knew several of his fraternity brothers who traveled abroad and encouraged other members to do the same:

It made it a lot easier for them to do it, and there's probably some of 'em that wouldn't have gone without the encouragement. I guess if some of my core group of friends in the House had said, 'Hey, what do you think about this; you wanna go?' I probably would have thought about it more than I did.

Ian expressed the same idea:

Maybe if it was someone who I knew or someone that I had known for awhile or something had come up to me and really just been like 'you seriously, like you should do this because it was a life changing experience this and that.' I feel like

if I had like a testimonial from someone that I knew that would be a persuasive enough to I guess get me motivated into it. That would have probably helped.

These quotes imply that, as the factor analysis suggested, males rely heavily on personal connections with trusted individuals for information. For the males in this study though, the availability of such messages from other male peers seemed to be lacking.

Male Messages Limited or Missing

I asked the males to discuss the content of the messages they heard from peers and if the messages seemed different based on sex status. Generally, the volunteers reported that peer messages were supportive and encouraging regardless of sex status, but males felt that they heard fewer and less specific messages about study abroad from other males when compared to females. Sometimes, the messages became more than informational and took on a persuasive attitude, as Bill explains in relationship to a former roommate and his friends:

I actually lived with a graduate student from Malawi, so his friend would always talk to me about different programs. One of them kept trying to get me to go to Africa...I've heard sort of the academic answer, 'This is a great opportunity for you to sort of see what's outside of your borders or city or what have you and see how life is, not United States. And that's a great opportunity, sort of eye opener.' For Greg, messages from friends were essential to getting beyond the surface-level messages he heard around campus:

Part of it was just like I was involved with the church a lot, and so the people that would talk to me about it were people that I had known for awhile. Study abroad was always talked about in like one large chunk, and so I was never really sure

exactly where they went or exactly what it had to offer. I don't think I ever really heard about individual programs unless somebody was talking to me about they had gone on study abroad to such and such a place.

Andrew stated that his friends in French class often talked about how much their program helped their language skills, but he also admitted most of his conversations focused on the social aspects of the study abroad experience:

It's interesting because I talk more about the non-academic experiences I had on study abroad than I do the classroom. I'm not sure exactly why, but I imagine it's because those are the more fun and more memorable, the more interesting. The classes are almost secondary when you're over there, at least for me.

Unlike the younger volunteers for the pilot study, the seniors interviewed for this study did not report a lack of support from their male peers when compared to females. They generally found their friends to be a good source of information and interested albeit only in surface ways—in the experience. Matt reported that:

Everyone's pretty supportive about it, and all the guys I know who have done it really loved it. Guys, when I was home, they were like, 'Oh, man, you're in France this summer? Like that's awesome. How was it?' And stuff, and like, 'I'd really like to do Study Abroad,' and stuff like that.

In addition to the generally favorable messages and support, many of the males stated that their male peers tended to be interested in their experience, yet in a different way than their female friends. According to Will, both his male and female friends:

...Say that they both love the experience. They both tell me pretty cool stories, but men tell more about the fun stuff. Guys like to exaggerate like I did this. I

went out to the bar. I went and got drunk. I went on the train. Got to talk to this person, I got lost. The women, they like, just you know, I went around Europe, went backpacking. You know, saw this, and saw that.

Generally, the males interviewed felt that females with whom they interacted tended to share the details of their overall learning experience and their male friends tended to share the "war stories" or fun experiences they had while abroad.

Sam explained his perception of differences between males and females during study abroad programs this way:

I think females to a certain extent, are much more independent thinkers than males and when males are around a peer group, they are much more likely to get caught up in that peer group, so if they have close friends that are stating why are you going abroad, that's not really cool to talk about learning.

Corey, Chris, and Danny agreed with Sam. All these males suggested that their female friends spoke more about culture, art, and the details of the experience, while their male friends seemed more attracted to sex, alcohol, and stories about funny experiences. Danny went on to share that, based upon his experiences, his female friends:

...tell their story by pictures and they try to place the scenario more. They try to capture the feeling of it more. For men, I think this is in general when it comes to start telling the – every single guy friend I have is like who, what, where, why, like punch-line story.

In response to his observations about the differences he noticed between his male and female friends, Corey felt that it was important for male students to hear about study abroad from other males.

Taylor agreed that the peer messages relate mostly to fun, but unlike other males in this study, he did not equate these messages to sex or gender differences; however, he did say that for an academically-minded student like himself, these peer messages were not an incentive to study abroad, "Most of the stories that get back to me about study abroad are just the things that they've done in the other country ...For someone like me, someone that's academic-oriented, it would be helpful to have more academic messages." Jason said he sees this communication trend with the students he talks to as part of his job in study abroad. He noted differences between individuals based on his conversations with students who come into the study abroad office looking for help finding the appropriate program, with some students wanting to go for academic reasons and others wanting to party.

These comments suggest that different groups of males may desire and thus communicate and seek out different values related to study abroad. Furthermore, these quotes signal a potential connection between gender roles and males' perceptions of study aboard, which could help with the interpretation of these differences. Oscar classified his peers into two groups: one related to the academic-orientation and the other to a fun-orientation. John, a campus resident assistant, connected similar observations between his male residents based on majors:

One of them is a Japanese major, so he's thinking about going to Japan to study Japanese and he talked to me about like my French program. He asked me about how much language did you learn. And his questions were very directed at what specifically I got out of it and my French context, like how much did I learn, was it useful, did it matter at all?...The other guys on my floor are like math,

engineering, chemical science, mechanical engineering majors. I'll tell them about going to France and the only thing they care about is like the girls you meet, how much did you drink.

Another difference running through these comments was that males perceived that males were generally less effusive about their experiences than females. Greg discussed how many of his male friends barely talk about their experience, yet he knows many details related to his female friends' programs. Taylor discusses his observations of his male friends:

We encourage each other for spring break, but for some reason we don't for study abroad. I think women tend to, I don't know if they flaunt it, but they like to tell people about it, like I see pictures on Facebook, messages online, and then when they come back they want to tell me about their experiences, whereas guys, they do talk about it too but they're not as gung-ho about it. They're more like, 'I had a great time, you should definitely do it.'

Another gender-related theme from the interviews related to the volunteer's peer groups. On several occasions, males admitted to knowing few males who had participated or who had not participated. Three of them—all participants—also stated that they did not typically think of themselves as "traditional men," suggesting some gender role and peer group differences between the volunteers. Oscar—who lived with a group of males who had all studied abroad, Eric, and Shaun each told me that they could not name anyone who had not gone abroad because all of their friends had gone. Andrew made a similar statement, saying that most of his conversations about study abroad were with people who either went or where about to go abroad. Each of these males related their

peer relations to the fact that they were in a residential, internationally-focused program, and tended to hang out with other students with similar interests.

John, on the other hand, noted that he knew mostly females who went abroad, stating that he knew "50, 60, 70 friends that are girls that have gone like on study abroad," but that the only male friends he had who went abroad were those who went on his specific program. Ian also admitted to knowing only "a few friends who actually have studied abroad," and that he never really had a serious conversation about the subject with any of his male friends. Eric took this sentiment a step further, when discussing the concepts of gender:

I don't associate myself with the majority of men, so I don't – and I don't interact with the majority of men, so I don't see that perspective...Whenever you ask me about it, I think of someone throwing a football. I think of the male student at [school], and I guess that's who you're talking about when you mention it. Jack's statements paralleled this idea, stating that he could not "relate to the 'all guy' stereotype and play video games, drink beer all day, make stereotypical jokes about females, watch sports shows about football and play football."

Finally, in addition to recognizing slight differences in messages and peer groups, some of the males purposefully changed their message depending on the group. Just as Oscar was able to identify the different interests between his peers, he recognized that he needed to change his messages when we went home:

I'm like from a rural northern Michigan town, not many people go to college, let alone study abroad. When I talked to my peers, I still have to tone down my experience so that it's not like a flashy thing like I could sell it as this amazing

vacation, traveled around the world sort of thing or make it some other researchbased sort of thing.

As with Oscar, Danny purposefully tried to avoid seemingly like he was boasting about this study abroad experience:

My friends were sorta jealous. If anything, they wanted to hear about the partying, and the stupid stuff I got myself into like every now and again; but mostly, I knew a lot of friends who didn't want to hear anything about it, cause they thought it was kind of offensive, or not offensive, but kinda like, 'Well, you got to do all this cool stuff, and I was around working at Sears all summer.'

More commonly, students mentioned that they give different messages and stories to their parents than they do to their friends. Chris stated:

With my family I don't, at least with my parents, emphasize the nightlife. With my female friends I don't talk about some of the things I did over there. You share different experiences with different people... I'm a guy; I don't have any problem telling my guy friends what I did, usually.

This theme suggests that students purposefully and knowingly change their discourse about study abroad depending on the audience with whom they are communicating, which could mean that males tell other males what they think they want to hear based on their perception of social norms and perpetuating a stereotypical "male voice." It also might imply that males who study abroad interact with peers who also participated, keeping the positive messages and relationships males seem to desire circulating amongst participants and failing to defuse the "male voice" into the general population.

Concluding Thoughts

As this section highlights, the messaging aspect of study abroad is complex and multi-faceted. All the males had heard about study abroad and seemed to recognize it as valuable and reputable; however, the deeper understandings, meanings, and perceptions they take away from the advertising is less positive and often ill-informed. Male nonparticipants seem to know about study abroad as being fun and perpetuate this message even though they also clearly desire messages related to value and academics. This factor might be self-reinforcing, with males giving out the messages they receive as a means of conforming to social expectations.

When giving and receiving messages then, study abroad bounces between two extremes: as either a vacation-orientated, fun, superfluous activity or as a serious, academic, organized program. Thus, Oscar's observation, that students seem to be motivated by either fun or academics, played out throughout the interviews, with different males seeking out, experiencing, and perpetuating both foci. In the next section, I discuss data related to the idea that males' sense of risk and adventure—in other words fun—relates to their participation decisions, and in the final section, I explore the concept of males' pragmatism and career-orientation.

Interest and Risk-Taking Behaviors

The third research question used during the interviewed involved dispositional issues related to students' interests in study abroad. Related to Oscar's observation that some students view study abroad as an exciting, fun activity, in this section I explore issues related to students' sense of study abroad as an adventure. To accomplish this task, I asked each student to describe his perfect study abroad experience and to discuss why

he did (or would) study abroad. From the discussions, I identified three themes. First, the males clearly desired to travel, and while traveling, they sought to have exotic adventures. While having this adventure, they also wanted an experience that they could not get on their own.

Second, males reported a need for independence, and when discussing this need, they noted several differences between males and females, a third theme. Males discuss males as more independent, adventuresome, and lazy, while discussing the females they know as seeking the safety and organization that study abroad offers. These data findings led me to conduct an additional quantitative analysis related to males' and females' academic-level at the time of their first study abroad experience. As with the previous sections, I start this discussion with a brief overview of the previous research.

Previous Research and Overview

The study abroad literature suggests that males might not be willing to take risks during their college career, such as jeopardizing their GPA by participating in special activities or interacting with a foreign culture, or that males might be too complacent (Dessoff, 2006); however, the risk literature suggests that males are actually quite adventuresome in areas related to thrill-seeking because they connect it to a masculine gender role (Kelling, Zirkes, & Myerowitz, 1976; Zuckerman, 1991). Bringing these two ideas together, my pilot study found that males often perceived study abroad as a "safe" academic endeavor, and in some cases would prefer to travel on their own rather than have a teacher lead them. Females, on the other hand, are thought to value study abroad for the safety and security inherent in traveling on an organized school program

(Dessoff). As the previous section suggested, males' parents worry about safety, yet males are less worried about their safety than females according to the phase 1 survey.

Looking at the quantitative findings, little evidence suggests that males are more or less worried about their academic performance or the challenges of studying abroad, but female participants clearly rated their health, safety, and homesickness as significantly stronger obstacles to their participation than male participants. Given the lack of quantitative data related to males' motivation to study abroad and perceptions of risk, the qualitative phase of this dissertation asked a number of questions focused on having males discuss issues related to their interest in study abroad, with one question specifically asking males to "design their ideal program" given no constraints on their thinking (e.g., cost, time, location, content were open for them to determine). Based on these interviews, I confirmed and somewhat expanded upon the pilot study findings.

Theme 7: Let's have an Adventure

Although the literature characterizes males as disinterested in cultural learning or ill-prepared developmentally to travel, most of the males I interviewed had some desire to travel, and unlike what the messages about study abroad might suggest, they were interested in more than an international spring break destination. For example, George stated that he "would say it's important just because the opportunity is there and it's a good chance to diversify." Jake also framed his interest in terms of becoming more culturally aware: "I'm very in favor of becoming more worldly or at least having an outside knowledge of just the United States." Finally, Eli stated that he was attracted to study abroad "just by the idea of going somewhere different... it would be interesting to meet new people."

Most students also related study abroad to their desire to experience something new and exciting, a way to satisfy a curiosity. Chris stated that he simply "wanted to go someplace [he] had never been before," and Ian explained study abroad as "something different rather than just doing the same, going to classes." For Shaun, study abroad offered "definitely a much better summer than having to work." Danny's travels to France "started off as just curiosity," but he also found the utility of taking classes: "I figured if I wanted to travel Europe, might as well kill two birds with one stone."

For Jason, the draw to study abroad was the travel and newness of the experience: "At this time I was pushing myself to try new things...I just really wanted to find out myself, you know, see new things, explore the world, come out of my shell without joining the Marines or something like that." Even Taylor, who did not go on a study abroad, realized the allure of travel: "The fact that I'd be in an entirely other country with study abroad was kind of fascinating to me. So that would have been a great experience I think."

These statements about curiosity pervaded the study abroad conversations with the volunteers. Almost all of the males recognized the exotic value of study abroad to them as persons and students. Specifically, in response to a question that asked them to design their perfect program, regardless of participation status, all of the males described the need for adventure, independence, and value-added excitement. They wanted a longterm program that provided them with the opportunity to learn, see, and interact with different ideas, people, and places than they could access at home or on personal travel.

Thus, as suggested by the risk literature, males desired to attend programs that they viewed as taking them someplace that, in Kenny's words, "you'd never be able to

get on your own." Kenny went on to explain what he meant by saying the university allowed him to access unique individuals and places:

... the speakers and the people that you get to interact with and having the opportunities to go to businesses and have giant corporations and to talk with them...On your own, you couldn't just be able to call them up and say, 'Hey, can I meet with your marketing people or your advising people.'

Similarly, George felt that "Europe is a lot easier to go to" and "more accessible relative to going to Africa or Asia or South America," so he viewed study abroad as a means of going someplace less accessible to him as an individual, as did Corey:

One of the reasons I definitely stuck with Australia is study abroad does give you an opportunity to go to places, Thailand, India, I had a friend go to Laos, places that I don't think people would normally think about for vacation purposes or something like that...Study abroad gives you an access to a lot more than people think about in terms of traveling.

Like these students, Bill wanted to travel to someplace rather exotic and learn something he couldn't read about or do on his own, but these interests were motivated by his interest to learn about developing nations:

I'd probably want to go to some sort of underdeveloped nation. I don't want to just go to tourist sites...Then what's the point of going. You didn't actually learn something you probably couldn't have read about. If I went on a study abroad I'd probably want to be able to really get to visit villages, talk to people, and perhaps if there's a particular project, like volunteer work.

Eric, who wanted to study in Africa, connected his desire for study abroad to the degree to which this destination was "not similar to the United States," as did Bill, who associated the location to the value of participation and the amount of learning he expected to receive:

A lot of [students] end up going to Europe, which Europe is cool and all but it's like a giant waste...Kind of a more useful place to go is East Asia or Africa. If I went on a study abroad, that's what I'd want to do because that's where I can learn something. I get particularly depressed when I see people go to Britain—I mean really—or Dublin. I know why you went there!

Jack explained a similar point, saying that he would forgo a trip to Paris for "someplace more obscure," yet the exotic location was not the only programmatic characteristic desired by the males in this survey.

Many of the males also wanted a program that moved around or showed them a lot of different locations. Eli connected his desire to travel around Europe, reliving and tracing his father's experiences as a youth "and doing something somewhat once-in-alifetimey." Beyond the chance to reenact this father's experience, Eli also had a desire to experience more than just one city. Like other students interviewed for this study, Eli expressed an interest in a program that traveled around Europe rather than staying in a single location for an extended period of time:

I wish [study abroad] would be more, 'We're gonna study – we're gonna be in London for a little while, and then Madrid, and then Paris, and then Brussels,' rather than spending the whole time in Brussels. I'm restless, I like to move around, see the different cities, see what each has to offer.

Kenny also stated that the traveling was an important aspect. When designing his dream program, he wanted "something between four to six weeks and with a lot of travel in it. Like pretty much no more than like three or four days in each city if it's a big city, or just – I think the traveling to different places was really the best part." Eric had the same perspective, and he believed that "to get the most out of the experience," he "wouldn't stay in one area for most of the time." John experienced a similar desire, although he focused more on a variety of activities rather than cities:

If there was like more diversity of it, I'd be so much happier. We just took like a bus to the next chateau and went back. Bus to another chateau and went back. Bus to another chateau and went back. It would have been nice to go to a beach or somewhere. It would have been nice to like go visit Paris for a weekend, but we didn't do any of those things, which was too bad.

Corey stated that he liked his traveling program in Australia because it allowed him to see multiple locations within the continent while on the program:

The thing about traveling is you get to experience more on the program. It'd be important to stay in certain places depending on where you are for more than just a day or two... But local speakers, field trips, just getting a sense of what it's really like to be where you are, ravel around, meet people, and experience things. *Interest in the Value-Added*

In addition to wanting an exciting experience, students also felt that if they traveled abroad, they wanted to experience more than they would on campus. They believed that the study abroad program should be more than just classroom and credits overseas, they wanted to get out and experience the culture and apply their learning in a

real-world setting. Oscar explained that if his study abroad had been a "[college] classroom transplanted into Egypt, that would not have been attractive" for him. Similarly, John wanted to avoid "just only speak[ing] the language and only focus[ing] on learning it instead of like getting the overall culture," which he felt provided him with "the full experience" of study abroad.

Jack felt that he would "be distracted almost by taking classes if [he] was to travel somewhere." He explained that we would have been more likely to go abroad "if there were experiential programs that were more traveling and field-based and not go and take a class, or an internship...I would want a balance between classes and having the free time to explore and become accustomed with the culture." George summarized a similar sentiment; he felt that "if you're spending all that money and going someplace else, you don't want to be in a classroom." Eric also valued his out of class experiences:

Relative to the rest of the trip, I didn't like study time in the classroom, because I felt I was learning so much more outside of it. In the classroom, I wasn't focused at all...There are teachers from the university there teaching us, but it was still [our university's] students only, and still pretty much the same material that I could get here, or be taught here. So if I'm going to go somewhere, I'd really like to be in a classroom at a minimum.

Even Eli, who decided not to study abroad, articulated a need for learning outside of the classroom during his internship. Although he spent part of his day in a classroom, he also had speakers and practical application of his learning: "Every day we would go out and we would essentially manage people's campaigns, and we'd set up doorknocking patterns, call-patterns, and go out and register voters." When describing his

idea study abroad program, he—like other students—wanted a mixture of class time and application: "Maybe half the program spent in an African university, and then you put that knowledge to use by if you're studying, like the environment, by going hiking after you learn about the various shrubs and berries."

Generally then, the males did value study abroad for experiential, cultural learning about people and places exotic to the individual. This desire was prevalent amongst all of the participants and most of the nonparticipants. As males described their ideal programs, they spoke of seeing new places, normally not reachable by tourists or individual travelers. They also sought programs that balanced academic time in a formal classroom or learning environment with free-time to experience the culture. More than just time outside of class, though, the males I interviewed discussed a need for independence while abroad, the next theme for this section.

Theme 8: Independence, Please

When describing their ideal programs, both participants and nonparticipants raised independence as an issue, and they connected this independence to a more experiential format. For example, Jake felt that having an experiential program "would have been a little more adapted to me because I'm more independent." Andrew enjoyed his program because of the balance between structured academics and free time. Oscar was in a unique position, having gone on several different international experiences during college. He expressed a similar interest in being more independent while contrasting his two programs:

That's probably one of the reasons I picked Egypt [for my second program] because I was supposed to be the only student going, and I'd be by myself...The most valuable experiences I had were traveling by myself in Egypt, finding the little places by myself and not having a teacher show me that, so if there was a lot of structure to it, I don't know that I would have enjoyed that as much. Matt also found his international internship more appealing that his other study abroad program because he was "more independent" and "able to get away from the group."

With similar sentiments, John connected the idea of independence to his program format, which exceeded his expectations:

My expectation was it would be really structured...I was worried that like it was going to be a chaperone at the head of the bus with a microphone like directing us around to other parts of France, and there were parts like that when we went and visited chateaus and places in France. That's when we had like tour guides and everything, we were acting as the tourist...But when we actually got time off by ourselves, we could go shopping to the clubs, to the bars.

For the program in Ireland they are brought into a community and are not given much direction. They are just sent, make a community project. Do something for the community that is good, that they approve of, that you work together on, that has a lasting impact, and then, bring your results back to us and we'll talk about it and then we'll check up on it in a year or so and see how it turns out... I have to be hands on about it, or I have to talk to people to get things accomplished, like I can't just stay in my house and ignore everyone and just do my school work.

He then compared his program in France to one his friend participated on in Ireland:

John's comments suggest that, for some students, the perception of study abroad as overly structured was a negative one. Jason noted that the Office of Study Abroad

needed to do a better job letting people know about the various formats; he thought that "students may be thinking it's just gonna be a lotta work, and not all study abroad programs have to be sit in a lecture or sit in a classroom and get lectured." Corey's statements mirrored Jason's thoughts; he felt that the office needed to communicate more about the potential for travel. He believed that study abroad marketing should take a different tact. In addition to talking about the program itself, John thought that the university should also highlight opportunities for free time and personal travel.

In aggregate, these quotes suggest that the males interviewed for this study value their autonomy and independence . This last quote further suggests that the males noted differences between themselves and females on this issue. This idea connects back to the literature about risk and safety, which suggests that males typically seek thrills and adventure, and the literature about masculinity, which states that gender role norms cause males to desire—or think they need—independence from others. As the next section highlights, different perceptions of risk were not the only distinctions the males made based on sex role. They also believed males seemed to want freedom, independence, and spontaneous experiences and females wanted to have a more systematic, organized program that ensured their safety.

Theme 9: Organized Safety vs. Spontaneous Experience

The themes of experiential learning and independence were strong throughout the interviews, especially for Jack, who was determined to travel on his own because he thought it would be cheaper than traveling with his university:

I'd honestly rather if I'm going to travel somewhere go on my own accord and find cheap deals when I want to go. I would easily rather go on my own...I'd be

more comfortable just kind of experiencing things and figuring out stuff on my own than having a preset program to what you're going to do... I'm more of a self-driven person so to have like a routine like that and have classes would just be, I don't know. I wouldn't like it.

Jack did not connect his confidence and independence directly to his sex or gender role, but for Jack, the difference was clear. From his perspective, "Women go to the bathroom together. Women sign in classes with their friends or study together...Most of the girls I know went on study abroad with someone they knew while the guys I know when on their own." Frank believed that males are more independent than females, so they seek out different types of programs and experiences. Jason shared a similar observation about differences between the males and females with whom he interacted:

This is a chance that [women] can study – or they can leave the country, travel in bigger groups. I've heard of – women usually don't feel comfortable studying or traveling more – not studying more, but traveling alone; and study abroad could be a chance for them to study in larger groups; and they can feel safer.

As Jason discussed the differences between males and females, he related the differences to their purpose for going abroad. Connecting their interests back to the discussion of differences in communication patterns, he thought that females seem more interested in the actual classes and learning than males. He told a story about how many males have asked him to set up an international trip that mimicked study abroad because "they want the same trips, but they don't wanna take the courses."

Another idea mentioned by about half of the males was the idea that males were less likely to plan ahead, more "lazy" or "unorganized," than females, which may relate
to why males are less likely to sign up for the study abroad or perceived as less academically adventuresome. Jake admitted that he almost did not get to go on his program because he signed up late because he was busy with "other stuff." For Taylor, his planning was also side-tracked because he seemed to lose track of time during his college career:

I wanted to go abroad, and the largest roadblock I had was my GPA was too low when I was a freshman, so I didn't qualify for the business study abroad. After that, the roadblock I had was just finances. It was going to be a little bit more expensive, and I just didn't want to pay the money. Now I do kind of regret it being a senior.

Will expressed similar regrets in hind-sight: "If I had to do it again, I would try maybe try to plan it out better so I could go."

Some males compared their experiences to females they knew. For example, Eli related his experience with international travel in high school in relationship to his younger sister:

She, as a freshman in high school, pinpointed, 'I want to go to France; I want to go to France with the program,' and she was going to go...Going to Spain never intrigued me, and I wasn't competent in my Spanish skills, but I don't think she's as competent in French skills. We're in the same boat, so just looking at that, my sister and I same environment, one would think that given her sheltered status, I would be the one more likely to reach out– the whole family was shocked.

This difference continued into college:

Now, I want to go to Israel, but she really wants to go to Israel...There's a Birthright trip, and if you've never been to Israel, there's some shady Jewish organization sends you there for free, and I've applied twice and I've been accepted. I've just kept pushing it back because I'm not ready to do it, or I don't want to do it, or there's something important – something important does come up. And she's – she's much more anxious to get out, which is just so – so not in keeping with her style. I'm the one that likes to go to cities on trips; she's the one that likes to go and lay at the pool at the hotel, not even the beach.

Eli's comparison ended with his admission, "I never went to the study abroad fair. I always meant to, but I'm lazy, things came up."

For Eric, the challenges were not so much about timing, but the extra planning and effort that comes from certain study abroad programs:

I think guys are lazier, maybe that's the problem. It takes a lot of effort to do study abroad, especially in like, developing areas, because you have to go to Olin

- I mean, I know I was stressed out from all the stuff I had to do, and I mean, I don't usually have to do all that kind of stuff to go somewhere.

As this quote implies, about half of the males admitted their own problems with planning, and many males mentioned planning and ambition as a major difference between males and females they knew. Speaking of himself and other males, Greg stated that:

Most of the guys in college kind of wing it a lot more than the girls. For example, in my case looking back one of the things that would have definitely helped to get me abroad is if I had come in and had my plan and stuck to it: this is when I'm going to do this and make sure that I kind of set myself up from an early point.

Then, comparing himself to females, he went on to say that:

For women they're more likely to actually come and say, 'This is what I'm interested in, this is what I want to do while I'm here, how do I do it,' and have it set at an earlier point. I've got two friends who are in study abroad and both are girls and I think one had her eye on the program since at least a year before she went and the other knew basically which program she was going to go in before she was even admitted to the college. So I think that might have a part to do with it as opposed to most of my guy friends who are like 'I'll get a free summer and this is something I want to do so let's do it.'

In addition to being indifferent or lazy, the males also classified themselves and their friends as complacent. Bill felt that "men are a little less receptive to change than women." Kenny continued on this theme of male willingness to change when saying that "women are more open-minded maybe. They are more willing to experience things; and guys might just kinda like stuff the way they are like they're a 'big dog here,' so they'll just stay here." He felt that males had many advantages to being on campus—such as friends, work, and sporting activities, and he theorized that females might go away to seek out interests unique to them.

For David, Ian, Taylor and Eli—all nonparticipants—going on study abroad was not something they wanted to do because they did not want to leave the university setting for various reasons. David said:

If I was a little bit more adventurous – I think my personality type has something to do with why I didn't go on a study abroad. I mean –cause [men] are more narrow minded...You get comfortable where you're at. You're thinking about –

you know, for a lot of guys like me, 'I've got all these different activities going on in my life. I've got schoolwork keeping me busy, I've got my job, I've got my family at home'

Ian agreed with David, stating that he enjoyed college too much to leave for a semester: I really liked where I had moved to and what I was doing here, so it's just kind of like I had found something that I liked and I just kind of wanted to experience it here, not leave. It was more or less like I kinda had settled in here, and I really liked where I was so I didn't wanna necessarily change that right away. I mean now that I've been here for five years it's, it's kind of a little different, but since I'm graduating in a semester it's kind of too late for that.

Taylor felt pressured to stay by his fraternity friends and duties, and finally, Eli shared his rationale:

The first two years I didn't want to do it because I – the programs I was looking at were – I didn't want to miss college football season, which is just embarrassing... I knew I didn't want to take a semester off school, cause this is where my home is. I only get four years here, and I've had such a great time here that I didn't want to leave my friends. I didn't want to lose that connection.

In many cases, the nonparticipants found other reasons not to go abroad, and as these quotes suggest, although peer relationships can be a powerful influence toward participation, they can also be an obstacle opposing participation for some males.

During his interview, Corey was surprised by the fact that fewer males study abroad, as were many of the other students. As the conversation progressed, he continually tried to sort out some ideas to explain the difference:

I don't know if you've ever read – I've read this book called *Wild Heart* and it's just this book about men being controlled by American Christian society, and we're expected to be these obedient, strong blah, blah men. It's just the way our society has molded us to be and after reading that in my opinion men would be more likely to study abroad. Men in my opinion are more adventurous, want to do more, want to see more, and after reading this book, that's how I feel.

Needing some form of a rationale, Corey defaulted to a comment that Eli would have appreciated: "I think die hard football fans aren't going to want to miss their season."

Embedded in the discussion about males' complacency is the idea that males may consider study abroad later in their academic career, and many of the other males discussed this point directly. For example, Matt thought that "It didn't seem like it was possible right after freshman year. It wasn't really until my sophomore year that I started really considering it, because I saw some of my friends were gonna do it." Jason related a similar experience based on his observations and conversations with male first-year students during study abroad recruitment events: "They'll happen to talk to the Study Abroad table, and they'll say something derogative about study abroad—relating it to gay men or something like that, something that's silly. After trying to talk to 'em, they'll just kinda shrug it off." These comments reiterate similar ideas made by students during the pilot study, which suggested that younger males—those coming right from high school do not see a value in or understand the value of studying abroad.

Based on these findings, I went back to the quantitative data and performed two additional analyses. First, I compared males and females in relationship to the year in school during which they first traveled abroad. Using an ANOVA analysis, a significant

difference between the means for males and females existed at the .025 level, with females tending to study abroad mid-way between their sophomore year (2.58) and males studying abroad a bit later, closer to their junior year (2.80). This finding supports the idea that males might study abroad later than females (see Table M1, p. 303).

I also conducted a chi-square analysis for male and female participants and nonparticipants based on their year in school. Although females showed no significant differences between the expected and observed values, males did show significant differences at the .000 level. This test suggests that males are underrepresented in the participant group and overrepresented in the nonparticipant group during their first two years of colleges; however, they were overrepresented in the participant group during their junior and senior year and underrepresented in the nonparticipant group during their senior year (see Tables M2 and M3, pp. 303-305). Collectively, these findings suggest a link between study abroad participation and development or age, *with males not seeking out study abroad options until later in their academic career*. As I discuss in the next section, this issue poses obstacles for males, as they often find it more difficult to find time for study abroad as they near graduation.

Concluding Points on Risk and Fun

The results from this third research question suggests that males seek dynamic, experiential, and semi-independent experiences that provide them with fun, exciting options not available to them through other means. It also suggests that males seek independence, a status they associate with more experiential programs that have less structure. Finally, these findings suggest several differences related to males and females, which seem to be associated with gender role and identity issues. Despite these findings,

though, this section fails to illuminate issues related to Oscar's second student "archetype."

Another major idea about study abroad relates to its value to students academically, and although all these students all seemed to recognize the general value of study abroad to them personally and all seemed to have an interest in traveling, they all did not participate in study abroad. Some other factor appears to intervene as males make their decisions to participate. The next research question looks at this issue by examining students' perspectives related to study abroad as academically and professionally valuable to them.

Careerism and Success

Oscar's statement about fun versus academics implied that some males might value study abroad for reasons other than adventure. As noted in the section on peer messages, many males seemed to recognize study abroad as a valuable learning experience; however, they often framed the value only in terms of their cultural abilities. Other students noted that the lack of clear academic messages actually served as a disincentive to participate. In the previous section, I discussed issues related to males' desire for thrills or adventure, and in this final section, I discuss findings related to how males associate study abroad with their academic and career learning.

As this section's findings show, students who make the connection between study abroad and their academics or career are more likely to go on study abroad and those who see less connection tend to be nonparticipants. This general idea emerged from three themes: first, although almost all the males saw study abroad as fun or personally fulfilling, most males also sought a connection to their major and career; second, even if

they connected study abroad to their major, some males tended to see study abroad as just one of many beneficial options to them; and when making decisions about participation, all males tended to use a very pragmatic cost-benefit analysis to make their decision.

Previous Research and Overview

The fourth research question, and the third pilot study finding, relates to the idea from the study abroad and literature about males, which suggest that males are more pragmatic in relationship to study abroad because they feel the need to graduate on time and/or gain practical work experience that advances their careers, such as internships, rather than spend time abroad. As the last section suggests, even males who seek out adventure and fun want to couple their experience with some benefit or learning, albeit not necessarily formal classroom learning. Connected with the ideas related to both parents and marketing messages, males may see less relationship or value between study abroad and their academic major than females. In other words, they may not clearly see how the activity will benefit them professionally, so they are less interested in investigating the options and/or less willing to accept the financial and time costs associated with their participation.

Based on the quantitative findings, males actually seemed less influenced by programmatic features such as cost, timing, and duration and obstacles such as lost wages than females; however, male participants were significantly more likely to worry about delay of graduation as an obstacle. As indicated under the first qualitative research questions, some male nonparticipants did discuss study abroad as a delay to their obtaining a career and becoming self-sufficient. A major idea related to this discussion of male-careerism is that STEM majors are also less likely to study abroad. This idea,

connected to the discrepancy between the number of males and females in the STEM fields, suggests that perhaps males' major selection and not their sex is the primary determinant on their feelings related to study abroad. Admittedly, science, engineering, and other technical majors have a murkier benefit and typically less time within their curriculum to participate when compared with Spanish or history majors.

The analysis for this survey showed that although males did participate at a significantly lower rate than females, males were also slightly overrepresented in the STEM majors group and very underrepresented in the liberal arts major group. With this factor in mind then, perhaps, it was that males' major decisions made delay of graduation more of a reality for them, thus males rated this item more highly than females. To better understand the issue of male career orientation, I interviewed males in diverse majors, capturing both the STEM perspective and the liberal arts perspective. From this technique, some themes emerged related to how males balance pragmatic variables, such as time and money, with their other interests and obligations.

Theme 10: Value to Major and Career

As discussed in the previous sections, many males saw value in study abroad, and they thought about study abroad as an activity that could help them have some fun and learn more about the world or themselves. Danny expressed this idea by saying that "everyone should travel in general. It's important to every human being's development to travel; it widens your variety a lot, your point of view on things." Eric explained study abroad's value this way:

The best aspects of study abroad are probably encountering a different culture and learning from meeting people who are human just like you, and realizing that –

that deep down, everyone has the same concerns pretty much, with living, or just

living, and you just get a - a perspective on how people live somewhere else. These ideas focused on how study abroad could help students build their own capacities and knowledge-base in terms of global, international, and intercultural issues. This idea was pervasive amongst all the males, yet all the males did not study abroad.

After more discussion and review, though, the difference between participants and nonparticipants seemed to be the students' ability to connect this general sentiment to study abroad's value specifically in terms of their major or career interests. For example, Oscar knew that he "was going to study abroad at some point." He felt the chance to go abroad was that "every student should study abroad because it's integral to your life experience to go some place other than your home, to go beyond your comfortable range and to see the world from a different perspective," but also an important part of his "career and academic interests" as an international relations major.

As with Oscar, Chris framed the value of study abroad in terms of cultural learning, but he also linked the value of this learning to his major field of study: "It is valuable, especially for someone in more of a social science field. I don't think you can truly judge a situation until you've seen it firsthand, and that's what study abroad does. It lets you see other situations firsthand." He continued on to say that study abroad also fulfilled some personal interests, as well as helped him satisfy some degree requirements.

Andrew also connected his study abroad program with his major and especially pursuit of French language, which is why he decided to study abroad:

My French had reached a level that it had kind of stagnated with English professors teaching me, so I went to the office of study abroad and found out what

programs there were available to learn the French language...I'm an International relations major, and I think that so often people get entrenched in their own viewpoints and being able to live with a French family really helped to expand and let you see from other perspectives what's going on in the world. So while the program I took part in was just a language program it helped a lot more than just to learn the language.

The value to learn a language was a common theme amongst the males in two of the three cohorts, as many of their majors required some language courses. John, a French minor, valued study abroad for offering the "kind of experience you get learning the language in France is not going to be the same here." Matt, a communications and French major, also indicated that he studied abroad for language ability:

I'm a French major, so I think going like – going to a French-speaking country kinda goes hand-in-hand with it. I actually went to the Study Abroad fair, just kinda looked at what programs they had in France and stuff, and I found the tour program...It's kind of like part of learning a language is being immersed in that, and I guess more people in the French probably like do it in relation to French. Some males valued going on study abroad for indirect benefits related to their major. Shaun wanted to study in Africa as a way of learning more about the region, even

if he didn't get credit for the experience:

Since I'm in African studies it makes a whole lot of sense to study in Africa, that's a really important experience I think. To understand my studies, how that fits into potentially, what I want to do in the big picture... What was most important for me was the experience and so, I mean, taking the classes, getting the credit was good, but what was more meaningful to me was being able to go and interact with people, ask questions, see what was different.

For Jack and Eric, the study abroad experience was valuable not in terms of their actual degree program, but for their future career. Jack, a nonparticipant, discussed how study abroad could help if someone was "studying something location specific." Like some of the other students, he noted that "being there is a large difference in contrast to studying something, you know, as a way, way, outside observer." Eric explained that: "I plan on living and working abroad after graduation, so I thought it would be a great experience for my résumé, but also to know what I'd be getting into, and plus I want to broaden my perspective." Jason also associated his international activity with future career plans:

It's better to know how to communicate, how to work with – how to get over your own ideas that have formed here as an American, that's why I think it's important. I'm in an opportunity where I can be working internationally; and if I don't know how to get outta my own comfort zone, then I don't know I'd ever be able to be successful. Since my major is bio-systems engineering and I'm specializing in international agriculture, I've decided somewhere in my career that I'd like to do the Peace Corps.

Corey linked study abroad not so much to his major or career interest, but rather to his passion for the subject-matter within this degree program and how it connected to his personal life. He intertwined his personal interest in travel with his history major:

As a history major and stuff you learn that history is normally presented through one point of view, normally the dominant force or the conquering force and I

think as Americans that we look at life through American eyes. We look at it through what we've been taught here...The world looks in at us as Americans too and kind of, 'Oh Americans,' and that sort of thing, but when you travel and stuff and you meet people on a personal level it's easier to see like, 'Oh you're not so diffèrent than me. You're the same person as me.' Yeah, our governments have flaws, yeah our governments do rape...As Americans, we kind of focus on ourselves and not necessarily how the rest of the world is run. So both, I mean, I

think for my major less. I think I did it more for myself than for my major. Most participants talked about study abroad this way, as a blending of their personal interests and their academic or career interests. They discussed study abroad as a way to prepare themselves for their future careers and/or augment their majors and they tended to connect the cultural learning gained from study abroad to their major or career interest. Of course, not all the conversations focused solely on personal learning for the sake of learning.

In addition to helping directly with the career or major interests, about half of the students, mostly nonparticipants, framed study abroad's value more as a way to build a résumé. For example, for George study abroad was mostly about building his résumé: "You definitely get the message and impression that it looks good to employers or graduate schools, just because you have like experience more in different cultures." Sam, who considered but did not actually study abroad, said:

I became interested in study abroad basically from the fact that I knew I needed, it sounds kind of horrible, but it needs to be there for our résumé building tool and for that experience. Study abroad is something that you can only get, obviously

from leaving this country and experiencing that, so I heard about it mostly and it was promoted to me especially by advisors as a way to increase your résumé, make you more diverse, which is important as I already stated.

Will put it in similar terms:

It would be a great experience, one just for the simple fact that it's put on your résumé because a lot of employers do love that. So I mean, just like that experience of going abroad because like a lot of companies you know, expand overseas and then if you know something about a different culture, that's huge...Obviously, I could go abroad and experience that because I mean, that's pretty big to keep like well-rounded education because well all, all the undergrads have to take humanities class.

Although not himself primarily motivated by résumé-building, Matt recognized that the résumé was a large motivator for some students who might assume study abroad is only about taking classes:

When I told a guy here that I was doing this internship in France; and he was like, 'I know that's unpaid; but you really don't know when you can put that on a résumé. That's just like – it is just like that would jump off the page of a résumé. You have no idea. An internship is like worth its weight in gold.' So – and I don't think a lotta people know that international experience counts so much—weights your résumé. They maybe look at it more as like, 'Oh, you know, get a couple credits and have fun for a couple thousand.'

These quotes suggest that although some males did not associate study abroad with career skills directly, they did see it as a way to build their résumés; however, as the

subsequent section suggests, study abroad as a résumé-builder alone was insufficient rationale to motivate participation. Nonparticipants, specifically the STEM students, viewed study abroad as only one way to build the résumé. Although they acknowledged the value of study abroad, they did not see it as a necessity.

In the end, nearly all of the nonparticipants and a few of the participants discussed the value of study abroad as dependent on the person and the person's interests. In other words, study abroad's value was relative to the individual. Greg exemplified this sentiment:

I would definitely say that it's worthwhile. It's something that personally enriches you a lot, but I haven't seen—and my major is international relations, so obviously it would help my résumé to get abroad—but as far as like academically I haven't seen a whole lot of advantages to it...So I didn't see it entirely as something like on my must list.

Greg explained that ,in terms of his priorities, "Once I got to college it was get your GPA, do your work experience, if you can go abroad, go abroad." Danny, who participated, distinguished the value of study abroad based on roles: "As a person, I think I benefitted a great deal; as an engineer, probably not whatsoever. I think they need to do more research into their program. But study abroad in general I'd recommend for anybody."

Will, a nonparticipant, echoed Danny's comments, linking his rationale to not going to both the costs associated with his involvement and other priorities related to his major:

I actually didn't even take a summer class and consequently I'm taking five years, but I've got two internship experiences right now. Employers also like for

engineering and like if you are going to go to grad school, they want to see research, like not just necessarily study abroad. Unless if I could have found a study abroad program related to engineering, I would have done engineering research abroad, then that would have been something I would consider very carefully.

As Will's comments suggest, many males weighted the study abroad option's value against other needs and interests in their lives. For Will, his major, marching band, and the need to work interfered with study abroad. As Greg discussed, his involvement with ROTC hindered his ability to travel. John explained the major connection this way: "Math is the same whether you are in Tokyo, or whether you're here. You can get the same textbooks. You can read the same kind of literature so what advantage is there to going elsewhere?"

Hence, many nonparticipants see a value in study abroad, yet they choose not to participate because of other factors. For some, like Eli, other opportunities domestically attracted their attention. Eli explained about this decision to go to Portland, Oregon:

There was a couple of law schools I was considering out there, so I could see if I liked it out there. You never – I've spent – grew up in Grand Rapids, gone to school in Lansing for four years, so I've never really been on my own, so I was on my own for three months in Portland, not knowing a single person...It was just the right opportunity and the right time. They were paying me to learn stuff, so I was happy. That was the final argument. After sophomore year, I said, 'Well, I'm traveling. I'd rather just do a field experience and so something hands on because I want to go into *American* politics.'

Other nonparticipants, such as Sam, faced time and financial obstacles that did not outweigh the benefits of going abroad:

It's very important to do things, even if it's not for a moral reason, to do it for a professional, career building, because today, in the global economy, it's essential that students have global experience, that students are culturally diverse...If money wasn't an obstacle I would have already gone on four programs by now.

The threat of delayed graduation was another common concern mentioned by the males. Bill related his decision not to study abroad to his transfer student status, which caused him to be behind in terms of his credits and requirements. He did not want to take an extra semester to study abroad—even though he acknowledged its value. Ian had similar concern with moving forward:

I knew what my goals were. I'm trying to graduate you know with an engineering degree, so I thought it would probably be better just to kind of push through and just knock that out rather than traveling abroad or something like that. I'm sure I would have enjoyed it because I like traveling, but it's something I probably wouldn't have been able to accumulate the same amount of credits as I would have if I had stayed here but I don't know that for certain.

Jason indicated that his college, engineering, generally supports study abroad, but does not put the emphasis on it over activities: "a lotta times I've heard 'em – some of the upper division students talk about how it's not necessarily a good idea for an engineering student because of the fact that they're gonna be pushing their graduation back."

The rationales varied from student to student, yet the common theme running throughout the interviews was that each individual makes a personal decision concerning

how the program relates (or fails to relate) to their degree. That is, each student seemed to evaluate the extent to which the program was valued and needed or unnecessary. Obviously, students' interests and majors played a large role in the volunteers' decisionmaking, with males wanting to work abroad or to study culture and social issues more readily making a connection than those students pursuing science.

Earlier in the discussion of these interviews, I mentioned Oscar's observation about the motivational difference between males seeking fun and vacation versus those who think about study abroad as personally or professionally valuable. Sam made a similar comment related to the value of study abroad. According to Sam, males come to college feeling "that it won't be beneficial to them," which is "a different mindset than somebody that has made that choice coming in." The next section looks at the unifying theme between these two groups of males: pragmatism.

Theme 11: The Pragmatic Mindset

All the participants and nonparticipants viewed study abroad programs as valuable experiences, but the manner and degree to which they viewed them as valuable tended to relate to their major and/or career interests. The participants often noted a clearer relationship to their degree or career interests than nonparticipants. For example, Andrew and other language students noted that they traveled abroad to improve their language abilities. Other students sought credit toward their degree, as Jason indicated when I asked if he would have studied in Germany if he would not have gotten engineering credit: "Probably not at that time. No, I wanted credit for my engineering degree. I would love to be able to go on a program and just for the experience alone, but I'm here at MSU for earning my degree."

Many students focused on the need to get required credit for the experience. Matt, a participant, associated the value of study abroad with getting some required credit:

I wouldn't have done it for empty credits. I woulda done it for like [general education courses] or whatever. I would've looked into one of those programs, too, so it wouldn't have to be specifically to my major. Because it's like you usually get between like 8 and 12 credits, and like that's a lot to go for just one summer. I wouldn't take a whole semester of classes that were not required.

Danny also wanted credit, stating that he went abroad "to knockout some classes that I had that were pretty easy." When asked if he still would have gone abroad if the program he selected offered no required courses, he admitted "at the time, no…now, yes." Only after his time abroad did Danny see the value of "being able to explore culture."

The need to have the experience "count" or "provide a value" surfaced amongst almost all of the males. Even Eric, who was not originally interested in study abroad, started thinking about study abroad when he decided to change his major:

I found a social science major in international studies, so I changed to that next. My decision to go abroad was pretty much in line with my mindset when I was changing my major. I developed the need to go abroad, and it coincided with what I wanted to do with my study and my postgraduate life.

For some participants, study abroad was not necessarily about the actual credit, but rather as a valuable experience related to the major. Oscar felt that study abroad gave him creditability as an international relations student:

You can talk about it as much as you want in the classrooms, read as much as you want, but until you have actually traveled abroad, like had first hand encounters

with other cultures, you're just talking about it in an abstract way. That was very valuable for me to internalize the experiences and to add that to my knowledge; I mean to authenticate what I've seen in books.

As this quote suggests, credit toward the degree was one of several types of values important to the males. Chris wanted some credit related to his major in international relations, and he wanted this credit from a program located in Africa:

I wanted to go on a program that was interesting and related to my major. I was really dedicated to going – really adamant about going to Africa some time. I thought it was best to go now when I had the opportunity, as opposed to later when I didn't know if I'd have the opportunity or not.

When one of the two classes he needed was dropped from the program, he still wanted the experience: "I was really upset because I was very adamant about going." Chris was willing to take a class as a substitute that did not count toward his degree, but when I asked if he would have gone on the program if none of the courses would have counted toward his major, Chris stated that he did not "think so. [He] had to get some benefit. [He] couldn't spend that amount of money and not get any – because if [he] just went by [him]self, then it would be a lot lower cost. The price of that tuition was a cost that [he] had to gain from" by taking a class for graduation.

Even though Kenny said he would have gone on study abroad regardless of his major, he talked about the value to him in terms of his career twice:

I would probably have gone anyway; but I think that if it's relevant to your degree, it's definitely more advantageous or more likable...You're just able to experience something that's completely different from what you're used to. And,

also, it – since you're taking classes, it's kind of a good way to show employers or prospective employers that you can handle, adapt into a situation or work in an environment that you might be uncomfortable with or is new to you.

Along similar lines, George was willing to go abroad for a subject outside his major, but he still wished he could get needed credit:

For me specifically it would be one that had either courses required or courses that could take the place of physiology credits...The other thing that stopped me from doing a whole semester somewhere because I didn't really want to take a whole semester off and then not get all the classes I would need. I was able to go [on my short-term program] and come back and still work at a hospital, which I needed to do in order to put that on my med school application.

George's quote suggested that time is also a factor for some males, a variable mentioned by Shaun when he explained why he did not go on semester-long program: "I couldn't during the regular school year; I can't really take the time off. That is, if I want to graduate in four years, which hopefully I will. It was mostly time, not money."

John, who went abroad for his French minor and family interests, admitted that "if Spanish was my minor I would have gone to Spain. If English was my minor and biology was my major I would have gone to England or I would have done something with biology." Despite his strong interest in France for family reasons, John stated that he would have went there "sooner or later," but he would have gone on his own. His comments show that even males with clear personal interests in study abroad still select programs that could relate some credit or outcome they desire.

Just as participants like John wanted a value, nonparticipants also sought out value related to credit and their major or career; however, they often used their degree program as a rationale for not participating. Will and Frank highlighted the lack of availability of higher-level classes as a major obstacle. Will suggested that study abroad should "make classes more available so when students want to head out, maybe like just co-oping, they don't have to like prolong the graduation two years." He believed that the highly sequential nature of his curriculum and the lack of course offerings limited his choices. Frank agreed, and referring to study abroad, he stated that "a lot of them they got for either, like general education or maybe one or two really low level engineering courses...I guess that would be the where the ability to take like upper level chemical engineering courses would have helped."

This concern was typical among the STEM students, but not only of the STEM students, as Taylor expressed with his thoughts:

If there were core classes that – like let's say right now I'm in Econ 420. If they had classes like that abroad then I would have done it this semester or either next semester. But the classes they did have, they were a little bit different and it seemed like they wouldn't transfer...If they were more flexible on the courses they offered I think that would have helped

Taylor went on to discuss this issue in terms of his academic level. As a senior about to graduate, he felt that his needs differed from what study abroad could offer:

I'm focused on my major and I need to get certain classes out of the way. Right now I don't have a lot of options in the classes I need to take; they're pretty much planned out for me. So it's not really feasible for me to go abroad right now where as far as a freshman, first of all I wasn't even an econ major so I could have gotten some of the core classes out of the way. There were just a lot of other things, more flexibility when you're younger.

For most nonparticipants then, given limited time to graduate and financial resources, study abroad was just not as important as other aspects of their academics. Their decision-making was not necessarily due to a lack of interested, though. Will wanted to do a study abroad:

Being an engineering major, I'm more interested in getting internship experience and it won't be necessarily abroad... But other than like definitely get an internship, because that's again, what I am looking for this year and that's like my whole number one priority. ... I would like go abroad and spend a whole summer, 10 weeks, of learning about the culture and learn about how different cultures do different scientific work and research.

For Greg, other priorities came up related to ROTC, something he planned to pursue as a career. Due to these other commitments, he lacked time to go abroad:

I'm also in Army ROTC, and I would have like to have done an international internship last summer but last minute they had a training opportunity that came up that they really wanted me to take so I ended up doing that instead of pursuing an internship or something along those lines and then I've gone this summer again with them and because our training takes place during the school year I can't do it during the school year.

Often, the issue of time related to the students' desire to graduate and get a job. Ian felt that graduating with his engineering degree, getting a good job, and paying off his

loans was more essential than study abroad. Kenny had similar feelings, but his advanced placement credit (AP) and summer coursework gave him the time to go:

The engineering program is pretty difficult to get through in four years. You have to take four or eight really intense semesters. I came in with more than a semester's worth of credit, and I've taken summer school ever since I've been here. So I think that put me ahead enough that I was able to spend time abroad, but I'd say that the majority of engineers are just focused on being able to get through all their core classes.

For David, money and time were also issues:

I didn't want to pay for the trip and then be gone from work all at the same time, even though – I'm sure it would be a wonderful opportunity, but for me it never really fit in...I did my internship in that kind of – and my internship was the same time as one of the trips, and so it just kind of didn't work out.

These quotes by David and others echoed the theme that even though the males found study abroad as valuable, they did not necessarily see it as the most essential activity for them to pursue. Other students had a clear reason to and interest in going abroad, but they faced pragmatic obstacles such as time and money. For example, Jack said "I've got a lot of friends that have done it and for me it just seems like the costs would be too much." He went on to recommend that "if you're going to study abroad, make it practical and applicable to your other learning. Being worldly is great, but not at that cost."

Other students, though, figured out a way to make it work, given enough desire. For example, Andrew could not afford to take classes or time in the summer because he needed to work to pay for school, yet he managed to go abroad:

More often than not it's that you can't financially or you can't fit it in somewhere. Money was definitely an issue. I had spent the summers working to help pay tuition and bills, and in previous years, I had to go out and find a job here during school, which I typically don't like doing because I need to focus on schoolwork and whatnot. So I worked that spring and fall before the summer I went.

Hence, regardless of how the males placed study abroad amongst the many priorities and activities competing for their attention, they clearly made their decisions based on a pragmatic value. Some males saw a clear need and connection to their degrees; others viewed it as an add-on activity that did not warrant the time away or the financial cost. The way males worked through this decision-making process seemed influenced by their perceptions of study abroad and their specific situations. A final comment by Greg summarized these ideas:

A lot of it has to do with in high school I got good grades, and it's like it would be a waste of these good grades if I didn't get into a good college. Once I got into a good college it's like it would kind of be a waste to be at this good college if I didn't get a good job to go with it. For me, I'd have to see some benefit to me down the road because you're paying, paying tuition while you're abroad.

Theme 12: Intra- and Inter-Group Differences

As with the other research questions, the males' statements indicated differences that existed between groups of males and between males and females. As first suggested by Oscar, males seemed to divide themselves into two groups: those with a clear value and interest in study abroad for cultural reasons and those without clear reasons or motivations. For about two-thirds of the males, the primary difference between these

groups related to majors because, as John explains, some majors lack a clear connection to international content: "For math, there's probably not that many study abroad programs. Whereas, like for French, English, language, the liberal arts, I know there are more study abroad programs."

Jake agreed with John, which he indicated when he discussed his thoughts on why males are not participating:

A field like engineering it's all about you know getting your internships, getting a foot in the door...Engineering is more about the sciences and math ...The social sciences more lend themselves to exploring all cultures and even if they don't explore things culturally a lot of times economics focuses internationally.

Beyond the cursory statement about major, though, John, Jake, and other respondents tended to frame the issue in terms of sex and gender roles more than in terms of the major itself. For example, Jake connected his statements about engineers to the fact that many engineers are males. Matt, although he talks about major explicitly, also framed the study abroad participation issue in terms of gender: "It's like stereotypically more feminine, and I'd say as far as like the arts and cultures and stuff like that I think there's more women who would think about being involved in that type of stuff."

Often feeling embarrassed or qualifying their remarks, about half of the males connected their comments about major to traditional gender roles. Taylor, who did not "like to stereo-type," spoke from his experience that:

For the most part, a lot of women that I know are either in teaching, retailing, basically a little bit more generalized majors whereas a lot of the guys I know are in business, economics, engineering, a little more specialized. Generally with their

majors it seems a little bit more important to go abroad and to get more of that experience than it is for us where the academics are more important.

This statement echoed Gore's findings (2005), as did Jason, who said:

Engineering's also traditionally a field of men...They don't think they could fit it in, whether they take summer classes or not... I would maybe think for women, if they're in – since their fields are the ones that they traditionally dominate are like nursing or education; there's a lot of programs geared towards those majors.

Males also raised other gender-related differences related to participation. John suggested "that women are more willing to kind of go into another culture and experience it and look at it from a more humanistic standpoint than what they are just going to get out of it explicitly. Like, in terms of like base-knowledge." This comment again raised the issue of pragmatism, with males being more pragmatic and wanting something from the experience and females being more willing to just have the experience. Bill's comment supports this idea when speaking of males in relationship to females he knew:

They see things in terms of almost like economic terms. What's the return on me going to Thailand? They're like, 'Yeah, I guess that would be maybe interesting but I could graduate in four years, get a job, start making money, yadda, yadda, yadda,'... Women see sort of a more intrinsic value in going out there than men do.. It's like something has to have practical use versus just being good.

In the context of comparing males to females or when just talking about males in their lives, the interview volunteers continued to discuss the issue of males as being goalorientated, career-focused, and pragmatic. They linked this interest to priorities for activities other than study abroad.

George stated that he did not know any females with long-term career goals, but speaking of his male friends: "my roommate, he's already interning for accounting internships and another one's like just starting to talk with firms. I know another guy who already has a few job offers and he hasn't even graduated yet." Corey noted similar behaviors amongst his peer group, talking about his business-major roommates, he said: "They're very driven to make money, to be successful, and they had it regimented out. 'I need to do this, I need to get this grade, I need this class next semester to graduate,' and neither of them have studied abroad." He contrasted these males with himself:

Of course I want to go out and make money, but I don't want to do it when I'm 21 years old. Yes I'm adult, yes I have responsibility, but at the same time I don't want to go out and sit in an office at 21 and go, 'Well this is what I'm going to do for the rest of my life,' and not have any of that experience, not have any of those options, not have any of those connections that I made during traveling or study abroad that they don't have and I look at that as another opportunity.

Speaking of the value of study abroad, he explained that:

You meet people, you make connections, you realize that college isn't about getting through to get a job. You realize there are tons of opportunities out there, there are tons of ways to make a living, and I think people who are more structured and more either money driven or academically driven don't look at study abroad as an option.

Concluding Thoughts

I first noted the perceived differences between males and females and amongst male participants and nonparticipants during my first interview, and as I have referred to

Oscar's comments throughout this chapter, it seems fitting to end with some thoughts related to his observations. Oscar suggested that some males do not see the value in international study because they think of study abroad "as cultural exchanges, as the fluff of education." He felt that many males view study abroad as non-essential skills:

You're not learning your methods class or calculus abroad. Those are things that you have to have for your career and [study abroad] is maybe the liberal arts part of your education. I think that traditionally women have been pigeonholed or pushed towards the softer cultural, not as hard science, classes and careers.

In his interview, Oscar alluded to Gore's (2005) statements about the feminized messages and values of study abroad and what Kimmel (2008) would call the "guy code." Although his observations are slightly more complex than either of these studies alone, they have provided an interesting lens through which to consider the interview data.

Based on this data, males clearly seek a pragmatic value in relationship to their study abroad decision. By viewing study abroad as one of many activities, the males I interviewed discussed it as something that could be important to them depending on their situation, and when considering their unique situations, each male seemed to weigh the pros and cons of participation against competing needs and interests. Although majors serve as an important variable shaping this decision process, major alone does not seem to be the only influence. Rather, males seem to consider variables such as value to their career, time, money, major and classes, as well as personal interests in a complex matrix.

Conclusions

The second, qualitative phase of this study provided important depth and insights about the issue of male participation in study abroad (see Table 2, p. 223). For example,

this chapter suggests that parents are quite involved in their sons' decision to participate and are worried about their sons' safety; however, it also implies that young males will move ahead with their plans in the face of opposition or support from parents. Similarly, this chapter indicates that academic majors are important influences on study abroad participation, but perhaps not as important as the individual males' situations and dispositions. When starting this study, I thought my findings might lead to a clear idea or set of principles that could address my research question, but these findings have suggested no quick, easy answers. Instead, this study has begun to highlight complex interactions between variables. I explore these ideas more holistically in the next and final chapter.

In Chapter 6, I pull all of the themes and data together in an attempt to describe male decision-making processes relating to this study. Through this discussion, I seek to both better outline and to move forward scholarly discussions about the issue of study abroad participation. As part of this chapter, I present five "big ideas" related to study abroad participation that emerged from this study. I also discuss recommendations for action and for future researchers interested in the issue of male engagement.

Table 2: Summary of Qualitative Findings

Category	Theme
Family	1. SES does not seem to influence interest or positive support, but
background	previous international travel or interaction increases the interest
and support	and motivation to study abroad.
	2. Parental support often relates to safety and is often cost neutral:
	students can go if they pay for it themselves. Parental travel
	experience seems to increase parental support.
	3. Parental support is sometimes not sought out due to males'
	assumptions about their family obligations and duties.
Peer and	4. Males have a generally positive, broad concept of study abroad,
	but they lack depth and accuracy.
institutional	5. Males report that study abroad marketing and peer messages
	highlight the fun and culture, but lack clear messages about the
messages	academics.
	6. Males seem to value, but report having less, information about
	study abroad from other males.
Fun and	7. Males view study abroad as an opportunity to have an adventure
adventure	and/or do something they could not do at home or on their own.
	8. Males express concern that study abroad might be too structured
	or too classroom-locused, and they value having independence
	Malas often describe themselves as loss or loss structured when
	9. Males often describe themselves as lazy or less structured when compared to females.
Career-focus	10. Males recognized the value of fun, but felt that having fun alone
and value	was not enough to go abroad, they also wanted to receive a
	career/academic benefit.
	11. Males recognized that study abroad was valuable, but weighted
	their assessment of its value against other competing needs.
	12. Males note differences amongst themselves and when compared
	to females, often based on gender role stereotypes.

Chapter 6: Analysis and Implications

In this final chapter, I summarize the findings from Chapters Four and Five and present ideas about how males seem to work through the decision to participate in study abroad. Second, I analyze some of the major themes that resulted from my study based on my literature review. As part of this discussion, I present a model for male study abroad participation in the context of my original conceptual framework involving dispositional, motivation, informational, and programmatic variables. Third, I offer recommendations for action and practice based on my analysis, and I conclude with some final comments about the value and limitations of this study and how future research efforts could build on this study.

Summary of the Findings

This section provides a summary of the overall findings from this dissertation. I present each main concept by numeric point, with the core idea in italics for easy review. The subsequent sections of this chapter look at the interactions between these nine ideas.

1. Males were interested in international travel, and they travelled in a variety of capacities including vacations with friends, family travel, extra-curricular involvements, religious interests, and academics both before and during college. At the institution studied for this project, the males were aware that study abroad exists as an option for them, and they generally considered study abroad to involve taking classes abroad with a faculty member overseas or enrolling at a foreign university. Furthermore, they knew that study abroad is a common, typically respected, activity at the institution that is encouraged by

faculty members, staff, and administrative offices, who the males viewed as helpful and supportive.

- 2. In terms of its value, males realized that study abroad would provide them with an opportunity to have fun, learn about other cultures, and often a way to augment their résumé; however, these factors alone were not always enough motivation to study abroad. When making the decision to study abroad, males wanted an experience that could help them achieve their academic and/or career goals. For some males, having fun, cultural learning, and résumé-building were not important enough reasons to study abroad given other constraints, which included time away from home, family and friends; lost wages and opportunities to work; conflicts with other—more important—activities such as research and internships; and delayed graduation.
- 3. Males reported less support and/or encouragement from individuals in their lives when compared to females, and they reported receiving less information about study abroad from other males when compared to females. Male students seemed to associate with people of like-minds, so for nonparticipants, peer messages related to study abroad were limited. Related to their parents, males who wanted to travel to exotic locations faced more questions about safety, but males generally considered parents' support as somewhat neutral—supportive of going but not necessarily pushing or paying for them to go.
- 4. Males expressed limited knowledge about study abroad opportunities, which seemed to limit their interest or pursuit of diverse options that would more effectively match their interests. Some males conceptualized study abroad in

limited ways: either thinking about it as purely about fun and not worth doing through an organized school program (when they could travel independently with friends) or as purely about academics and not valuable to them (when they could pursue as other professional opportunities such as internships). Participants balanced between these two extremes, but most nonparticipants tended to accept one of these ideas, especially the second one.

- 5. Males did not respond well to general study abroad marketing messages and found them lacking in depth related to academics and the experiential aspects that most interest them. They sensed that the messages about study abroad promoted it as fun or that it was a cultural immersion, and based on their personal interests and situations, this impression led them either to seek more information or to feel disinterest.
- 6. For many participants, more information often came from an experience with a mentor, friend, or family member, who sparked their interest in international travel. Males generally put a lot of emphasis on friends and peer messages—more than females; however, these messages were not always supportive. If positive, messages alone were still not necessarily enough to get them to study abroad.
- 7. Almost all of the males valued having an independent, highly interactive, exciting learning experience, and they related these characteristics to the nonacademic aspect of study abroad. Generally, males reported fewer concerns associated with their personal health, safety, and related concerns such as missing home. Males also reported a significant preference for longer

programs than females and seemed to prefer highly exotic, inaccessible activities and locations.

- 8. Males valued study abroad's contribution to their personal interests such as a connection with family heritage or an exciting opportunity to experience or learn something they could not learn by staying at home, yet even with these interests as motivations, the primary motivations still seemed to be academic and career benefits.
- 9. Males wanted to see a clear benefit to them based on their participation and preferred hearing this message from their colleges or faculty members. For all the males, the major value was the ability to have an experience that supported their academic/career goals, such as studying a topic, language, or world region and not delaying their graduation. Liberal arts and social science majors tended to make this connection more readily than STEM majors.

Nonparticipant Issues

Nonparticipants had different themes. Some nonparticipants noted that because they had waited to study abroad until later in their academic career, they had fewer course options and less opportunity (i.e., time) to travel. Although they had the same interests related to the type of experience and the same desires for academic value as participants, they chose not to participate. For many nonparticipants, especially those in the sciences, they discussed the availability of required classes, the difficulty of their curriculum, and the need for work experience or internships as obstacles.

For the science students specifically, study abroad's benefits to their actual career and major were less direct and obvious, thus less important and essential to them. Due to

these obstacles, nonparticipants seemed to feel that they could travel on their own in another, non-academic, capacity and still achieve some of the values associated with study abroad without incurring the financial and time costs they associated with it. In other words, they thought they could do it better on their own without the baggage or concerns associated with coursework or school.

Interaction between Findings

Males had several motivations that facilitated their interest in international travel, yet the primary reason for studying abroad—and rationale for not studying abroad—was a pragmatic one related to academics and career. Once interested in study abroad based on a primary interest or value, males sought study abroad programs that offered them ways to pursue their secondary motivations, like selecting programs that provided them with an adventure and allowed them to explore parts of the world unavailable to the causal traveler. Hence, male participants used these secondary values as a decision-point related to the program they selected. This entire decision-making process happened within the context of males' unique situations and dispositions, which influenced their specific interests and perceptions of the benefits and obstacles. For the nonparticipants, the obstacles outweighed the benefits and interests.

In the end, the common thread among all the males was that the benefits of study abroad should outweigh the costs. As stated, most science students felt that internships and work experience were more important than cultural learning, but the non-science students shared similar sentiments. All the males reported obstacles to their study abroad participation as primarily being the availability of courses and delay of graduation, and they also mentioned factors related to the financial and time costs of being away as
related to other factors in their life besides their academics. They weighed the costs of their attendance against the benefits, and for most of the nonparticipants, the benefits of going were just not as strong as the benefits of staying home. Typically, this sentiment related to the fact that the males did not see international travel as related enough to their career or major to warrant the time and monetary costs of being away.

On this point, I distinguish between the actual costs associated with participation and the opportunity cost. Males did not frequently discuss programmatic variables in relationship to their participation decisions. In other words, the direct time and financial costs were not so much the concern, but rather the opportunity costs associated with the program (e.g., time away from work at home, time away from friends, time not spent studying or working toward their degree, etc.) vis-à-vis their perception of its value. Males felt they could overcome most obstacles, given enough of an incentive to do so. As such, it seems that based on the conceptual model, male disposition were the most influential variable in the study, because the males selected from amongst programmatic options based on their dispositions, with their unique situations and support systems influencing their final decision positively or negatively.

Understanding Differences amongst Males

In this section, I discuss differences between male participants and nonparticipants in the context of new research by Barbara Schneider (forthcoming), which classifies young adults into various categories based on their motivations for work and play. This emerging research suggests that differences exist between groups of young adults in relationship to the alignment between their goals and their efforts and motivations related to school. Based on her research, she presents four semi-distinct

classifications for young adults that range from low engagement, low motivation idlers to strategic planners who seek to balance work and play in preparation for their future.

Players and Workers

Oscar's comments pointed to differences between two groups of males: those seeking to drift through college and have fun and those seeking to engage as much as possible. This distinction proved to be an important one, because at times some of the males' comments seemed hard to align with each other. All the males understood the common message of study abroad as fun, but some males thought negatively about study abroad because of this fact. All of the males valued study abroad for academic benefits, but most males also did not want study abroad to be an overly structured, school-like program. Although the literature about males and masculinity used for this study can somewhat explain these divergent values, these conflicts also point to differences that exist amongst individuals in relationship to the balance between work and play.

In a forthcoming book, Barbara Schneider investigates the career aspirations and educational attainment of young adults in the context of their motivations toward work and play. Her work was prompted by studies that suggest that even though 70% of high school seniors enter a post-secondary educational experience after graduation, only about 33% of these students complete a program within seven years (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2007). Through The Alfred P. Sloan Study of Youth and Social Development (SSYSD), which has surveyed over 7,000 students from around the country about their conceptions of work, Schneider studied young adults in a longitudinal study that began in the 1990s. Her latest research included a sample of 849 students who completed the instruments during the sixth, eighth, tenth, and twelfth grades, and of these

students, about 600 continued to be interviewed beyond high school. These volunteers completed in-depth interviews and several different surveys related to careers and work. The study also used interviews with students' teachers, counselors, and parents, as well as a time-on-task activity that asked students to log their actions at random intervals throughout the day.

Based on this study, Schneider (forthcoming) identified four categories of young adults: idlers, players, workers, and strategists. She describes these groups as a semidistinct continuum of attitudes ranging from low toward high engagement. Differences between the groups included their perspectives on the nature of work, their general happiness, their self-esteem, their alignment between goals and effort, and their engagement. Looking at these students five years after high school graduation, Schneider provided background about each group's characteristics:

- Idlers—This group had the most unrealistic perceptions of work and tended to spend a lot of time in a play mode by watching TV, reading, spending time with friends, and playing video games. This group does not clearly connect effort in school to their desired career aspirations, and they often have incorrect information or perceptions about their career goals. Idlers often have weak social networks and tend to feel as if they are not in control of their lives or their futures, and, as a result, they do not adequately assess their own strengths and weaknesses and have difficulty adjusting their expectations and goals.
- Players—Like Idlers, this group has unrealistic ideas about work and careers, and they tend to consider any challenges they face to be caused by external factors. They are focused on their friends and having a good time, especially during their

last year of high school, and they expect that their career and academic opportunities will just come to them. As such, they do not typically plan ahead and have a high need for independence. Although they do want to achieve academically, players do not want to work hard to achieve what they desire.

- Workers—Workers have career goals and desire success, and they are more likely to toil away to achieve success. Workers put a lot of effort toward employment and academic opportunities that they perceive as helping them achieve their goals, yet they do not typically enjoy the effort. Workers do work that they perceive as helping them to be successful in the future so as not to need to labor hard in the future, so they make decisions carefully and based on extensive research. Despite this effort, though, workers tend to have a narrow perspective on their goals and a limited conception of success—typically related to money and security.
- Strategists—The final grouping represents the smallest number of young adults in the study. Strategists build upon the work ethic of the previous group but combine it with a broader sense about the definition and value of work. Strategists like a challenge, and they push themselves through experiences that build their ability to reach their goals. This group tends to have broader, more flexible career goals and engage with academic and extracurricular opportunities that will help them achieve these goals. Strategists tend to be more civically and globally minded, and they often come from homes with higher levels educational attainment.

Players and Workers on Study Abroad

Schneider simplifies these four groups by collapsing them into two main groups: one that aligns academic and career goals and works toward them and a group that does

not have this alignment or work ethic. Just as some of these students have lofty career aspirations but fail to work toward these interests, most males I interviewed for this study knew about study abroad and had some common perceptions and values related to participation, but they decided not to participate. Based on Schneider's matrix, I can see how male participation—and probably participation in general—varies between her groups. Connecting her groups to the findings from my study:

- The Idlers included those nonparticipants who described themselves as lazy and who waited until later in their career to try and participate in study abroad. This group could also represent those students who had career interests related to global international issues, but who failed to connect the value of study abroad to their goals. Idlers might not have paid attention to messages about study abroad, put off applying, or simply not have been interested. This group needed more motivational and convincing messages and could have benefitted from having their peers reach out to them directly. Logically, this group was probably not well-represented, or at least under-represented, in this study because they would most likely have been those students who did not respond to interview requests.
- The Players included my study's students who viewed study abroad as a fun, beer-laden vacation, as well as possibly those students who expressed concern that study abroad was too structured and culturally-focused. For this group, getting them abroad would only be a matter of making it sound fun. Given my findings, players could be the largest group going on study abroad or at least the easiest group to recruit using the current marketing messages associated with fun.

- The Workers included those students in the study who responded negatively to the fun-focused messages and/or did not find study abroad to be the most valuable activity in relationship to their career interests. For many of the nonparticipants in my study, study abroad was not a clear benefit to them, so they viewed study abroad as more of a play-orientated activity. In relationship to the worker mindset, a students' major would heavily influence their decision-making, with a science student perhaps less likely to see study abroad as a fit and a language student highly likely to view study abroad as essential.
- The Strategists included the students who used study abroad as a means of achieving their career goals both directly—through courses and language skills—and indirectly—through intercultural learning and experience living abroad.
 These students were those who I interviewed that integrated study abroad across a range of their interests and viewed the activity as important on multiple levels.

Clearly, although this study did not use Schneider's categories as part of its conceptual framework, her ideas represent a new, valuable way to consider male engagement and study abroad participation. Her study did not report differences in category grouping by sex, but she did note some important demographic variables. White students were more likely to be players, Asian students workers, and African American and Hispanic students idlers. Looking at social class, workers were represented at all levels, and strategists were more, but not significantly so, represented at higher levels of parental education. Idler behavior was slightly less for students with highly education parents, and finally, player behavior had a bimodal distribution: high at both low and high

parental education. Schneider reported that most players have highly educated parents and connected this factor to the entitlement that comes with higher social status.

These relationships are interesting given that I suspected from the explanation and my findings that players would be a high participating group, and players' demographics overlap with study abroad participation demographics: White and affluent. This research could also help explain why so few minority students are participating on study abroad. Future studies should consider using Schneider's work as a model for looking at study abroad participation and the influence of sex and gender roles as related to her groupings. Even though she did not find differences between the groups based on sex status, she might find differences between males and females based on their gender identity. The literature on sex and gender roles suggests some intra-sex group differences, so her four categories might reflect broad groupings with different sub-groups internally based on gender. In other words, although her study did not indicate that males were not more likely to be workers than females, male workers might be different than female workers. I summarize these ideas in Table 3 (p. 236), and based on this section's brief analysis and comparison to my study's findings, males in each category could logically be less likely to participate than females when I account for masculine gender steereotypes.

Analysis of Themes

As stated, the most important domain related to the decision to participate seemed to be males' own dispositions, which clearly overlapped with theories of masculinity and gender. This section of the study analyzes the data and summarizes some core ideas from the whole study. First, I discuss the idea related to institutional and peer messages and information related to study abroad. Second, I write about the influence of fun or play on

Table 3: Con	nnect	ion between Schneider's Groups and S	Study	y Abroad	
		Participants		Nonparticipants	Possible Gendered Influence
	•	Under-represented in this group	•	Over-represented in this group	Male idlers may be less likely to participate than females because
Idlers	•	Not engaged in many activities	•	Lack social connections to peers who participate	men are more influenced by peers and peer messages
			•	Lack motivation to work toward participation	
	•	May be overrepresented generally	•	May be under-represented	Male players may be less likely
	•	View study abroad as vacation		generally in this group	to participate because they do not view study abroad as fun or
Players			•	May view study abroad as too	as independent of an experience
	•	Seek study abroad as a means to maximize exposure to difference		controlled or too academic	as compared to women
	•	May be under-represented	•	May be over-represented	Male workers may be less likely to participate because they are
Workers	•	Majority are majors in liberal arts and international fields	•	Lack clear career goal or interest related to international travel	over-represented in STEM majors
	•	May be overrepresented	•	May be under-represented	Male strategists may be less likely to participate because
Strategists	•	Tend to view study abroad as both work and play and connect study abroad to their goals on multiple levels	•	May view other opportunities and engagements as more valuable than study abroad	they tend to view work and internships as more important experiences than study abroad

Abroad	
Study	
Broups and	
chneider's C	
between S	
Connection	
able 3: (

males and its relationship to masculinity. Third, I present a hierarchy of values males seemed to associate with study abroad, which suggested that fun was a weak motivation to participate. Fourth, I distinguish between males' unique situations as related to study abroad participation and pragmatic decision-making. Finally, I discuss males' dispositions in the context of masculinity and gender roles as an over-arching theme woven throughout this study.

Depth, Clarity, and Meaning of Study Abroad Messages

As suggested by literature on male development (Davis & Laker, 2004; Edwards & Jones, 2009) and Schneider's work (forthcoming), the way individual males or types of males perceive study abroad would influence how they interpret information about study abroad and how they connect study abroad to life and their educational goals. Evidence presented in Chapter Four further suggests that these perceptions are modulated by gender role stereotypes. Gore's (2008) research about study abroad states that study abroad's advertising, reputation, messages are feminized. In her report, she discusses study abroad as a frivolous, culture-laden add-on typically associated with females and women's "lesser" academic pursuits.

Brannon (1976) states that one of the main masculine imperatives dictates that males should avoid all things feminine. Work by Kimmel (2008) and Edwards and Jones (2009) state that many college-aged males still subscribe to this gender norm; therefore, study abroad could generate some gender role conflict for young males with traditional ideas about their masculinity (Nicolazzo & Davis, 2007). Similarly, Sax (2008) and others state that males and females still adhere to some traditional majors and career options based on gender roles, with males more likely to be found in technology, science,

and engineering fields and women more likely to be found in the languages, humanities, and helping professions (i.e., nursing, social work, education, etc.). Based on this research and the data collected from this study, *I suggest that the messages about and reputation of study abroad do not appeal to young males based on their values and interests, especially those with traditional notions of gender.*

Although males had varying degrees of knowledge about study abroad and did not necessarily label study abroad as a female-orientated activity, their unifying belief was that study abroad is a fun activity, teaches students about other cultures, and is valuable to them personally if they have the opportunity to participate. Without a clearer value based on a more specific experience or knowledge-base, males—including participants—tended to view study abroad as merely an optional or fun activity, not as important to them as their internships, work experiences, or other involvements. These ideas relate directly to the participation literature, which suggests lack of information and perceived value can lower participation motivations and that for males social, fun outcomes are weak motivators (Cross, 1981; Henry & Basile, 1994). The data also suggested that male students received fewer messages and information from other males about study abroad. If this supposition is true, then the lack of messages to males from males would further exacerbate the depth and clarity of information related to study abroad and enhance the overall "feminization of study abroad."

As discussed in the men's development section, researchers such as Gilligan (1992) have provided evidence that males and females develop and communicate differently. Coupled with years of information related to males and females in college presented by Sax (2008), literature about males (Connell et al., 2005; Davis & Laker,

2004; Tyre, 2008), and the males' comments during this study, one could conclude that males might think differently based on their adherence to gender roles. Given this statement as a basis for considering participation, *I believe that current study abroad marketing efforts are limited in their effectiveness for males because they lack substance around issues important to many (not all) male students.* Current marketing efforts are generally appealing, but they emphasize fun and culture, lacking specific information targeted at males that might appeal to their independent, career-orientated value systems.

Given an absence of more tailored information, males consider study abroad in limited ways based on their own unique perspectives; therefore, serious male workers or strategists might not be attracted to study abroad because it seems overly fun and lacking academically. Conversely, male players might not be attracted to study abroad because it seems like a chaperoned vacation, and idlers might not be interested because they see no value to them or do not know about the range of opportunities available to them. More holistically, males who adhere to very traditional ideas about masculinity would not be interested and actually could be scared off by typical study abroad messages in an attempt to avoid "sissy stuff" (Brannon, 1976) and adhere to the "guy code" (Kimmel, 2008).

Based on this analysis, I suggest that study abroad offices consider ways to increase the clarity and diversity of their messages about study abroad. Specifically, they should consider talking more about the diverse types of programs offered, the academic value of these programs for all types of majors, and the connections between study abroad and employment. Second, they should recruit and/or use more males in their advertising. At the institution used for this study, there are only three male staff members out of a staff of 23, and out of a student staff of 10 volunteers, only two are male. Males

should be involved in crafting and communicating print, electronic, and oral messages about study abroad, and in some instances, universities might want to consider hiring male staff members and engaging more male returnees as volunteers who can specifically reach-out to male audiences. Finally, study abroad offices may want to partner with colleges and academic units to improve the amount and consistency of academic and career-orientated messages.

Fun as a Valued Programmatic Feature

Related to the messaging of study abroad, fun arose as a common programmatic theme amongst all the males in terms of their discussion about the value and format of their ideal program. Consistently, almost all of the males described study abroad programs as providing them with an experience that they could not have had traveling alone or with friends. They described this idea in a number of ways, including as:

- Accessing organizations, locations, information, and people that average tourists could not reach;
- Learning about content not available to them on campus;
- Traveling to countries or regions that would be unsafe or difficult to reach as a traveler or tourist; and
- Traveling to multiple places within a country or geographic region on a single trip, which would be hard to organize as a tourist.

In addition to discussing these values, the males discussed the need for experiential learning opportunities and free time that allowed them to explore their location on their own terms. In other words, they wanted study abroad to provide them with a structure around which they could explore real-world problems and issues in addition to classroom learning, and they desired the opportunity to pursue their unique interests independently of the group for at least part of the time abroad.

These desires associated with fun, independence, and experience reflect the literature on three different levels. First, considering males and risk, males are attracted to thrill-seeking, adventurous experiences (Clayton et al., 2004; Davis & Laker, 2004), which would explain why males view study abroad as something that could take them someplace very different, exciting, and even dangerous. Survey evidence and earlier studies suggest that females use study abroad as a means of traveling safety, and this study suggests that the near opposite might be true for males (Dessof, 2006; Shirley, 2006). Males want to use study abroad as a way of accessing locations difficult to reach independently and use personal travel for more readily-accessible locations such as Europe and North America. As males do not worry as much about their personal safety and health, they are less likely to use study abroad as a means of ensuring safer travel writ large when compared to females.

Second, and related to this idea, is Brannon's (1976) concept of males as "a sturdy oak." Traditional masculine gender roles suggest that "real" men should be strong and independent, a value that Edwards and Jones (2009) state is still common amongst college males. Based on this categorization, males with traditional gender values would want to seek out highly independent study options that met their individual needs and interests. Again thinking back to females, who might use study abroad for the safety of the group, males want to use study abroad as a vehicle to travel but then be left alone part of the time to explore. This variable suggests that messages about safety, security, and

structure might appeal to females, but serve as a disincentive to males who do not want to be baby-sat.

Third, Davis (2002), Sax (2007), and Kimmel (2008) indicate that males are more tactile and active learners than females. Males seek out real-world applications and practical uses for their learning. For these males, knowing that study abroad is more than sitting in an overseas classroom or touring a museum would be essential to peak their interests. Based on this study, I believe study abroad needs to do a better job at promoting and developing programs that actively engage in real world problems, including more programs that incorporate research, service, and internships.

Overall, males in this study seemed to have a high desire for fun, excitement, and independence and want exotic program locations, but some males also found the association with fun as a weak motivator (Henry & Basile, 1994). *Thinking holistically, study abroad offices need to better describe the reality of study abroad options and schedules in terms of the balance between free time and structured academic time.* If faculty and staff advertized the actual schedules for the programs, then students could see the amount of free time, group time, and field experiences embedded into the program. In making these changes, study abroad professions must go beyond their explicit messages and also consider the implicit messages they send to students based on the word choices, formats, visual images, and pictures used to promote the activity.

In this study, peer and institutional messages reinforced the notion that study abroad was time for vacation. Males described the study abroad office's publications and visual materials as highlighting intercultural learning, interpersonal interaction, tourism, and vacation-orientated experiences, which they associated with soft skills rather than

actual academics. They also suggested that their peers perpetuated the fun message through stories focused on the non-classroom and evening activities. They found academic messages limited to short quotes and side-comments and almost absent from the visual design, video, and pictures. For some of the males, those interested in more than fun, the idea of study abroad as fun made them think study abroad was not as serious—or as valuable—an academic experience.

As metnioned, the fun value also worked the other way. Another group of male nonparticipants seemed to think about study abroad as a fun, yet still academic, group trip. For these males, the idea of studying abroad with a group of other students under the supervision of a faculty member was not as interesting as going abroad alone or on one's own volition. The male volunteers generally sought highly independent opportunities, and some males saw any level of academics as interfering with the value of fun. From this perspective, if the major benefit of the program involves having fun, then some males see no reason to "seek fun" on an academic trip. These males are the ones who chose to back-pack through Europe or take spring break vacations with their friends rather than study abroad.

Thus, the ideas related to study abroad as fun were almost bi-polar in the extreme. The students viewed study abroad as either a vacation booze-cruise or a chaperoned field trip. Only about one-third of the males spoke of a balance between free-time, learning experiences, and formal academic time, so even though study abroad offers an excellent opportunity to put classroom learning into practice, most males seem to not see the potential for this synergy. One reason for this disconnect is the limited messages that reinforced a fun orientation.

Going back to Schneider's categories, I can explain these differences based on workers and players. Workers do not necessarily see the academic value of study abroad because it seems too fun, and players sometimes disregard study abroad because it seems like too little fun. Expanding on this line of thinking then, participants who balanced the ideas of fun and work could be considered strategists. Fun as the primary value motivation would seem to attract the most attention from players, but it would seem to be a weak motivator for workers and strategists. I explore this theme of weak and strong motivators more in the next section.

Weak and Strong Motivators

This aspect alone—the value of fun—was not enough though to get all the males to participate. Even though all the males recognized the fun factor, they did not all choose to participate. In fact, based on the factor analysis and the interview data, having fun was a very weak motivation to actually participate (Henry & Basile, 1994). Other external values, such as learning a language, building a résumé, and obtaining credit toward their degree, surfaced as more important benefits. *Thus, the distinguishing feature for all the males was the desire for some external benefit, and participants tended to identify these benefits more readily than nonparticipants.*

More than four-fifths of the males associated study abroad with an external value. According to the service learning literature, many students, and especially males (Sax, 2008) tend to have egoist, extrinsic motivations attached to their involvement (Allen, 1982; Finch, 1987 & 1991). They want something for their participation. Also, the information on males and career suggests that males would seek out some benefit or value (Covin & Brush, 1991; England, 1992). This issue was especially true for study

abroad. All the males recognized some benefit associated with study abroad, and when considering the benefits, the clearer the value to the man's academic and career goals, the more likely he was to participate.

After fun, the most common value males mentioned was learning about the world and other cultures, yet this value was also a weak motivator. Similar to the values associated with fun, the idea of study abroad as enhancing their cultural learning was a value-added for most of the males because cultural learning was related to their personal development and not as important as content information associated with their academic or career goals. Similarly, another weak, yet pervasive, value associated with study abroad was that it looked good on a résumé. Males valued study abroad as a way of setting themselves apart from peers, but they also recognized that other opportunities such as clubs, work experience, research, and internships—provided equivalent benefits. As such, a résumé-builder alone was insufficient to guarantee participation.

The primary common benefit to the males who volunteered for this study was the desire to have study abroad add value to their academic and career goals. Males with a clear link to study abroad discussed the importance of language learning, regional study, and international content as essential to their future careers. Some males discussed the importance of travel as preparation for their careers, and even the nonparticipants, when discussing the possibilities for study abroad, discussed their hypothetical involvement in ways that clearly linked to their academic and career goals.

Relating these findings back to the research on males' perceptions of success and gender roles (England, 1992; Kimmel, 2007; Tuss, 2004; Sax, 2008), I interpret this idea as related to the concept of males as a "sturdy oak" (Brannon, 1976). Males believe that

they need to succeed in certain ways, and their quest for this success can either facilitate or hinder their decision to study abroad. Similarly, males believe they have duties (Deutschendorf, 1996), both explicit and implicit, that they need to fulfill, which sometimes conflict with the desire to study abroad. For some males, study abroad fits neatly within their life, and the participation decision is easy and facilitated by study abroad's connection to their academic, career, and life goals. For those with more obstacles or who might benefit less directly and obviously from study abroad, such as STEM majors, study abroad participation interferes with their desire to be responsible and successful.

Thus, of all the values named by these males related to the motivation to study abroad (fun, cultural learning, résumé building, and academic/career goals), academics and career showed the strongest and nearly uniform importance across all this study's volunteers. By making this claim, I am not saying that some males do not go abroad just for fun; some students do go abroad for fun. During my conversation with Chris, he continually talked about fun, drinking, and womanizing, and for him, fun was a clear and perhaps the strongest—motivation to participate. What I am saying is that the most consistent and seemingly most important value across both participants and nonparticipants was that it provided a career or academic benefit. They did not all see study abroad as providing this value, but they all wanted it to do so.

This finding supports information related to male perspectives and emphasis on success and work (Dyke & Murphy, 2006), and it further highlights the importance of academically-orientated messages for males. As suggested by Schneider (forthcoming), worker and strategist students would specifically be attracted to messages about the

academic benefits of study abroad. Even though major and career benefits were a preeminent value amongst the males, this value is not a panacea. Some males knew about the value of study abroad and still did not participate. Several of the nonparticipants expressed regret for not having participated, and although better messaging might have gotten these males to participate, some males' unique situations also played an important factor in opposing their engagement. Issues such as money, transfer student status, and obligations also influenced participation. In the next section, I discuss males' unique situations as a factor related to their participation.

Situations Define Benefits and Obstacles

The literature often cites different participation rates in science, technology, engineering, and related majors as a major rationale for lower male participation in study abroad (Dessoff, 2006). Although males are overrepresented in science and technology curricula (Kimmel, 2008), Redden (2008) suggest that this factor alone cannot explain lower male participation. She indicates that although participation rates amongst engineers and scientists are increasing, male participation rates are stagnant. My study found that males were more likely to be STEM majors than females and that STEM majors were less likely to go abroad than non-STEM majors, but I also interviewed males from STEM fields who did go abroad and males from liberal arts and internationallyfocused fields who did not participate. *Based on my findings, major does play a role in the participation differences between males and females, but I cannot categorically state that major plays the only, direct, or primary role in participation.* Based on the interview data, I conclude that major represents just one of many situational variables that can complicate the decision to participate.

Both male participants and nonparticipants reported delay of graduation as more of a concern than females, significantly so for male participants, and this concern played out clearly during the interviews. As discussed in the previous section, even participants with clear rationales to study abroad for other reasons discussed study abroad in terms of its relationship to their major. For nonparticipants, the major was the most common rationale for not participating. This group believed that participation would delay their graduation because it did not offer any courses required for their degree, yet the major was not their only reason for not participating.

Males also mentioned transfer student status, interpersonal and group relationships, money, and other activities—such as work and internships—as obstacles to their participation. In some cases, males described study abroad as a time and financial requirement that interfered with other priorities, and at other times, they discussed study abroad as less valuable to them than these activities. Even though a diversity of rationales existed, the common theme amongst all the males, regardless of participation status, was that they *tended to weigh the costs of participation against the benefits*, and if the costs were too great, then they did not participate. As a result, males in specific situations tended to view study abroad differently based on their perception of the benefits and obstacles.

For example, most male nonparticipants in STEM majors viewed study abroad as too costly in terms of their participation, but those who participated found a value that overrode their sense of the costs. For example, as an honors student, George used his study abroad program to earn some general education classes he needed to graduate. Jason wanted to go abroad because he wanted to work abroad after graduation, yet Chris,

who also wanted to work overseas after graduation, did not study abroad because of ROTC duties. Conversely, most of the males in language and international majors viewed study abroad as a way of facilitating their graduation and career goals, but not all went abroad. Some of these students faced obstacles too high to overcome, such as Eli, who had limited time and money and wanted to do an internship.

Based on this consistent finding, I believe that major is not the only factor influencing male participation, but rather, it is more accurately viewed as one variable in a complicated decision-making process during which males determine if the benefits of participation are enough to spur them into action. This process is controlled by males' desire to obtain academic or professional value from participation. Supporting my analysis, several studies suggest that males typically define success differently than females and place more value on status, power, and money (Dyke & Murphy, 2006; Jones & Edwards, 2009). Kimmel (2008) states that males are still bound by traditional masculine gender stereo-types, which may limit their interest in study abroad participation due to their sense of what it means to be a successful male (England, 1992; Tuss, 2004), so even though males know about a variety of benefits related to study abroad, situations in their life cause them to prioritize their interests in relationship to competing factors. In this model, the benefit that most clearly and consistently overcomes the diversity of situational obstacles is a clear linkage to their major and career goals.

Masculinity as Influencer

Regardless of the exact obstacles or values, factors related to informational and situational variables seem to be supporting concepts that influence how males make decisions based on their individual dispositions. Hence, all these factors are important,

but it is males' dispositions and how these dispositions are formed during their youth, reached by peers and institutional messages, and processed given other competing opportunities that seem to be most salient. In the next section, I discuss males' dispositions in the context of gender roles and masculinity, ongoing themes running throughout my analysis. Linking my discussion back to Brannon (1976), the variables mentioned here all relate back to his descriptions of masculinity.

First, the idea that study abroad is a feminine activity or associated with female learning and values relates to the idea that men should avoid all things feminine (Brannon, 1976; Davis & Laker, 2004; Kimmel, 2008). Second, males' desire for a highly experiential and independent study abroad experience relates to the idea that males should be independent and strong (Brannon). This idea is especially interesting, in that males clearly desired freedom, independence, and autonomy while abroad; however, they also clearly sought the approval and advice of other males. Looking at this issue through the lens of masculinity, I explain this seeming dichotomy by suggesting that males look to other males as guides and mentors for how they think they should behave and what they should want (Nicolazzo & Davis, 2007; Sax, 2008)., which leads them to consciously or unconsciously feeling the desire to be highly independent.

Third, the concept that males should be successful and support their families relates to how males prioritize success vis-à-vis study abroad and make decisions about it (Brannon; Deutschendorf, 1996; Dyke & Murphy, 2006). *Given the overlap between the findings from this study and the typical facets of masculinity defined within the literature, I suggest that male dispositions and the degree to which the individual male's thinking reflects traditional notions about gender roles plays the pivotal role in the participation*

discussion. Connecting back to Schneider's typology, I can also connect the different groups to the idea of situational variables influencing the decision to participate. Workers would clearly be less likely to go abroad without a clear value. This group works hard to get ahead, and they might not see the value in a fun activity and would be more likely to face obstacles related to coursework and other obligations.

Conclusion: Disposition is Key

Henry and Basile (1994) presented a model of participation that included institutional messages, reputation, deterrents, programmatic features, personal characteristics, and personal motivations all influence the decision to participate. This study used this model as a way of looking at four major groupings related to this theory: programmatic features, institutional and peer messages, men's unique situational features, and men's unique dispositions. Based on this conceptual model and the data obtained from this study, I have discussed the idea the importance of having programmatic features that include fun, exciting programs that also provide a clear benefit to individual males based on their unique situations. I have also discussed how the common messages and ideas about study abroad fail to influence males based on their unique interests.

The issue of gender and masculinity has been a common thread throughout these discussions. On many levels, differences between males and females and the theoretical rationales for males' values relate back to definitions of masculinity and gender differences. As such, I conclude that males' unique dispositions—the degree to which they believe in, feel pressured by, and act-upon traditional masculine gender roles—seem to be the most important aspect related to their decision to study abroad, with the other areas providing the context in which these decisions are made by supporting or hindering

what is ultimately a personal decision. In this section, I discuss each of these areas as it relates to my analysis, connect my analysis more closely with the gendered literature base, and discuss the relationship to men's decision to participate.

I classified factors such as location, cost, duration, and timing into the programmatic/institutional category. Based on the study, males actually seemed less influenced by these variables than females. In both the ANOVA and factor analyses, the results suggest that programmatic features are not the most important issue for men. Rather, the qualitative results indicate that finding a program of value to them, whether for fun or professional development was highly important, and thus men did show a significantly stronger interest in avoiding programs that delayed their graduation or hindered their ability to pursue courses, work, or other professional opportunities. Some evidence suggests that males might not be motivated by program design because they are lazy and haphazard in their planning (Kimmel, 2008); however, I believe that programmatic variables are a contextual feature bounding men's decision-making.

Program variables are not central to the decision, but rather provide the context in which the decision is made. The presence of a diversity of programs facilitates but does not necessarily directly influence participation. I offer this conclusion for two reasons: (1) programmatic opportunities and designs vary from institution to institution, yet the number of men studying abroad is relatively the same across the country (Davis, 2008; Redden, 2008); and (2) a diversity of program models helps males and females at any given institution equally, so the mere presence of more programs alone cannot fully explain gender differences (i.e., the diversity of program models is not the influence, but rather, a facilitator).

Based on this analysis, I think of programmatic features as the availability of mass transportation. Having a train present is a necessary precursor to having a male use it to travel to work, but just because the train is present does not mean the male will take it. Put another way, although Seth did not go abroad, he considered it because of the availability of a program related to his major. The presence of the engineering program did not ensure participation; however, it facilitated the opportunity. Similarly, I believe that the presence of many program types, times, costs, topics, and locations allows for a wider range of interests and needs, facilitating the participation of a larger number of students regardless of their personal characteristics.

Next, if I consider situational features—the unique features of males' lives that include their major, involvements, obligations, etc., the data seem mixed. According to the survey, males are somewhat more concerned about their academics, graduation, and obligations (although not always significantly different) and less worried about finances and lost work opportunities than females. During the interviews, though, males consistently talked about the financial and time opportunity costs to participation. This situation led me to consider the concept of costs in the context of a cost-benefit analysis versus the actual costs incurred. Depending on their situations, males weigh the costs of participations against the benefits; however, their analysis of these variables—even the variables they consider—are unique from individual to individual. The only unifying factor seems to be that the benefits—often framed as an academic or career benefit must be greater than the costs.

Again, as with programmatic variables, males' situations alone do not necessarily explain the decision to participate. One reason for this statement is that females within

X	the sa
	more
	colle
	wou
	mal
	situ
	uni:
	abr
	tha
	lik
	no.
	Sc
	w ¹
	V
	31
	4
	:
	II
	10
	W
	li
	p
	a

the same majors or with the same situational backgrounds as males still study abroad more than men (Redden, 2008). Second, the literature suggests that males entering college are typically of higher socio-economic standing than females (Sax, 2008), so one would expect them to have an easier time overcoming obstacles than females. Third, males of all backgrounds and situations have studied abroad, so although specific situational variables might generally tip the scale toward participation or not, they do not uniformly determine participation. Some males work harder than others to make study abroad work for them, and this factor seems more related to their individual dispositions than their specific situations.

Building off the train analogy, a male who lives near a train stop is probably more likely to take the train than a male who lives farther away; however, proximity alone does not equate with taking the train. Similarly, this analysis lends itself quite well to Schneider's typology. Idlers would be less likely to overcome obstacles than strategists, who would logically seek ways to make study abroad work for them if they saw it as valuable. Similarly, workers might face more situational obstacles than players, who avoid getting overly engaged in any serious obligations.

The third area related to the messages and reputation of study abroad at the institution. As mentioned, males received fewer messages and less positive support than females about study abroad, yet males tended to value interpersonal support more than women according to the factor analysis. The messages that males did receive seemed limited, and as suggested by Gore (2005), these messages were not always interpreted as positive or convincing. As with the two previous categories, I put the issue of messages and reputation as a supporting characteristic. Males and females receive the same

messages about study abroad at the institution; however, they seem to interpret or react to these messages differently. Thus, the issue is the interpretation of the message, not the message itself. Similarly, even though all males had a generally favorable impression of study abroad, some males did not pursue the opportunity.

Messages and support are powerful tools to support males' participation, but based on males' unique perspectives, the messages may or may not work. In some cases, as noted in the discussion about fun, messages meant to be positive and encouraging could be discouraging, In the end, the message needs to fit the male and his interests. This issue would seem to influence both males and females, but if the messages are primarily crafted by females and tend to reflect feminized messages, then they could logically influence males to a lesser degree.

Going back to the train, a male is probably more likely to take the train if he has ridden one before or if he has been told the train runs well, but ultimately, the decision to take the train—or participate on study abroad—comes down to a combination of factors internal to the male given his external constraints. In other words, availability, desire, and support all must align with the males' desires and needs to result in participation. Similarly, Schneider's work would highlight that different types of students would be influenced by different messages based on their interests, regardless of gender role or sex as a variable.

Males' beliefs about the value of study abroad vis-à-vis the opportunities cost seem to be the ultimate determinant in a pragmatic analysis of costs versus benefits. The way they interpret the values and costs is determined by these other variables and their unique dispositions. By offering a good mix of programs and providing targeted

messages, study abroad professionals can help males overcome their situational obstacles. Males are not a uniform group, and although they share some general characteristics, the degree to which they adhere to stereo-typical "guy codes" of conduct seems to influence their participation decisions (Kimmel, 2008).

Model of Study Abroad Participation

Based on this analysis, Figure 4 (see p. 257) represents a diagram of male decision-making based on the four categories of participation discussed in the original conceptual model. This diagram depicts a series of concentric circles, with "fun" representing the outer, surface-level motivation and "major" representing the core, strongest motivation. This design implies that males acknowledge multiple benefits to studying abroad, but that they layer these values in terms of their importance, putting benefits to their major or career at the core of their decision-making. Lesser motivations exist and can lead to participation depending on the individual's unique situation and dispositions. For example, a male highly interested in fun could be motivated by fun alone given a certain situation, but a male interested in learning about culture would need a different and, based on my analysis, deeper message in the same situational context. Similarly, students with similar dispositions (e.g., fun or culture) might face very different situations (e.g., finances, family support, major requirements, etc.).

The overall institutional and programmatic factors establish the context in which males make their decisions. Schools with many types of programs and models can appeal to a greater variety of males' values and interests. Modulating the connection between the availability of programs and male interests and values are males' individual situations. I represent these situations as semi-permeable "barriers" between levels of male

di

dispositions. For example, the science student might have situational barriers that prevent him from going on study abroad for "just" fun or cultural reasons, yet a sociology major would be able to connect culture directly to his major and interests. Hence, this model suggests that males have multiple values and motivations, but their unique situations influence the degree to which the individual can act upon them.

Figure 4: Understanding Male Values and the Decision to Participate



Finally, the model suggests that if programs exist (institutional and program values), then the messages about these programs must align with males' situations and interests. This aspect of the model illustrates the need for the institution to provide targeted information and marketing messages to males based on their unique situations and motivations, and if such messages are not available, then males will probably not

p W

participate. In Figure 4 (p. 258), I use a line to depict a "fun" marketing message, which was not interesting to the student and has no influence on him, yet for the same student, a different message, targeted toward major and career benefits, went deeper toward his interests and values and would be more likely to result in his participation. In the end, if the message does not match the situation and interests, then males are likely to ignore the message or believe that the costs outweigh the benefits, leading to non-participation.

Gender Roles and Masculinity

I have woven issues related to gender roles and masculinity throughout the preceding discussions, and during my analysis, I have come to the conclusion that male disposition, as influenced by gender roles and masculinity, is the essential aspect of this study. The review of literature suggests that males develop more slowly than females and that environmental and sociological factors may be further influencing this process (Sax, 2007, Kimmel, 2008; Tyre, 2008). According to some authors, these processes contribute to males' physiologically, causing them to "be" lazy and /or disengaged academically, and socially, both reinforcing traditional male behaviors such as competition and aggression and eliminating safe, appropriate expressions of the male psyche. Generally, the literature portrays males as the fractured sex striving to define new concepts of masculinity and ways of being, yet still yoked to traditional values and stereo-types (Davis & Laker, 2004; Jones & Edwards, 2009).

Based on the pilot study and some comments from the males, some differences in participation may hinge on gender role norms and development directly. First, quantitative and qualitative evidence suggested that males apply to and participate in study abroad programs later than females. Although the ramifications of this issue relates

somev lazine study in m sugg thar fen und de le S(Π (somewhat to male major and career choices, the reasons given for their lag related to laziness and lack of maturity. Also, according to the pilot study, the perception exists that study abroad might be a "female-activity." This study did not specifically look at changes in male attitudes over time or measure male attitudes about gender, yet evidence does suggest that males might come to consider study abroad later in their academic career than females. Future studies should consider this issue more directly.

Second, during the interviews, males clearly noted differences between males and females and different groups of males. In the context of gender roles, it is important to understand that males seem to fall into different groups, and these groups could be defined by gender role identity, Schneider's work, or some other factor. For this study at least, groups seemed to be defined by the students' ability to connect study abroad to something of value. Most of the participants had a clear interest in travel and were able to make a connection between their life and study abroad as a valuable experience. Conversely, most of the nonparticipants viewed study abroad as an activity that they could pursue if given the time, as an add-on with limited value. Many factors fed into these groups' decision-making processes, but related to the idea of masculinity, the males tended to group together. In other words, males who participated tended to have other friends who participated and vice versa.

Kimmel (2008) believes that males still adhere to traditional notions of gender. If this situation is true, then differences amongst the males might relate to the degree to which individual male's thinking and behavior matches the social norms associated with being a man (Thompson & Pleck, 1986). If—as Brannon (1976) suggests—being a male is most closely aligned with "no sissy stuff" and males view study abroad as a female-

orientated activity, then the issue of gender is salient. Similarly, if males think that they must be highly independent and/or achievement-orientated based on their gender role, then this line of inquiry needs more work to understand study abroad participation.

In the end, males who adhere to a strict code of masculinity—a strong desire to graduate and get a good job, a strong sense of duty and obligation, etc.—seem to be less likely to go abroad. The more pragmatic the male, the less likely he was to see beyond the obstacles presented to him. Given the overlap between my findings about males' beliefs and behaviors and the literature related to male social norms (Brannon, 1976; Kimmel, 2008; Thompson & Pleck, 1986), I suggest that masculinity is a key issue related to understanding male participation; however, the role of male gender roles was not the main focus for this study. As such, additional study is needed on the topic. Future studies could combine measures related to masculinity as part of the participation study to see if there is a correlation between gender role identity and participation.

Recommendations for Action

Based on my research and analysis, I have several recommendations for future action in relation to increasing male study abroad participation. I present these ideas below in categories related to the audience in question: study abroad offices, colleges and faculty members, student affairs professionals, and the families and friends of young males. In the next section, I discuss recommendations for future research.

Study Abroad Offices

 Study Abroad offices need to think about their communication efforts beyond simply advertising the programs to inform a uniform student audience; they should craft unique messages for students based on:
- a. demographics—such as gender, disciplinary background, and other factors such as socio-economic status and racial background—and
- b. Motivational and work styles as suggested by Schneider.
- 2. Study abroad offices need to embark on educational efforts that help students understand the diversity and range of opportunities available to them.
- Study abroad offices should work more closely with faculty members, former students, and parents in terms of communicating the value of study abroad to their students, friends, and sons.
- Study abroad offices should actively seek to recruit males for their marketing efforts and staff positions and should feature images of males more in their communications and advertisements.
- 5. Study abroad offices should seek a better balance between the perception and image of study abroad as a fun, additive activity, and as an organized field trip. Images and stories associated with study abroad should include more than "tourist" shots and specifically show students in active learning environments.
- 6. Study abroad should develop messages and support systems that help students think more clearly about overcoming the obstacles to participation rather than just focusing on the benefits to participation.
- 7. Study abroad should collaborate with colleges and departments to explicitly outline and articulate the value of study abroad to students based on their academic majors and their career interests.

- 8. Study abroad offices should engage with the sociological and educational literature related to student develop and gender as a means of understanding their students' motivations, obstacles, and attitudes in a deeper, more significant way.
- 9. Study Abroad Offices could assist researchers by asking gender related questions on marketing surveys and program evaluations.

Colleges and Faculty Members

- 10. Colleges should clearly articulate the value of study abroad in terms of learning outcomes (e.g., relationship to the career, major, and academics) and intrinsic values (e.g., relationship to citizenship and professional skills).
- 11. Colleges and departments should consider methods of raising the "status" of socalled "soft" skills such as language and culture by highlighting knowledge and skills in these areas as an essential aspect of the major or degree program.
- 12. Colleges should engage faculty members in marketing and recruiting efforts.
- 13. Colleges and faculty should work with study abroad professionals to clearly connect study abroad participation to the curriculum.
- 14. Colleges and departments should consider diversifying their programs to:
 - a. Offer a range of programs, program-models, and locations that would appeal to diverse groups of males.
 - b. Offer more programs that provide the opportunity to do research and/or internships abroad.
 - c. Offer more programs or opportunities to complete higher-level course requirements.

- d. Design programs that provide males with some independence, excitement, and unique learning experiences.
- e. Design short-term programs that allow males to travel abroad but also return home to work or intern for the summer.

Student Affairs Professionals

- 15. Advisors and student affairs professionals should keep sex and gender differences in mind when working with young males and encourage young males to engage.
- 16. Advisors and student affairs professionals should work with Colleges and Study Abroad Offices to get more information and discussion going amongst first- and second-year males about study abroad opportunities.
- 17. Advisors should prepare multi-faceted talking points related to the value and importance of engagement and study abroad participation.
- 18. Student affairs professionals should work with career services to define and then communicate the value of study abroad to students' career development and advancement.
- 19. Student affairs professionals should partner with study abroad professionals to do outreach and programming with fraternities.
- 20. Student affairs professionals should work with the campus community to work on issues related to gender-role conflicts, especially as related to male engagement.
- 21. Student affairs professionals should seek to support and advise Study Abroad Offices on issues related to male development and male gender role norms as a means of improving institutional practice.

22. Student affairs professionals should partner with study abroad offices to develop language for students who need help talking with their parents about study abroad, and conversely, they should consider developing resources for parents to help them speak with their children.

Families and Mentors of Young Males

- 23. Individuals who care about young males, such as parents, teachers, coaches, and other mentors should think about their influence on them and encourage males to engage.
- 24. Parents should ask more questions of their sons related to opportunities to engage while at college.
- 25. Parents should seek support in understanding their children's academic and career choices if they seem "counter" to tradition and avoid biasing their children based on traditional notions of gender.

Research: Limitations and Future Directions

This research design offered several advantages over previous studies.

Specifically, the use of a mixed method framework allowed me to look at general factors related to study abroad participation, and for the first time, employed a qualitative phase to add depth and understanding to understanding this topic. Second, this study looked specifically at differences between male participants and nonparticipants, not just at the differences between males and females. As Sax (2008) states, some of the differences essential to understanding the issue of participation are more related to difference amongst males, not differences between males and females and females.

Third, this study used a gendered-lens through which to analysis and interpret the findings. This literature allowed me to consider differences between males and females and amongst males from a gender role perspective. Given that the concept of masculinity seems central to all facets of the participation model used in this study, inclusion of these ideas and theories has been pivotal. Future research efforts should build off the work started here and further integrates measures of gender roles and masculinity into the actual research design and instrumentation.

Beyond these advantages, this study has some inherent limitations. First, I relied on an institutional survey rather than design my own. Generally, this survey contained most of the variables I wanted to analysis; however, its format and content limited my ability to do certain types of analysis. Specifically, the survey did not include socioeconomic status (SES) as a variable, which would have been a valuable demographic and situational variable. SES could heavily influence students' values, interests, and concept of gender. More importunately, the survey format did not ask nonparticipants to answer a set of questions that participants answered, which limited comparisons and the factor analysis and prohibited the use of a regression. Finally, the survey design itself did not use the literature as a base, so even though it has good overlap with my conceptual framework, it does not perfectly overlap or connect to theory. If I redid this study, I would look to redesign the survey.

The second limitation of the study relates to the qualitative interviews. Finding young males to interview is difficult, and finding males who did not participate in an activity can be even more challenging. If I had more time and when I conduct future studies, I would want to seek out more nonparticipants from a greater diversity of majors.

As I interviewed the males, I found that Sax's (2008)—and others—ideas about differences between males to be valuable. Additional nonparticipants and interviews with groups of males—such as athletes or fraternity members—that represent other facets of the male "experience" would be valuable. This study primarily looked at issues related to males' interactions with their families, friends, and major/career interests, but it would have benefited from looking at males in groups and the influence of these groups on them (Rhodes, 1995).

Third, although not a weakness per se, I view this study as somewhat exploratory in nature. As noted in the literature review, the study abroad literature lacks depth and continuity in relationship to research. Few researchers have built upon previous work within study abroad, and as a field, substantive, inferential work is only just starting and the link to and application of educational and sociological theory is weak. This study used the participation and male engagement literature to explore some important connections and build off the few previous gender studies within the literature, but this study is only a beginning. More qualitative research is definitely needed to investigate in more depth some of the findings from this study. Also, additional quantitative surveys focused specifically on comparing male participants and nonparticipants would be helpful to better compare males broadly on variables found in this study to be of interest.

Based on these limitations the findings presented above, I recommend the following ideas for current and future researchers:

1. Continued use of qualitative methods is needed to improve theory and understanding related to the issue of male study abroad participation.

- 2. Researchers should continue to use literature bases outside, but related to, study abroad to generate theory, design conceptual models, and assist in the interpretation of findings.
- 3. More work needs to be done internally to males, by looking at differences between groups of males in addition to differences between males and females. Specifically, I recommend looking at stereotypical "masculine" social groups such as athletes, fraternity members, ROTC members, etc.
- 4. Related to gender, more emphasis on the nature of gender and its links to dispositional and sociological forces is needed. This study takes a sociological approach; however, work in psychology and the mytho-poetic research lens might provide different insights.
- 5. More attention needs to be paid to students' social-economic status and the characteristics of their hometowns in relationship to their participation choices, as their background may influence their decision to participate and the locations they travel to if they choose to participate.
- 6. This study suggests that male students seek a high degree of freedom while abroad. Future research should delve deeper into these concepts as related to male students' development and their interest in autonomy.
- 7. Future surveys should consider using participation studies as a basis for their design, and when asking students about influences and obstacles, they should ask all students all questions and consider having students both rate and rank the variable. In other words, in addition to knowing to what degree variables influence students positively or negatively, I believe it would be useful to

know how the variables interact and which was the most or least important when compared to other variables.

- 8. This study looked at issues of participation broadly, and future studies could focus in more specifically on some of the prominent findings from this study, such as males as more independent and adventurous than females and males as more career-orientated and pragmatic.
- 9. Future research should explore the influence of parents' opinions on males and females in a comparative manner to determine if males are more independent of their parent's support.
- 10. Future researchers should use a survey design and seek sample sizes that allow them to compare male participants and nonparticipants by specific majors or demographic statuses.
- 11. Future studies might also want to look at differences between males over time, specifically looking at how males' perspectives on study abroad might evolve or change while in college.
- 12. Additional research is needed at private, liberal arts schools and regional public institutions. This study's findings reflect the perspectives of males at a large research university.

Conclusion

This study used a mixed method design to investigate the question: "Why do male students participate at significantly lower rates than female students?" This issue is of importance for both pedagogical and logistical reasons to study abroad offices and international educators. As the United States' government and higher education

institutions seek to internationalize students' experiences, determining the factors related to men's lower participation is an important step toward providing all graduates with a global perspective and work force skills. As part of this study then, I reviewed the literature related to study abroad, and I also explored the literature bases related to participation studies, men's literature, and college engagement. From this literature review, I developed a model of participation based on Henry and Basile's (1994) theory of participation, and I designed the study to investigate the factors they highlighted as influencing participation decisions.

Using a secondary analysis of an institutional survey and personal interviews of male study abroad participants and nonparticipants, I determined that significant differences do exist between men and women; however, differences also seem to exist between male participants and nonparticipants in terms of their opinions and knowledge about the value and purpose of study abroad. In the end, men's personal decision-making based on a cost-benefit analysis of study abroad seems to be the major factor related to their participation status. Their decision-making is influenced by—but not primarily dependent on—other participation factors such as programmatic offerings, institutional messages and information, and their personal situations. As such, study abroad offices can consider manipulating these factors to enhance—but not ensure—male participation rates.

Looking toward the future, study abroad offices and colleges should seriously consider their marketing and curriculum integration efforts and improve messages related to the range of opportunities and benefits that study abroad offers. Better outreach towards males is also warranted, as a means of bringing the male perspective into the

study abroad discussion and to provide additional direct support to young males seeking to navigate college. For researchers, additional emphasis on the specific ideas presented in this study is important. Also, the continued use of educational literature bases, theories, models, and research designs will enhance future research on study abroad topics.

Study abroad is an important tool for campus internationalization and a powerful learning experience for students. To ensure that all students engage in study abroad though, professionals need to understand the influences and obstacles related to them as a group. Research on study abroad is nascent, as is quality research about males in college, and it must continue to better understand this complex issue. Only by building on this and other studies can study abroad begin to develop models and understandings in a systematic and coherent way.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A:

Summary of Sweet Briar Alumni Survey Data

Tuble ATT. Builling of Sweet Brial Attaining barvey Bata (Gore, pp.							
Question: Why do you think more women go abroad than Men % Women % men?							
	541	41.0					
• Men need to stay in the U.S. to focus on job training.	54.1	41.9					
• Women are more interested in understanding and	88.9	87/5					
supporting art and culture.							
• Women are more capable of learning a foreign	21.9	31.1					
language							
Question: Why did you go abroad?							
• I went abroad to develop my career skills.	82.4	76					
• I went abroad to broaden my cultural horizons.	100	99					
• I went abroad to develop my independence.	100	88.1					
Question: Did you encounter beliefs that impeded your study							
abroad pursuits?							
• Faculty belief that my discipline could be best studied	43	52					
in the U.S.							
• Faculty belief that study abroad was not serious	29	52					
• Faculty suspicion of study abroad	43	34					
Question: What factors helped you decide to go abroad?		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
Academic interests	68.9	74.6					
• Family's interest in international issues	37.8	36.6					
• Male faculty member	35.6	17.1					
• Female faculty member	4.4	21					
Question: Prior to study abroad, what was your major							
• Humanities	22.2	11.9					
• Foreign language	13.3	5.4					
• Science or engineering	13.3	3					
• Business	0	2					
Ouestion: How did you hear about the program?		·····					
• From a friend who attended the program	22.2	15.3					
• From a parent or adult relative	0	9.3					
 From a faculty member 	53 3	46.5					
 From a study abroad advisor 	15.6						
 FIOH a study abroad advisor 	12.0	22. 4					

APPENDIX B:

Recruitment Letters

Recruitment letter #1 (those who participated)

Dear student:

My name is Jim Lucas, and I'm a graduate student at Michigan State University in the Higher, Adult, and Lifelong Education program. As part of my doctoral dissertation, I am interested in talking with male students, over 18 years of age, who participated on a study abroad program to determine how they found out about the program and why they decided to participate.

I received your name from X as a person with whom I should talk about my work. As part of my research, I would like to conduct a brief interview (about 45 minutes) to discuss your experience with the program. If you are interested, please contact me by email: <u>lucasjam@msu.edu</u>, by phone: (517) 449-2570, or on Facebook.

Thank you,

Jim Lucas

Recruitment letter #2 (those who did not participate)

Dear student:

My name is Jim Lucas, and I'm a graduate student at Michigan State University in the Higher, Adult, and Lifelong Education program. As part of my doctoral dissertation, I am interested in talking with male students, over 18 years of age, about issues related to participation in international activities at MSU, specifically how they come to know about different opportunities available to them and how the decide whether or not to participate in these opportunities.

I received your name from X as a person with whom I should talk about my work. As part of my research, I would like to conduct a brief interview (about 30 - 45 minutes) about your experiences. If you are interested, please contact me by email: <u>lucasjam@msu.edu</u>, by phone: (517) 449-2570, or on Facebook.

Thank you,

Jim Lucas

APPENDIX C:

Volunteer Consent Form

Participant Informed Consent Form Where are all the Males?: Mixed Methods Inquiry into Study Abroad Participation

Summary:

Many theories exist as to why male students decide to participate or not participate in experiential activities such as clubs and organizations, study abroad, service learning, leadership institutes, etc. during their first-year at college. This project seeks to investigate ideas about male student participation in study abroad based on a survey and interviews with traditionally-aged, male undergraduate students at Michigan State University. The primary objective of this study will be to generate a theory about how male students receive messages about study abroad and make decisions about their participation.

Estimate of Participant's Time:

The interview will consist of 10 open-ended questions and will take about 45 to 60 minutes. Any follow-up interviews will be approximately thirty minutes in length.

Voluntary Participation:

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary, and participation in this study is in no way linked to your status at Michigan State as a student. You may choose withdraw you consent, refuse to answer specific questions, and/or discontinue participation at any time during the study without penalty. If you choose to withdraw from the project, all data records related to you will be destroyed immediately. Please note that you must be at least 18 years of age and a US citizen to participate in this study. You can ask questions of the interviewer at any time during the process.

Handling the Data:

The interview you grant for this project will be digitally recorded. If you prefer the interview NOT be taped, the interviewer will take and transcribe notes from the session. You will not be identified in any way on the transcription of the tape or the notes. The researcher and her assistant will be the only people with access to the tapes and notes, and they will keep these data in a locked drawer in a locked office. When the study is completed all tapes will be destroyed.

Confidentiality and Anonymity:

Your privacy in this study will be protected to the maximum extent allowed by law. Also, your decision regarding participation in this study will not be released to any other person or agency. If information gathered from this study is used in future research or publications, you anonymity is guaranteed in reports and data summaries through the use of a pseudonym (an alternative name). All data will be treated in a confidential manner and no student will be identified by name in reports.

Risks:

There are no known risks associated or financial obligations associated with this study.

Contact Person(s) and Questions Regarding this Study: If you have any questions about this study, please contact the primary investigator, Dr. Ann Austin, by phone: (517) 355-6757, by email: aaustin@msu.edu, or by regular mail: 417 Erickson Hall, East Lansing, MI 48824.

If at any time you have questions or concerns regarding your rights as a study participant, please contact Peter Vasilenko, Ph.D., Director of the Human Research Protection Program by phone: (517) 355-2180, by email: irb@msu.edu or by regular mail: 202 Olds Hall, East Lansing, MI 48824.

Your signature below indicates your voluntary agreement to participate in this study. Please check the line which reflects your wishes regarding the audio-taping of this interview.

Yes, I voluntarily agree to have this interview digitally recorded. No, I do not want this interview to be audio-taped.

Signature of Participant	Date:
--------------------------	-------

Signature of Researcher: _____ Date: _____

APPENDIX D:

Interview Protocol

Title: Where are all the Men?: Mixed Methods Inquiry into Study Abroad Participation

- 1. Introduce self and cover the nature of the research and the research process.
- 2. Read consent form with participant and obtain consent.
- 3. Discuss background on the interview, including issues related to pseudonym, recording, field notes, and eye contact.
- 4. Commence with questions
- 5. Participant check for understanding
- 6. Debrief participant
- 7. Discuss potential for follow-up conversations
- 8. Conclude

Questions for interviews:

- 1. Walk me through what you know about the international opportunities at MSU:
 - a. What is available?
 - b. Why is it or is it not important?
 - c. How could you participate in these activities?
- 2. Let's focus on one specific opportunity: Study Abroad. What do you know about study abroad in general?
- 3. How have you heard about study abroad? From what sources or people?
- 4. Let's look at the web site and video now. What do you think about them?
- 5. What makes this specific opportunity attractive or not attractive to you:
 - a. Why did you want to/not want to participate?
 - b. What factors made this/would have made the opportunity more interesting to you?
 - c. What factors made this or would have made the opportunity less attractive to you?
- 6. How important is it for you to get involved in these types activities while at MSU?
- 7. A lot of people are talking about how women are participating more in these opportunities than men. What do you think about that? Why might that be the case?
- 8. How do you talk about study abroad with other people? Friends? Family?
- 9. What do guys say generally about study abroad?

- 10. If you could design your ideal study abroad program, what would be like?
- 11. What is your family background like in terms of school and work?
- 12. Is there anything else about this topic that you think I should know?
- 13. Do you have any questions for me at this time?

APPENDIX E:

Overview of Survey Volunteers by Demographic Characteristics

			Male			Femal	e		Participa	nts	No	nparticip	ants	Survey	Total
		N	Group %	Survey %	Ν	%									
Gender	Men							240	33.8	18.6	334	57.9	26.0	908	44.4
	Women							470	66.2	36.5	243	42.1	18.9	1133	55.4
Ethnicity	Minority	125	14.3	6.3	179	16.3	9.1	101	14.7	8.1	90	16.0	7.2	305	14.9
	Majority	748	85.7	37.9	922	83.7	46.7	588	85.3	47.0	472	84.0	37.7	1673	81.8
Transfer	Transfer	182	20.1	8.9	162	14.3	7.9	83	11.7	6.4	137	23.7	10.6	345	16.9
	Non-Transfer	725	79.9	35.6	970	85.7	47.6	628	88.3	48.8	440	76.3	34.2	1698	83.0
Major	STEM	409	45.1	20.0	406	35.8	19.9	231	32.5	17.9	518	64.0	22.3	817	40.0
	non-STEM	244	26.9	12.0	522	46.1	25.6	320	45.0	24.8	162	20.0	12.6	767	37.5
	Business	233	25.7	11.4	173	15.3	8.5	152	21.4	11.8	119	14.7	9.2	407	19.9
	Undeclared	21	2.3	1.0	32	2.8	1.6	8	1.1	0.6	10	1.2	0.8	53	2.6
Yr. in School	First	132	14.9	6.5	163	14.8	8.0	34	4.9	2.60	57	9.9	4.4	295	14.4
	Second	175	19.7	8.6	235	21.4	11.6	97	14.1	7.50	89	15.5	6.9	411	20.1
	Third	253	28.5	12.4	307	28.0	15.1	235	34.1	18.30	153	26.6	11.9	562	27.6
	Fourth	251	28.3	12.3	328	29.9	16.1	258	37.4	20.10	204	35.4	15.9	580	28.4
	Fifth or higher	76	8.6	3.7	65	5.9	3.2	65	9.4	6.60	73	12.7	5.6	190	9.3
Participated in	Yes	240	41.8	18.6	470	65.9	36.5							712	34.8
Study Abroad	No	334	58.2	26.0	243	34.1	18.9							578	28.3

Table E1: Overview of Survey Volunteers by Demographic Characteristics (% = Percent of Total Survey)

Ta . TF

APPENDIX F:

Tables Related to Background Variables

		Sex				
Participation Statu	IS	Male	Female	Total		
Participated	Count	240	470	710		
	Expected Count	316.7	393.3	710.0		
	% within Participation	33.8%	66.2%	100.0%		
	% within Sex	41.8%	65.9%	55.2%		
	% of Total	18.6%	36.5%	55.2%		
Non Participated	Count	334	243	577		
	Expected Count	257.3	319.7	577.0		
	% within Participation	57.9%	42.1%	100.0%		
	% within Sex	58.2%	34.1%	44.8%		
	% of Total	26.0%	18.9%	44.8%		
Total	Count	574	713	1287		
	Expected Count	574.0	713.0	1287.0		
	% within Participation	44.6%	55.4%	100.0%		
	% within Sex	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
	% of Total	44.6%	55.4%	100.0%		

Table F1:	Crosstab	Table f	for Part	icipation	Status by Se	X

Table F2: Chi-Sc	juare Test for	Participation	Status by Sex

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	74.72	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1287		

		Sex					
Racial status		Men	Women	Total			
Majority	Count	748	922	1670			
	Expected Count	738.6	931.4	1670.0			
	% within Racial	44.8%	55.2%	100.0%			
	% within Gender	85.7%	83.7%	84.6%			
	% of Total	37.9%	46.7%	84.6%			
Minority	Count	125	179	304			
	Expected Count	134.4	169.6	304.0			
	% within Racial	41.1%	58.9%	100.0%			
	% within Gender	14.3%	16.3%	15.4%			
	% of Total	6.3%	9.1%	15.4%			
Total	Count	873	1101	1974			
	Expected Count	873.0	1101.0	1974.0			
	% within Racial	44.2%	55.8%	100.0%			
	% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			
	% of Total	44.2%	55.8%	100.0%			

 Table F3: Crosstab of Racial Status by Sex

Table F4: Chi-Square Test for Racial Status by Sex

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.406	1	.236
N of Valid Cases	1974		

		Sex				
Previous Travel		Men	Women	Total		
Yes	Count	484	614	1098		
	Expected Count	488.5	609.5	1098.0		
	% within Travel	44.1%	55.9%	100.0%		
	% within Gender	53.3%	54.2%	53.8%		
	% of Total	23.7%	30.1%	53.8%		
No	Count	424	519	943		
	Expected Count	419.5	523.5	943.0		
	% within Travel	45.0%	55.0%	100.0%		
	% within Gender	46.7%	45.8%	46.2%		
	% of Total	20.8%	25.4%	46.2%		
Total	Count	908	1133	2041		
	Expected Count	908.0	1133.0	2041.0		
	% within Travel	44.5%	55.5%	100.0%		
	% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
	% of Total	44.5%	55.5%	100.0%		

pent

Table F5: Crosstab of Previous Travel by Sex

Table F6: Chi-Square Test for Racial Status by Sex

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.160	1	.689
N of Valid Cases	2041		

		Sex				
Major Category		Male	Female	Total		
STEM	Count	409	406	815		
	Expected Count	362.4	452.6	815.0		
	% within STEM	50.2%	49.8%	100.0%		
	% within Sex_2	45.1%	35.8%	40.0%		
	% of Total	20.0%	19.9%	40.0%		
Liberal Arts	Count	244	522	766		
	Expected Count	340.6	425.4	766.0		
	% within STEM	31.9%	68.1%	100.0%		
	% within Sex_2	26.9%	46.1%	37.5%		
	% of Total	12.0%	25.6%	37.5%		
Business	Count	233	173	406		
	Expected Count	180.5	225.5	406.0		
	% within STEM	57.4%	42.6%	100.0%		
	% within Sex_2	25.7%	15.3%	19.9%		
	% of Total	11.4%	8.5%	19.9%		
No major	Count	21	32	53		
	Expected Count	23.6	29.4	53.0		
	% within STEM	39.6%	60.4%	100.0%		
	% within Sex_2	2.3%	2.8%	2.6%		
	% of Total	1.0%	1.6%	2.6%		
Total	Count	907	1133	2040		
	Expected Count	907.0	1133.0	2040.0		
	% within STEM	44.5%	55.5%	100.0%		
	% within Sex_2	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
	% of Total	44.5%	55.5%	100.0%		

Table F7: Crosstab Table for Major by Sex

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	88.10	3	.000
N of Valid Cases	2040		

Table F8: Chi-Square Test for Participation Status by Sex

 Table F9: Crosstab Analysis for Major by Participation Status

		Participation Status					
			Non				
Major		Participated	Participated	Total			
STEM	Count	231	287	518			
	Expected Count	285.7	232.3	518.0			
Liberal Arts	Count	320	162	482			
	Expected Count	265.9	216.1	482.0			
Business	Count	152	119	271			
	Expected Count	149.5	121.5	271.0			
Undeclared	Count	8	10	18			
	Expected Count	9.9	8.1	18.0			
Total	Count	711	578	1289			
	Expected Count	. 711.0	578.0	1289.0			

Table I IV. Chi-Square Test for Major by Tarticipation Status	Table F10:	Chi-Square	Test for	Major by	Participation	Status
---	------------	------------	----------	----------	---------------	--------

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	48.89	3	.000
N of Valid Cases	1289		

		Sex				
Transfer Status		Men	Women	Total		
Yes	Count	182	162	344		
	Expected Count	153.0	191.0	344.0		
	% within Transfer	52.9%	47.1%	100.0%		
	% within Gender	20.1%	14.3%	16.9%		
	% of Total	8.9%	7.9%	16.9%		
No	Count	725	970	1695		
	Expected Count	754.0	941.0	1695.0		
	% within Transfer	42.8%	57.2%	100.0%		
	% within Gender	79.9%	85.7%	83.1%		
	% of Total	35.6%	47.6%	83.1%		
Total	Count	907	1132	2039		
	Expected Count	907.0	1132.0	2039.0		
	% within Transfer	44.5%	55.5%	100.0%		
	% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
	% of Total	44.5%	55.5%	100.0%		

Table F11: Crosstab Analysis for Transfer Status by Sex

Table F12: Chi-Square Test for	r Transfer Stat	us by Sex
--------------------------------	-----------------	-----------

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.89	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	2039		

		Participation Status					
			Non				
Transfer Status		Participated	Participated	Total			
Yes	Count	83	137	220			
	Expected Count	121.4	98.6	220.0			
No	Count	628	440	1068			
	Expected Count	589.6	478.4	1068.0			
Tota	1 Count	711	577	1288			
	Expected Count	711.0	577.0	1288.0			

Table F13: Crosstab Analysis for Major by Participation Status

Table F14: Chi-Square Test for Transfer Status by Participation Status

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	32.76	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1288		

Table F15: Descriptives and ANOVA Results for Respondents' GPA

	Descripitves				ANOVA				
Group	Nt	Mean	Std. Dev.	df	F	Sig. (p)			
Men	891	3.26	.472	1	7.80	0.005			
Women	1109	3.32	.440						
Total	2000	3.29	.455						
Participants	699	3.37	.401	1	41.13	.000			
Non Participants	569	3.21	.484						
Total	1268	3.30	.447						
Scale = 4.0									

APPENDIX G:

Table G1: Descriptives and ANOVA Results for Programmatic Variables (Participants)										
		Rat	ting		Descripitves			ANOVA		
Variable		Nh	%	Nt	Mean	Std. Dev.	df	F	Sig. (p)	
Cost	Men	59	24.7	239	3.27	1.60	1	6.01	0.014	
	Women	153	32.6	469	3.59	1.63				
	Total	212	29.9	708	3.48	1.63				
Location	Men	193	80.4	240	5.16	1.15	1	12.47	0.000	
	Women	407	86.6	470	5.44	0.90				
	Total	600	84.5	710	5.35	1.00				
Duration	Men	120	50.2	239	4.33	1.37	1	12.24	0.000	
	Women	302	64.3	470	4.70	1.32				
	Total	422	59.5	709	4.58	1.37				
Timing	Men	147	61.5	239	4.63	1.43	1	7.12	0.008	
	Women	340	72.6	46 8	4.92	1.36				
	Total	487	68.8	707	4.82	1.39				
Coursework	Men	144	60.4	238	4.43	1.47	1	2.36	0.125	
	Women	271	58.0	467	4.61	1.46				
	Total	415	58.8	705	4.61	1.46				

Tables Related to Institutional and Programmatic Variable

Scale = 1 through 6, with 6 as high $\frac{1}{2}$

 N_h = Number of students rating variable as highly important 5 or 6)

 $N_t = Number of total respondents$

			Sex	
Duration of First Study Abroad Program		Male	Female	Total
Less 3 Weeks	Count	21	69	90
	Expected Count	33.3	56.7	90.0
	% of Total	4.6%	15.0%	19.6%
9 Weeks or Less	Count	100	166	266
	Expected Count	98.3	167.7	266.0
	% of Total	21.7%	36.1%	57.8%
9 to 16 Weeks (Semester)	Count	46	48	94
	Expected Count	34.7	59.3	94.0
	% of Total	10.0%	10.4%	20.4%
More than 16 Weeks	Count	3	7	10
	Expected Count	3.7	6.3	10.0
	% of Total	.7%	1.5%	2.2%
Total	Count	170	290	460
	Expected Count	170.0	290.0	460.0
	% of Total	37.0%	63.0%	100.0%

Table G3: Chi-Square Test for Program Duration by Sex

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.213	3	.004
N of Valid Cases	460		

APPENDIX H:

Tables Related to Situational Variables

		Ra	ting		Descripitve	s	ANOVA				
Variable		Nh	%	Nt	Nt Mean		df	F	Sig.		
Time	Men	34	14.2	239	2.72	1.50	1	0.056	0.813		
	Women	78	16.6	470	2.75	1.58					
	Total	112	15.8	709	2.47	1.55					
Money	Men	96	40.2	239	3.82	1.64	1	4.95	0.026		
	Women	226	48.2	469	4.11	1.64					
	Total	322	45.5	708	4.01	1.64					
Wages	Men	62	26.3	236	3.03	1.76	1	4.53	0.034		
	Women	142	30.3	468	3.32	1.76					
	Total	204	29.0	704	3.22	1.76					
Delay	Men	26	10.9	239	2.17	1.50	1	4.60	0.032		
graduation	Women	43	9.2	469	1.92	1.41					
	Total	69	9.8	708	2.00	1.45					
Required	Men	45	18.8	239	2.77	1.68	1	1.16	0.282		
courses	Women	83	17.7	470	2.62	1.66					
	Total	128	18.1	709	2.67	1.66					
Academic	Men	8	3.3	239	1.69	1.19	1	0.694	0.405		
requirements	Women	17	3.6	469	1.62	1.08					
	Total	25	3.5	708	1.64	1.12					
Family	Men	11	4.7	236	1.75	1.20	1	0.564	0.453		
duties	Women	28	6.0	466	1.82	1.30					
	Total	39	5.6	702	1.8	1.27					
Clubs	Men	16	5.0	312	2.44	1.58	1	1.062	0.303		
	Women	14	6.6	213	2.41	1.56					
	Total	30	5.6	525	2.43	1.58					
Lease	Men	18	7.5	239	1.89	1.31	1	2.75	0.097		
	Women	55	11.7	469	2.08	1.50					
	Total	73	10.3	708	2.01	1.44					
Athletics	Men	6	2.5	239	1.33	0.88	1	1.49	0.223		
	Women	12	2.6	469	1.25	0.81					
	Total	18	2.6	708	1.28	0.83					

Scale = 1 through 6, with 6 as high

		Ratir	Rating			'es	ANOVA			
Variable		Nh	%	N_t	Mean	Std. Dev.	df	F	Sig. (p)	
Time	Men	163	51.6	316	4.27	1.58	1	0.025	0.875	
	Women	117	54.7	214	4.29	1.63				
	Total	280	52.9	530	4.28	1.60				
Money	Men	170	54.0	315	4.16	1.76	1	8.57	0.004	
	Women	134	62.6	214	4.60	1.60				
	Total	304	57.5	529	4.34	1.71				
Wages	Men	127	40.7	312	3.50	1.91	1	5.277	0.022	
	Women	97	45.5	213	3.88	1.77				
	Total	224	42.6	525	3.66	1.87				
Delay	Men	97	30.8	315	3.19	1.82	1	0.555	0.457	
graduation	Women	66	30.8	214	3.07	1.88				
-	Total	163	30.8	529	3.14	1.85				
Required	Men	83	26.4	314	3.25	1.70	1	0.377	0.540	
Courses	Women	67	31.5	213	3.34	1.78				
	Total	150	28.5	527	3.29	1.73				
Academic	Men	25	7.9	315	1.88	1.34	1	0.033	0.856	
requirements	Women	17	7.9	214	1.87	1.38				
	Total	42	7.9	529	1.88	1.34				
Family	Men	38	12.1	314	2.24	1.57	1	0.00	0.99	
duties	Women	25	11.7	213	2.24	1.55				
	Total	63	11.9	527	2.24	1.55				
Clubs	Men	34	14 .1	239	1.86	1.26	1	0.043	0.835	
	Women	73	15.5	469	1.97	1.31				
	Total	106	15.0	708	1.93	1.30				
Lease	Men	40	12.7	314	2.56	1.50	1	1.32	0.252	
	Women	42	19.6	214	2.72	1.66				
	Total	82	15.5	528	2.62	1.56				
Athletics	Men	18	5.7	314	1.63	1.23	1	5.20	0.023	
	Women	7	3.3	213	1.40	0.98				
	Total	25	4.7	527	1.54	1.14				

Table H2: Descriptives and ANOVA Results for Situational Variables (Non-Partcipants)

Scale = 1 through 6, with 6 as high $\frac{1}{2}$

APPENDIX I:

Tables Related to Dispositional Variables

		Ra	ting	De	escripity	/es	ANOVA		
						Std.			Sig.
Variable		Nh	%	Nt]	Mean	Dev.	(df F	(p)
Language	Men	83	34.7	240	3.21	1.96	1	0.454	0.501
	Women	149	31.7	470	3.31	2.01			
	Total	232	32.7	710	3.28	1. 99			
Homestay	Men	110	45.8	240	4.01	1.80	1	0.122	0.727
	Women	243	51.7	470	4.06	1.88			
	Total	353	49.7	710	4.04	1.85			
Future	Men	159	66.5	239	4.82	1.36	1	2.22	0.137
	Women	327	69.6	4 70	4.97	1.30			
	Total	486	68.6	70 9	4.92	1.32			
Fun	Men	2 07	86.3	240	5.38	0.865	1	2.91	0.088
	Women	419	89.5	46 8	5.5	0.811			
	Total	626	88.4	708	5.46	0.831			

Table I1: Descriptives and ANOVA Results for Dispositional Influences (Participants)

Scale = 1 through 6, with 6 as high

Nh = Students rating variable as highly important 5 or 6); Nt = total respondents

		Ra	ating		Descripi	tves	ANOVA		
Variable		Nh	%	Nt	Mean	Std. Dev.	df	F	Sig. (p)
Academic	Men	16	6.7	238	1.92	1.32	1	0.22	0.639
performance	Women	30	6.4	468	1.87	1.28			
	Total	46	6.5	706	1.89	1.29			
Health	Men	6	2.5	239	1.69	1.03	1	20.09	0.000
	Women	39	8.3	469	2.14	1.37			
	Total	45	6.3	708	1.99	1.28			
Safety	Men	10	4.2	239	1.82	1.17	1	31.27	0.000
	Women	55	11.7	469	2.44	1.49			
	Total	65	9.2	708	2.23	1.42			
Miss family	Men	29	12.1	239	2.24	1.55	1	25.85	0.000
	Women	92	19.7	467	2.89	1.64			
	Total	121	17.1	706	2.67	1.64			

Table I2: Descriptives and ANOVA Results for Dispositional Obstacles (Participants)

Scale = 1 through 6, with 6 as high $\frac{1}{2}$

		Rating		D	escripitv	es		ANOVA	
Variable		Nh	%	Nt	Mean	Std. Dev.	df	F	Sig. (p)
Academic	Men	31	9.8	315	2.16	1.45	1	1.56	0.213
Performance	Women	17	7. 9	214	2.00	1.41			
	Total	48	9.0	529	2.09	1.44			
No	Men	72	22.7	317	2.89	1.78	1	18.91	0.000
Interest	Women	32	15	213	2.22	1.66			
	Total	104	19.6	530	2.62	1.76			
Health	Men	18	5.8	313	1.91	1. 29	1	0.034	0.854
	Women	11	5.1	214	1.93	1.26			
	Total	29	5.5	527	1.92	1.28			
Safety	Men	30	9.5	315	2.04	1. 42	1	0.433	0.511
	Women	12	5.6	214	2.13	1.37			
	Total	42	7.9	529	2.08	1.40			
Miss family	Men	71	22.5	316	2.76	1.78	1	0.719	0.397
	Women	51	23.9	213	2.9	1.78			
	Total	122	23.1	529	2.82	1.78			

Table I3: Descriptives and ANOVA Results for Dispositional Obstacles (Nonparticipants)

Scale = 1 through 6, with 6 as high $\frac{1}{2}$

Nh = Students rating variable as highly important 5 or 6); Nt = total respondents

		Rating			Descripitv	es	ANOVA			
						Std.			Sig.	
Variable		Nh	%	Nt	Mean	Dev.	df	F	<u>(p)</u>	
Study abroad	Men	125	73.5	179	1.91	0.900	1	0.137	0.712	
more interesting	Women	227	77.5	293	1.87	0.903				
	Total	352	76.0	463	1.89	0.901				
Study abroad more	Men	51	30.0	170	2.95	1.108	1	3.805	0.052	
challenging	Women	69	23.6	292	3.15	1.045				
	Total	120	26.0	462	3.08	1.072				

Scale = 1 through 5, with 5 as high $\frac{1}{2}$

 N_h = Number of students agreeing (4 or 5 rating); N_t = Number of total respondents

APPENDIX J:

		Rati	ng	1	Descripitv	res	ANOVA			
Variable		Nh	%	Nt	Mean	Std. Dev.	df	F	Sig. (p)	
Parental	Men	69	29.1	237	3.32	1.66	1	8.58	0.004	
encouragement	Women	167	35.9	465	3.71	1.65				
	Total	236	33.6	702	3.58	1.66				
Peer	Men	60	25	240	3.22	1.70	1	5.92	0.015	
messages	Women	171	36.4	470	3.55	1.76				
	Total	231	32.5	710	3.44	1.75				
Know	Men	46	19.2	239	2.60	1.79	1	0.00	0.988	
faculty	Women	91	19.4	468	2.60	1.80				
	Total	137	19.3	707	2.60	1.79				
Know	Men	36	15	240	2.30	1.69	1	1.09	0.296	
friends	Women	70	14.9	469	2.16	1.67				
	Total	106	14.9	709	2.21	1.69				

Tables Related to Relational/Informational Variables

Table J1: Descriptives and ANOVA Results for Information/Relational Variables (participants)

Scale = 1 through 6, with 6 as high

Nh = Students rating variable as highly important 5 or 6); Nt = total respondents

Table J2: Descriptives and ANOVA Results for the Information/Relational Obstacle

		Rati	ing	Descripitves		ANOVA			
Variable		Nh	%	Nt	Mean	Std. Dev.	df	F	Sig. (p)
Lack of	Men	6	2.5	239	1.53	1.01	1	5.98	0.015
family support	Women	36	7.7	468	1.78	1.36	5		
	Total	42	5.9	707	1.69	1.26	i		
Lack of	Men	34	10.9	313	2.08	1.46	5 1	0.57	0.451
family support	Women	23	10.7	214	2.18	1.51			
5 11	Total	57	10.8	527	2.12	1.48			

Scale = 1 through 6, with 6 as high

		Rating Descripitves		ANOVA					
		Ni	0.4			Std.	16		Sig.
Variable		<u>Nh</u>	%	N _t	Mean	Dev.	df	F	(p)
Study Abroad	Men	69	29.1	237	3.67	1.58	1	0.818	0.366
	Women	129	28.7	449	3.78	1.54			
	Total	198	28.8	686	3.74	1.55			
Financial Aid	Men	21	13.6	157	3.24	1.53	1	3.44	0.064
	Women	57	19.6	290	3.54	1.65			
	Total	78	17.5	447	3.43	1.61			
Advisor	Men	48	24.4	196	3.49	1.66	1	3.40	0.066
	Women	106	27.7	382	3.76	1.66			
	Total	154	26.6	578	3.67	1.67			
Program faculty	Men	118	50.0	236	4.36	1.84	1	0.01	0.914
/	Women	223	49.5	450	4.34	1.84			
	Total	341	49.7	686	4.35	1.84			
Dent faculty	Men	30	21.7	179	3 58	1 71	1	0 023	0 880
Dept. Ideatify	Women	60	19.8	305	3 60	1 75	-	01020	0.000
	Total	99	20.5	484	3.59	1.73			
Mymaior	Men	34	21 3	158	3 60	1 77	1	1 16	0 283
	Women	55	174	316	3.00	1.77	1	1.10	0.205
	Total	89	17.4	474	3.48	1.69			
				100	2.02			0.047	0.000
Dean's Office	Men	11	11.2	102	3.23	1./1	1	0.047	0.828
	Women	19	10.6	1/9	3.18	1./4			
	lotal	30	10.8	281	3.20	1.73			
Student accounts	Men	12	10.5	111	3.13	1.63	1	0.178	0.673
	Women	17	9.0	188	3.21	1.60			
	Total	29	9.6	299	3.18	1.61			
Travel clinic	Men	20	14.7	134	3.43	1.66	1	0.242	0.623
	Women	34	14.4	239	3.51	1.69			
	Total	54	14.5	373	3.48	1.68			
Athletic staff	Men	2	3.9	43	2.95	1.73	1	0.815	0.369
	Women	1	1.8	45	2.62	1.71			
	Total	2	2.9	85	2.78	1.72			

Table J3: Student Ratings of Institutional Helpfulness for Study Abroad

Scale = 1 through 6, with 6 as high $\frac{1}{2}$

		Rating		Descripitves			ANOVA		
Variable		$\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{h}}$	%	Nt	Mean	Std. Dev.	df	F	Sig. (p)
Friends &	Men	224	87.9	255	1.44	0.87	1	18.81	0
peers	Women	473	95.5	495	1.21	0.595			
	Total	697	92.9	750	1.29	0.706			
Parents &	Men	213	84.2	253	1.55	1.052	1	0.051	0.821
family	Women	417	84.5	494	1.56	1.132			
	Total	630	84.4	747	1.56	1.105			
Religious	Men	7	13.8	52	2.23	1.37	1	8.47	0.004
leader	Women	11	13.2	84	1.63	1.03			
	Total	18	13.4	136	1.86	1.2			
HS teacher	Men	8	14.6	52	1.92	1.169	1	12.17	0.001
	Women	30	23.4	129	1.39	0.823			
	Total	38	20.9	181	1.54	0.963			
Doctor	Men	7	12.9	53	2.17	1.24	1	1.24	0.267
	Women	20	17.2	116	1.92	1.38			
	Total	27	15.9	169	2	1.34			
Employer	Men	38	32.1	119	2.06	1.28	1	3.004	0.084
	Women	137	47.2	291	1.82	1.23			

Table J4: Participants' Ratings of Interpersonal Support for Study Abroad

Scale = 1 through 6, with 6 as high $\frac{1}{2}$

Nh = Students rating variable as highly important 5 or 6); Nt = total respondents

.

APPENDIX K:

Factor Analysis Table

		Components							
Variable		1	2	3	4				
1	Cost	0.476							
2	Location				0.565				
3	Duration	0.691							
4	Timing	0.701							
5	Coursework	0.607							
6	Language			0.738					
7	Home stay			0.737					
8	Peer messages		0.654						
9	Know faculty		0.716						
10	Know students		0.750						
11	Family encouraged				*				
12	Fun				0.763				
13	Future	*							
	Loading	13.82	13.17	11.1	10.44				
	Scale alpha	0.518	0.574	0.526	0.385				

Table K1: Principal Components Analysis for Participant Influences

KMO=.717

Bartlett's p = .000

* Only values higher than .4 are listed
| | | | Cor | nponents | 6 | |
|--------------|-------------------|--------|--------|----------|-------|--------|
| Variable | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | Cost | | | | | 0.664 |
| 2 | Location | | | 0.702 | | |
| 3 | Duration | | 0.764 | | | |
| 4 | Timing | | 0.628 | | | |
| 5 | Coursework | | | | 0.714 | |
| 6 | Language | | | | | 0.65 |
| 7 | Home stay | | | 0.719 | | |
| 8 | Peer messages | 0.622 | | | | |
| 9 | Know faculty | 0.732 | | | | |
| 10 | Know students | 0.798 | | | | |
| 11 | Family encouraged | | 0.42 | | | |
| 12 | Fun | | | 0.46 | | |
| 13 | Future | | | | 0.701 | |
| | Loading | 13.064 | 11.946 | 11.859 | 10.68 | 10.056 |
| $KMO = 68^4$ | | | | | | |

Table K2: Principal Components Analysis for Male Participant Influences

RMO = .085Bartlett's p = .000

			Compon	ents	
Variable		1	2	3	4
1	Cost	*			
2	Location				0.675
3	Duration	0.717			
4	Timing	0.709			
5	Coursework	0.642			
6	Language			0.729	
7	Home stay			0.782	
8	Peer messages		0.683		
9	Know faculty		0.668		
10	Know students		0.721		
11	Family encouraged		*		
12	Fun				0.757
13	Future	0.412			
	Loading	14.26	13.3	11.05	9.81

 Table K3: Principal Components Analysis for Female Participant Influences

KMO=.698

Bartlett's p = .000

<u> </u>	A	^	Compon	ents	
Variable		1	2	3	4
1	Finding time		0.532		
2	Finding money				0.851
3	Lost wages				0.848
4	Finding courses		0.803		
5	Delay graduation Meet		0.774		
6	requirements Acad.		0.550		
7	performance			0.405	
8	Safety	0.875			
9	Health	0.823			
10	Lease			*	
11	Clubs/leadership			0.645	
12	Family support			0.49	
13	Family duties			0.571	
14	Miss family	0.547			
15	Athletics			0.777	•
	Loading	31.63	9.73	9.36	7.06
	Scale alpha	0.702	0.686	0.757	0.736

Table K4: Principal Components Analysis for Participants' Obstacles

KMO=.698

Bartlett's p = .000

			Components	
Variable		1	2	3
1	Finding time		0.616	
2	Finding money			0.829
3	Lost wages			0.821
4	Finding courses		0.808	
5	Delay graduation		0.707	
6	Meet requirements		0.554	
7	Acad. performance	0.638		
8	Safety	0.685		
9	Health	0.672		
10	Lease	0.581		
11	Clubs/leadership	0.628		
12	Family support	0.699		
13	Family duties	0.637		
14	Miss family	0.636		
15	Athletics	0.707		
	Loading	37.69	9.54	9.04

Table K5: Principal Components Analysis for Male Participants' Obstacles

KMO=.698 *Bartlett's p* = .000

		Components				
Variable		1	2	3	4	
1	Finding time				0.455	
2	Finding money			0.843		
3	Lost wages			0.863		
4	Finding courses		0.799			
5	Delay graduation		0.753			
6	Meet requirements		0.536			
7	Acad. performance	0.466				
8	Safety	0.829				
9	Health	0.759				
10	Lease			*		
11	Clubs/leadership				0.672	
12	Family support	0.453				
13	Family duties	0.542				
14	Miss family	0.613				
15	Athletics				0.768	
	Loading	29.48	9.93	9.54	7.15	

Table K6: Principal Components Analysis for Female Participants' Obstacles

٦

KMO=.69, Bartlett's p = .000 * Only values higher than .4 are listed

		Components					
Variable		1	2	3	4	5	
1	Finding time					0.534	
2	Finding money				0.849		
3	Lost wages				0.799		
4	Finding courses			0.724			
5	Delay graduation			0.813			
6	Meet requirements	0.734					
7	Acad. performance	0.735					
8	Safety	0.605					
9	Health	0.603					
10	Lease		0.487				
11	Clubs/leadership					0.620	
12	Family support		0.422				
13	Family duties		0.741				
14	Miss family		0.775				
15	Athletics					0.788	
	Loading	26.23	10.45	8.92	6.74	6.4	
	Scale alpha	0.794	0.677	0.581	0.641	0.427	

|--|

KMO=.698

Bartlett's p = .000

			(Componen	its	
Variable		1	2	3	4	5
1	Finding time					0.563
2	Finding money				0.843	
3	Lost wages				0.788	
4	Finding courses			0.779		
5	Delay graduation			0.843		
6	Meet requirements		0.705			
7	Acad. performance		0.719			
8	Safety		0.635			
9	Health		0.595			
10	Lease	0.499				
11	Clubs/leadership					0.656
12	Family support	0.581				
13	Family duties	0.816				
14	Miss family	0.778				
15	Athletics					0.749
	Loading	27.52	10.39	8.52	7.06	6.64

Table K8: Principal Components Analysis for Male Nonparticipants' Obstacles

KMO=.698

Bartlett's p = .000

	Table K9: P	rincipal Con	ponents Analys	sis for Female I	Nonparticipants	'Obstacles
--	-------------	--------------	----------------	------------------	-----------------	------------

		Components					
Variable		1 2 3 4					
1	Finding time					0.732	
2	Finding money				0.731		
3	Lost wages			0.787	0.788		
4	Finding courses			0.751			
5	Delay graduation		0.647				
6	Meet requirements		0.688				
7	Acad. performance		0.710				
8	Safety	0.670					
9	Health	0.721					
10	Lease	0.586					
11	Clubs/leadership				0.674		
12	Family support			0.464			
13	Family duties	0.667					
14	Miss family	0.665					
15	Athletics				*		
	Loading	25.00	10.78	9.46	7.16	6.34	

KMO=.698

Bartlett's p = .000

-				(Componer	nts			
Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Cost						*		·	0.675
Location									
Duration						0.690			
Timing						0.751			
Coursework						0.504			
Language							0.778		
Home stay							0.673		
Peer messages					0.565				
Know faculty					0.716				
Know students					0.720				
Family encouraged								0.766	
Fun									0.734
Future								0.484	
Finding time		0.508							
Finding money				0.794					
Lost wages				0.826					
Finding courses		0.776							
Delay graduation		0.757							
Meet requirements		0.526							
Acad. performance	*								
Safety			0.865						
Health			0.801						
Lease	0.484								
Clubs/leadership	0.619								
Family support	0.464								
Family duties	0.602								
Miss family	0.401								
Athletics	0.710								
Loading	18.32	8.3	5.98	5.28	4.93	4.72	3.98	3.9	3.74
Scale alpha	0.728	0.686	0.847	0.736	0.574	0.515	0.468	0.299	0.385

Table K10: Principal Components Analysis for Participants' Influences and Obstacles

KMO=.806

Bartlett's p = .000

Appendix L:

Male Volunteers by Participation Status and Major Category

	Participants	Nonparticipants
Residential program for	Andrew	Bill
public policy majors	Chris	Eli
	Jake	Greg
	Oscar	
	Shaun	
Liberal arts and social science	Corey	Jack
majors	Eric	Sam
	John	Taylor
	Matt	
Science, technology,	Danny	David
(STEM)	George	Frank
	Jason	Ian
	Kenny	George

APPENDIX M:

Follow-up Analysis on Males and Age

			Descripitves			ANOVA		
Year in School		Nt	Mean	Std. Dev.	df	F	Sig. (p)	
	Men	170	2.80	0.94	1	5.078	0.025	
	Women	292	2.58	1.06				
	Total	462	2.66	1.02				

Table M1: Descriptives and ANOVA	Results for Partici	ipants' Academic Level
----------------------------------	---------------------	------------------------

Scale = 1 through 6, with 6 as sixth year in school (could be graduate student)

 $N_t = Number of total respondents$

			Participation Status			
Males			Participant	Nonparticipant	Total	
Year	1	Count	7	42	49	
		Expected Count	20.5	28.5	49.0	
		% within Year	14.3%	85.7%	100.0%	
		% within Participation	2.9%	12.6%	8.5%	
		% of Total	1.2%	7.3%	8.5%	
	2	Count	19	45	64	
		Expected Count	26.8	37.2	64.0	
		% within Year	29.7%	70.3%	100.0%	
		% within Participation	7.9%	13.5%	11.1%	
		% of Total	3.3%	7.8%	11.1%	
	3	Count	84	109	193	
		Expected Count	80.7	112.3	193.0	
		% within Year	43.5%	56.5%	100.0%	
		% within Participation	35.0%	32.6%	33.6%	
	<u>.</u>	% of Total	14.6%	19.0%	33.6%	
	4	Count	130	138	268	

Table M2: Crosstabs for Academic Year by Participation for Males and Females

			1121	155 0	268.0
		Expected Count	112.1	155.9	268.0
		% within Year	48.5%	51.5%	100.0%
		% within Participation	54.2%	41.3%	46.7%
		% of Total	22.6%	24.0%	46.7%
	Total	Count	240	334	574
		Expected Count	240.0	334.0	574.0
		% within Year	41.8%	58.2%	100.0%
		% within Participation	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	41.8%	58.2%	100.0%
Females			Participant	Nonparticipant	Total
Year	1	Count	23	14	37
		Expected Count	24.4	12.6	37.0
		% within Year	62.2%	37.8%	100.0%
		% within Participation	4.9%	5.8%	5.2%
		% of Total	3.2%	2.0%	5.2%
	2	Count	63	41	104
		Expected Count	68.6	35.4	104.0
		% within Year	60.6%	39.4%	100.0%
		% within Participation	13.4%	16.9%	14.6%
		% of Total	8.8%	5.8%	14.6%
	3	Count	160	66	226
		Expected Count	149.0	77.0	226.0
		% within Year	70.8%	29.2%	100.0%
		% within Participation	34.0%	27.2%	31.7%
		% of Total	22.4%	9.3%	31.7%
	4	Count	224	122	346

	Expected Count	228.1	117.9	346.0
	% within Year	64.7%	35.3%	100.0%
	% within Participation	47.7%	50.2%	48.5%
	% of Total	31.4%	17.1%	48.5%
Total	Count	470	243	713
	Expected Count	470.0	243.0	713.0
	% within Year	65.9%	34.1%	100.0%
	% within Participation	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	65.9%	34.1%	100.0%

Table M3: Chi-Square Test for Academic Year by Participation Status

Gender		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2- sided)
Men	Pearson Chi-Square	24.30	3	.000
	N of Valid Cases	574		
Women	Pearson Chi-Square	4.16	3	.245
	N of Valid Cases	713		

BIBLIOGRAPHY

•

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abes, E. S., & Jones, S. R. (2004). Meaning-making capacity and the dynamics of lesbian college students' multiple dimensions of identity. *Journal of College Student Development*, 45, 612-632.
- Agar, M. (1980). The professional stranger: an informal introduction to ethnography. New York: Academic Press.
- Akomolafe, O. (2000), Africanizing HBCUs: Problems and prospects of international education in historically black institutions. *African Issues*, 38(1/2), 103-107.
- Akomolafe, O. (1993, Feb. 11). Africa and foreign policy: The role of HBCUs. Black Issues in Higher Education, 9(25), 72.
- Allen, K. (1982, winter). American volunteer, 1981: A Gallup survey on volunteering. Voluntary Action Leadership, pp. 21-33.
- American Association of University Women (1992). How schools shortchange girls. New York: Marlowe.
- Arnot, M. & Gubb, J. (2001). Adding value to boys' and girls' education: a gender and achievement project in West Sussex. West Sussex, UK. West Sussex County Council.
- Ary, D., Cheser-Jacobs, L., & Razavieh, A. (1990). Introduction to research in education. Fort Worth, TX: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Belenky, M. F., & Stanton, A. V. (2000). Inequality, development, and connected knowing. In J. Mezirow & Associates (Eds.), *Learning as transformation: Critical perspectives on a theory in progress* (pp. 71-102). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Benn, R. (1997). Participation in adult education: Breaking boundaries or developing inequalities? In P. Armstrong, N. Miller, & M. Zukas (Eds.), Crossing borders, breaking boundaries: Proceedings of the 27th Annual SCUTREA Conference. London: Birbeck College, University of London.
- Bennett, M. J. (1993). Towards enthnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In R. M. Paige (Ed.). *Education for the intercultural experience*.Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press, Inc.
- Blume, S. (1997). Learning styles. In J. N. Gardner & A. J. Jewler (Eds.), Your college experience: Expanded reader (pp. 84-95). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

- Booker, R. W. (2001). Differences between applicants and non-applicants relevant to the decision to apply to study abroad. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 62(04), 1337A.
- Boshier, R. (1977). Motivation orientations re-visited: Life space motivations and education participation scale. *Adult Education*, 27(2), 89-115.
- Boshier, R., & Collins, J. B. (1985). The Houle typology after 22-years: A large-scale empirical test. Adult Education Quarterly, 35(3), 113-130.
- Brannon, R. (1976). The male sex role: Our culture's blueprint for manhood and what it's done for us lately. In D. David & R. Brannon (Eds.), *The forty-nine percent majority: The male sex role* (pp. 1-48). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Brooks-Harris, J. E., Heesacker, M., & Mejia-Millan, C. (1996). Changing men's male gender-role attitudes by applying the elaboration likelihood model of attitude change. Sex Roles, 35(9/10), 563-580.
- Briggs, A., & Burns, B. (1985). Study abroad: A European and an American perspective, Organization and impact of study abroad, (No. 1). Paris: European Institute of Education and Social Policy.
- Buchbinder, D. (1994). *Masculinities and identities*. Melbourne, Australia: Melbourne University Press.
- Byrnes, J. P. (1998). The nature and develop of decision-making: A self-regulation model. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Byrnes, J. P., Miller, D. C., & Schafer, W. D. (1999). Gender differences in risk taking: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125(3), 367-383.
- Capraro, R. L. (2004). Men's studies as a foundation for student development work with college men. *New Directions for Student Services*, 107, 23-34.
- Carlson, J. S., Burn, B. B., Useem, J., & Yachimowicz, D. (1990). Study abroad: The experiences of American undergraduates. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Carter, H. M., (1991). Minority access to international education. Presented at the 43rd International Conference on Educational Exchange, Charleston, SC, November 7-9, 1990. Council on International Educational Exchange. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED340323).
- Catell, R. B. (1966). The scree test for number of factors. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 1, 245-276.

- Chichester, M., & Akomalafe, S. (2003, January). *Minorities and underrepresented* groups in international affairs and foreign policy establishment. Paper presented at the Global Challenges & U.S. Higher Education Conference, Duke University. Retrieved October 12, 2007, from http://www.jhfc.duke.edu/ducis/globalchallenges/pdf/chichester.pdf.
- Chickering, A. W., & Reisser, L. (1993). Education and identity (2nd ed.) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Chiefflo, L. P. (2001). Determinants of student participation in study abroad programs at the University of Delaware: A quantitative study. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 61*(01), 3078A.
- Clayton, O., Lucas Hewitt, C., & Gaffney, E. D. (2004). Reflecting on reconnecting males to higher education. New Directions for Student Services, 107, 9-21.
- Cole, N. S. (1997). The ETS gender study: How females and males perform in educational settings. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Collins, C., Kenway, J., & McLeod, J. (2000). Gender debates we still have to have. Australian Educational Researcher, 27(3), 37-48.
- Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program. (2005, November). Global competence & national needs: One million students study abroad. Available from Lincoln Commission, 1 Dupont Circle, NW, Suite 250, Washington, DC 20036. Retrieved November 13, 2007, from http://www.nafsa.org/public_policy.sec/study_abroad_2/lincoln_commission_issu es.
- Connell, R. W., Hearn, J., & Kimmel, M. S. (2005). Introduction. In M. S. Kimmel, J. Hearn, & R. W. Connell (Eds.), *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities* (pp. 1-12). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Connell, R. W. (2000). The men and the boys. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Connell, R. W. (1987). Gender and Power: Society, the person and sexual politics. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.
- Cornwell, G. H., & Stoddard, E. W. (2009). *Globalizing Knowledge: Connecting international & intercultural studies*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges & Universities.
- Coutrney, S. (1992). Why adults learn: Toward a theory of participation in adult education. New York: Routledge.
- Covin, T. J., & Brush, C. C. (1991). An examination of male and female attitudes toward career and family issues. Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 25(7/8), 393-415.

- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among the five approaches* [2nd Ed.]. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2006). Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Cross, P. K. (1981). Adults as learners: Increasing participation and facilitating learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- D'Augelli, A. R. (1994). Identity development and sexual orientation: Toward a model of lesbian, gay, and bisexual development. In E. J. Trickett, R. J. Watts, & D. Birman (Eds.), *Human diversity: Perspectives on people in context* (pp. 312-333). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Darkenwald, G. G., & Merriam, S. B. (1982). Adult education: Foundations of practice. New York: Harper Collins.
- Davis, T. (2008). Open Doors 2008: U.S. Students Studying Abroad. New York: Institute for International.
- Davis, T. L. (2002). Voices of gender role conflict: The social construction of college men's identity. Journal of College Student Development, 43(4), 509-521.
- Davis, T. L., & Laker, J. A. (2004). Connecting men to academic and student affairs programs and services. *New Directions for Student Services*, 107, 47-57.
- Davison, M. L., & Sharma, A. R. (1994). ANOVA and ANCOVA of pre- and post-test, ordinal data. *Psychometrika*, 59:4, 593-600.
- Deardorff, D. K. (2006). Identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 10(3), 241-266.
- Deardorff, D. K. (2004). Internationalization: In search of international competence. International Educator, 23(2), 13 - 15.
- Dessoff, A. (2006, March/April). Who's not going abroad? International Educator, 20 27.
- Dewey, J. (1963). *Experience and education*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

- Doan, T. M. (2002, January). Asian American students: Study abroad participation, perspectives and experiences. Unpublished Masters Thesis, University of Minnesota.
- Dolby, N. (2007). Reflections on nation: American undergraduates and education abroad. Journal of Studies in International Education, 11(2), 141-156.
- Dolby, N. (2005). Globalization, identity, and nation: Australian and American undergraduates abroad. *Australian Educational Researcher*, 32(1), 101-118.
- Dolby, N. (2004). Encountering an American self: Study abroad and national identity. Comparative Education Review, 48(2), 150-173.
- Deutschendorf, H. (1996). Of work and men: How men can become more than their careers. Minneapolis, MN: Fairview.
- Dwyer, M. M., & Peters, C. K. (2004). The benefits of study abroad: New study confirms significant gains. *Transitions Abroad*, 27(5), 56-59.
- Dyke, L. S., & Murphy, S. A. (2006). How we define success: A qualitative study of what matters most to women and men. Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 55(5/6), 357 371.
- Edwards, K. E., & Jones, S. R. (2009). "Putting my man face on": A grounded theory of college men's gender identity development. *Journal of College Student Development*, 50(2), 210-228.
- Eisenhart, M. A., & Finkel, e. (1998). Women's science; learning and succeeding from the margins. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ender, M. G., Martin, L., Cotter, D. A., Marsteller-Kowalewski, B., & Defiore, J. (2000). Given an opportunity to reach out: Heterogeneous participation in optional service-learning projects. *Teaching Sociology*, 28(3), 206-219.
- England, E. M. (1992). College student gender stereotypes: Expectations about the behavior of male subcategory members. *Sex roles*, 27(11/12), 699-716.
- Erwin, T. D., & Coleman, P. K. (1998). The influence of intercultural experiences and second language proficiency on college students' cross-cultural adaptability. *International Education*, 28(1), 5-25.
- Faludi, S. (1991). Backlash: The undeclared war against American women. New York: Crown.

- Finch, R. T. (1991). Differences among community service volunteers, extracurricular volunteers, and nonvolunteers on the college campus. *Journal of college Student Development*, 32, 534-540.
- Finch, R. T. (1989). Characteristics and motivations of college students volunteering for community service. *Journal of college Student Personnel*, 28(5), 424-431.
- Foster, M., & Peele, T. (1999). Teaching black males: Lessons from the experts. In V. Polite (Ed.), *African-American males in school and society*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Fouts, K. S. (2009). Why students don't "go Greek": Survey Results. *WMU Greek Links*, 10, p. 1. Retrieved on April 1, 2009, from http://greeks.wmich.edu/GreekWeekly/Links3-09.pdf.
- Frenette, M. & Zeman, K. (2007). Why are most university students women?: Evidence based on academic performance, study habits, and parental influences. *Analytical Studies Branch --Research Paper Series* [Catalogue no. 11F009MIE, no. 303]. Ottawa, CA: Business & Labour Market Analysis Division.
- Fujita-Starck, P. J. (1996). Motivations and characteristics of adult students: Factor stability and construct validity of the education participation scale. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 47(1), 29-40.
- Furby, L., & Beyth-Marom, R. (1992). Risk taking in adolescence: A decision-making perspective. *Developmental Review*, 12, 1-44.
- Garraty, J. A., Kemperer, L., & Taylor, C. J. H. (1981). *The new guide to study abroad*. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gleason, J. B. (1987) Sex differences in parent-child interaction. In S. U. Philips, S. Steele, & C. Tanz (Eds.), Language, gender and sex in comparative perspective (pp. 189-199). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Gore, J. E. (2005). Dominant beliefs and alternative voices: Discourse, belief, and gender in American study abroad. New York: Routledge.
- Green, M. F., & Olson C. (2003). Internationalizing the campus: A user's guide. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Henry, G. T., & Basile, K. C. (1994). Understanding the decision to participate in formal adult education. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 44(2), 64-82.

- Hernandez, J. C. (2002). A qualitative exploration of the first-year experience of Latino college students. *NASPA Journal*, 40(1), 69 84.
- Hibbitt, K., Jones, P., & Meegan, R. (2001). Tackling social exclusion: the role of social capital in urban regeneration on Merseyside. *European Planning Studies*, 9(2), 141-161.
- Hovland, K. (2006). Shared futures: Global learning and liberal education. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges & Universities.
- Houle, C. O. (1961). The inquiring mind. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Hurtado, S., & Carter, D. F. (1997). Effects of college transition and perceptions of the campus racial climate on Latino college students' sense of belonging. *Sociology* of Education, 70(4), 324 345.
- Ingraham, E., & Peterson, D. (2004). Assessing the impact of study abroad on study learning at Michigan State University. *Frontiers*, 10, 83 100.
- Jacob, B. A. (2002). Where the boys aren't: non-cognitive skills, returns to school and the gender gap in higher education. *Economics of Education Review*, 21, 589-598.
- Jaffee, D. (2004). Learning communities can be cohesive and divisive. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 50(15), 144.
- Johnson, R. B., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time as come. *Educational Researcher*, 33(7), 14-26.
- Johnson, R. B., & Turner, L. A. (2003). Data collection strategies in mixed methods research. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavior research (pp. 297-319). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Johnstone, J. W. C., & Rivera, R. J. (1965). Volunteers for learning: A study of the educational pursuits of American adults. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.
- Jones, S. R., & Hill, K. E. (2003). Understanding patters of commitment: Student motivation for community service involvement. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 74(5), 516-539.
- Jones, S. R., & McEwen, M. K. (2000). A conceptual model of multiple dimensions of identity. *Journal of College Student Development*, 41(4) 405-414.
- Josselson, R. (1987). Finding herself: Pathways to identity development in women. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Katz, J., & Jhally, S. (1999) Tough guise: Violence, media, and the crisis in masculinity [Motion Picture]. Northhampton, MA: Media Education Foundation.
- Kauffmann, N. L., Martin, J. N., & Weaver, H. D. (1992). Students abroad: Strangers at home. Yarmouth, Maine: Intercultural Press, Inc.
- Kegan, R. (2000). What "form" transforms? A constructive-developmental approach to transformative learning. In J. Mezirow & Associates (Eds.), *Learning as transformation: Critical perspectives on a theory in progress* (pp. 35-70). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kimmel, M. S. (2008). Guyland: The perilous world where boys become men. New York: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Kimmel, M. S. (2000, November). What about the boys? WEEA Digest, 1(2), 7-8.
- Kimmel, M. S. (1997). Manhood in America: A cultural history. New York: Free Press.
- King, J. E. (2000). Gender equity in higher education: Are male students at a disadvantage? Washington D.C.: American Council of Education.
- Kirk, J., & Miller, M. (1986). *Reliability and Validity in Qualitative Research*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Kirkpatrick, S., Field, J., & Falk, I. (2001). Social capital: An analytical tool for exploring lifelong learning and community development. *CRLRA Discussion Paper Series* [ISSN 1440-480X]. Launceston, Australia: University of Tasmania.
- Kirkwood, T. F. (2001). Our global age requires global education: Clarifying Definitional Ambiguities. *The Social Sciences*, 92(1), 10 - 15.
- Kleinfeld, J. (1998). The myth that schools shortchange girls: Social science in the service of deception. (Report No. ED 423 210). Washington, D.C.: Women's Freedom Network.
- Kolb, D. A. (1984). Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Kohlberg, L. (1975). The cognitive-development approach to moral education. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 56, 670-677.
- Lev, A. I. (2004). Transgender emergence; Therapeutic guidelines for working with gender-variant people and their families. New York: Haworth Clinical Practice Press.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

- Locke, L. F., Wyrick-Spirduso, W., & Silverman, S. J. (2000). *Proposals that work: A guide for planning dissertations and grant proposals*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Looker, E. D., & McNutt, K. L. (1989). The effect of occupational expectations on the educational attainments of males and females. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 14(3), pp. 352-367.
- Lopes, L. L. (1987). Between hope and fear: The psychology of risk. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.). Advances in experimental social psychology (Vol. 20, pp. 255-295). New York: Academic Press.
- Mac an Ghaill, M. (1994). The making of men: Masculinities, sexualities, and schooling. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Maccoby, E., & Jacklin, C. N. (1978). *The psychology of sex differences*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- McClenaghan, P. (2000). Social capital: Exploring the theoretical foundations of community development education. *British Educational Research Journal*, 26(5), 565-582.
- Maher, F. A., & Tetreault, M. K. T. (2001). The feminist classroom: Dynamics of gender, race, and privilege. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Marks, H. M., & Jones, S. R. (2004). Community service in the transition; Shifts and continuities in participation from high school to college. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 75(3), 307-339.
- Marks, H. M., & Kuss, P. (2001). Socialization for citizenship through community service: Disparities in participation among U.S. high school students. *Sociological Focus*, 34(4), 377-397.
- Marotta, S., & Nashman, H. (1998). The Generation X college student and their motivation for community service. *College Student Affairs Journal*, 17(2), 18-31.
- Martino, W., & Pallotta-Chiarolli, M. (2003). So what's a boy? Addressing issues of masculinity and schooling. Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press.
- Maxwell, J. (1992). Understanding and validity in qualitative research. *Harvard Educational Review*, 63(3), 279-300.
- McEwen, M. (2003). New perspectives on identity development. In S. R. Komives, & D. Woodward, Jr. (Eds.), Student services: A handbook for the profession (4th ed,, pp. 188-127.). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

- Medina-López-Portillo, A. (2004). Intercultural learning assessment: The link between program duration and the development of intercultural sensitivity. *Frontiers*, 10, 179 200.
- Merriam, S. B., Caffarella, R. S., & Baumgartner, L. M. (2006). *Learning in adulthood: A comprehensive guide* (3rd Edition). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Messner, M. A. (1992). Power at play: Sports and the problem of masculinity. Boston: Beacon.
- Messner, M. A. (1990). Boyhood, organized sports, and the construction of masculinities. Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, (18)4, 416-444.
- Mestenhauser, J. (2003, Summer). Building Bridges. International Educator, 6 11.
- Miles, M.B. (1984). *Qualitative data analysis: a sourcebook of new methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Miller, H. L. (1961). *Participation of adults in education: A force-field analysis*. Boston: Center for the Study of Liberal education for Adults at Boston University.
- Miller, D. C., & Byrnes, J. P. (1997). The role of contextual and personal factors in children's risk talking. *Developmental Psychology*, 33, 814-823.
- Miller, J. B. (1976). Toward a new psychology of women. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Minichiello, V., Rosalie, A., Alexander, L. & Timewell, E. (1997). *In-depth interviewing: Principles, techniques, analysis.* Sydney, Australia: Pearson Education Australia.
- Moltz, D. (2009, April 1). Why not go Greek?. *Inside Higher Education*. Retrieved on April 1, 2009, from http://www.insidehighered.com/layout/set/print/news/2009/04/01/greek.
- Murphy, k. M, & Welch, F. (1992). The structure of wages. Quarterly Journal of Economics, 107, 215-236.
- National Center for Educational Statistics (2008). Fast fact: Enrollments. Retrieved March 1, 2009, from http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=98.
- National Center for Educational Statistics (2007). Percentage of persons 25 through 29 years old, by highest level of educational attainment: Selected years, 1940

through 2007, Retrieved March 13, 2009 from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d07/figures/fig_04.asp

- National Center for Educational Statistics (2006). Adult Education Participation in 2004-2005. Retrieved January 27, 2008, from http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2006/adulted/index.asp.
- Newkirk, T. (2002). *Misreading masculinity: Boys, literacy, and popular culture*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Nicolazzo, Z. D., & Davis, T. L. (2007). Promoting social justice attitudes in college men: A preliminary investigation. 2007 ACPA/NASPA Joint Meeting Research Brief.
- Opper, S., Teichler, U. & Carlson, J. (1990). Impacts of study abroad programmes on students and graduates. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd Ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Phillips, M. (1982). Motivation and expectation in successful volunteerism. Journal of Voluntary Action Research, 11, 118-125.
- Perry, W. G. (1970). Forms of intellectual and ethical development in the college years: A scheme. Troy, MO: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Pollack, W. (1998). Real boys: Rescuing our sons from the myths of boyhood. New York: Random House.
- Putnam, R. (1993). Making Democracy Work: civic traditions in modern Italy. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Redden, E. (2008, December 4). Women abroad and men at home. *Inside Higher Education*. Retrieved December 4, 2008, from http://www.insidehighered.com/.
- Rhoads, R. A. (1995). Whale tales, dog piles, and beer goggles: An ethnographic case study of fraternity life. *Anthropology & Educational Quarterly*, 26(3), 306-323.
- Russell, S. (1979). Learning sex roles in the high school. Interchange, 10(2), 57-66.
- Rudolph, F. (1977). Curriculum: A history of the American undergraduate course of study since 1636. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sax, L. J. (2008). The gender gap in college: Maximizing the developmental potential of men and women. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Sax, L. (2007). Boys adrift: The five factors driving the growing epidemic of unmotivated boys and underachieving young men. New York: Basic Books.
- Schneider, B. (forthcoming) Chapter in forthcoming book from Cambridge University Press.
- Segal, L. (1997). Slow motion: Changing masculinities, changing men (2nd ed.). London: Virago.
- Sell, D. K. (1983). Attitude change in foreign study participants. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 7, 131-147.
- Serow, R. C. (1991). Students and voluntarism: Looking into the motives of community service participants. *American Educational Research Journal*, 28(3), 543-556.
- Serow, R. C., Ciechalski, J., & Daye, C. (1990). Students as volunteers: Personal Competence, social diversity, and participation in community service. Urban Education, 25(1), 157-168.
- Shirley, S. (2006). The gender gap in post-secondary study abroad: Understanding and marketing to male students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks.
- Spring, J. (1998). Education and the rise of the global economy. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Sommers, C. H. (2000). The war against boys: How misguided feminism is harming our young men. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Stearns, P. N. (2009). Educating global citizens in colleges and universities: Challenges and opportunities. New York: Routledge.
- Stevens, S.S. (1951). Mathematics, measurement, and psychophysics. In S.S. Stevens (Ed.), *Handbook of experimental psychology*. New York: John Wiley.
- Stevens, S.S. (1946). On the theory of scales of measurement. Science, 103, 677-680.
- Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990). Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Study Abroad Task Force. (2007). Study Abroad Task Force interim report. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University's International Studies and Programs.
- Sumner, K. E., & Brown, T. J. (1996). Men, women, and money: Exploring the role of gender, gender-linkage of college major and career-information sources in salary expectations. Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 34(11/12), 823-840.

- Synge, J. (1977). The sec factor in social selection process in Canadian education. In R. Carlton, L. Colley, & N. MacKinnon (Eds.), *Education, change, and society: A* sociology of Canadian education (pp. 298-306). Toronto: Gage.
- Taskakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (1998). Mixed methodology: Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches. *Applied social research methods series* (Vol. 46). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Thelin, J. R. (2004). A history of American higher education. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Thompson, E. H. Jr., & Pleck, J. H. (1986). The structure of male role norms. American Behavioral Scientist, 29(5), 531-543.
- Trost, C. (1988, November 11). Men too, wrestle with career family stress. *Wall Street Journal*, p. B1.
- Trost, C. (1987, November 30). Best employers for women and parents. *Wall Street Journal*, p. 23.
- Tuss, A. (2004). Masculine identity and success: A critical analysis of Patricia Highsmith's The Talented Mr. Ripley and Chuck Palahniuk's Fight Club. The Journal of Men's Studies, 12(2), 93-102.
- Tyre, P. (2008). The trouble with boys: A surprising report card on our sons, their problems at school, and what parents and educators must do. New York: Crown Publishers.
- University of Minnesota. (2008). 2006-2007 senior survey of study abroad: University of Minnesota, Twin Cities responses. Retrieved on December 17, 2008 from http://www.umabroad.umn.edu/ci/docs/evaluation/surveys/06-07/Seniors_UMTC.pdf.
- Valentine, T. (1997). United States of America: The Current Predominance of Learning for the Job. In P. Belanger & S. Valdivielso (Eds.), *The Emergence of Learning Societies: Who Participants in Adult Learning* (pp. 95-108). New York: Elsevier.
- Valentine, T., & Darkenwald, G. G. (1990). Deterrents to participation in adult education: Profiles of potential learners. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 41(1), 29-42.
- Velleman, P. F., & Wilkinson, L. (1993). Nominal, ordinal, interval, and ration typologies are misleading. *The American Statistician*, 47(1), 65-72.
- Weaver-Hightower, M. (2003). The "boy turn" in research on gender and education. Review of Educational Research, 73(4), 471-498.

- White, R. (1981). Humanitarian concern. In A. Chickering & Associates (Eds.,), *The* modern American college (pp. 158-171). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Wigfield, A., & Eccles, J. S. (1992). The development of achievement task values: A theoretical analysis. *Developmental Review*, 12, 265-310.
- Yates, L. (2000). The "facts of the case": Gender equity for boys as a public policy issue. In N. Lesko (Ed.), *Masculinities at school* (pp. 305-322). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Young, J. P. (2000). Boy talk: Critical literacy and masculinities. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 35(3), 312-337.
- Zhao, C. M., Carini, R. M., & Kuh, G. D. (2005). Searching for the Peach Blossom Shangri-LA: Student engagement of Men and Women SMET majors. *The Review* of Higher Education, 28(4), 503-525.
- Zuckerman, M. (1991). Psychology of personality. Ambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

