

Research Note

Survey Evidence: Attributes of US Business School Undergraduate and Graduate Study-Abroad Programs

Thomas M. Porcano and David M. Shull, Richard T. Farmer School of Business, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio

Abstract

The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB)'s Assurance of Learning standard for business program accreditation (2006, p.15 and p.70) requires multicultural and diversity understanding. There are numerous ways to accomplish this, from infusing the core (domestic) curriculum with international perspectives to providing study-abroad opportunities. Study-abroad programs can be very beneficial to students, faculty and the college or university that sponsors them. This paper presents descriptive evidence regarding US Business Schools' study-abroad programs. The results provide insight regarding the infrastructure associated with these programs as well as how these programs are conducted. It is clear that the programs, compensation for faculty who teach in the programs, and costs for students who participate in them vary greatly. The results also provide some structural guidance for those currently offering such programs and those who might be establishing them in the near future.

Key words: Business Study-Abroad Programs, Survey Evidence, International Business Requirements, Globalisation

Introduction

The continued increase of globalization has led to increased interdependencies across nations (Friedman 2005). Global interconnections are not benign; they have both positive and negative consequences for the USA and elsewhere (Collins, Czarra & Smith 1998). This dynamic makes it imperative that students (and faculty) have a better understanding of other countries because all aspects of life (business, environment, social, etc.) are affected by it. Collins *et al.* (1998) believe that no institution in the USA needs to respond more to the challenge of globalization than does the US education system. For example, the results of a multinational student survey indicate that US students do not compare favorably to other students regarding their appreciation of other cultures (Fugate & Lassk 2003). Additionally, universities in other countries have recognised the need for their students to better understand other cultures and have entered into exchange programs with US and other countries' universities.

Numerous ways exist to increase student and faculty understanding of global issues, from infusing the core (domestic) curriculum with international perspectives to providing study-abroad opportunities. There are many ways to infuse the core curriculum and numerous ways to administer study-abroad programs. Some examples of study-abroad arrangements are: partnership agreements with US schools and foreign schools, student and faculty exchange programs, US schools having stand-alone campuses in another country, and US schools offering courses at foreign locations (using other schools' facilities or hotels). Each arrangement has ben-

efits and drawbacks, but all provide a hands-on, experiential-learning environment.

Study-abroad programs can be very beneficial to students, faculty and the college or university that sponsors them. They can provide an excellent means for students and faculty to better understand different cultures, races, customs, business practices, and politics (Praetzel, Curcio & DiLorenzo 1996), and affect students in four general areas: global competence, academic competence, attitude toward understanding new places and cultures, and personal development (Sindt & Pachmayer 2005). Employers view an international background as an important element in hiring decisions (Voris 1997), and entering freshmen ranked study-abroad programs as the second most important activity in college (Hesel & Green 2000). Finally, teaching/living abroad is an effective way to internationalize faculty (Kwok & Arpan 2002) and is an excellent professional development tool for business faculty (Festervand & Tillery 2003).

The number of US students studying abroad is still relatively small; fewer than ten percent of undergraduates at four-year colleges and universities study in other countries (Barker 2000). However, the number of US students studying abroad has more than doubled in the last decade (Institute of International Education 2006b). Even the events of 9/11 did not produce a decline in US students studying abroad. Despite 9/11 and a weak economy, the number of students studying abroad in the academic year 2001/02 increased 4.4% over the previous year, has continued to increase ever year since then, and has almost tripled since the 1980s (Institute of International Education 2006b).

Europe continues to remain the most popular regional destination, with approximately 61% of all US students in 2003/04 studying there (Institute of International Education 2006d). The UK, Italy, Spain, and France are the most popular destinations (Institute of International Education 2006e). The most common duration of study in 2003/04 is one semester, with the summer term a close second (Institute of International Education 2006a). Overall, approximately 48% of the US students studying abroad did so for a period of less than one semester. Finally, social sciences is the most common field of study (approximately 21% of all US students studying abroad), with business and management second at 18% (Institute of International Education 2006c).

There is also a special need for study-abroad programs in the Business School curriculum. The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business – International (AACSB) Assurance of Learning standard requires multicultural and diversity understanding, and adequate coverage in the curriculum of the global, environmental, political, legal, and regulatory context in which business is conducted (AACSB 2006, p.15 and p.70). One way to help achieve internationalization is via a study-abroad program, and some schools may be using study-abroad programs as a substitute for international business courses (e.g. see Trevino and Melton 2002). Given its importance, there is a need to investigate all aspects of business study-abroad programs. The existing literature deals primarily with undergraduate programs and addresses the researcher(s)'s experiences with a specific program. There is a lack of large-scale studies and studies on graduate-level study-abroad programs.

This paper presents the results of a national survey regarding structural issues of US undergraduate and graduate business schools' study-abroad programs. The next section reviews the literature dealing with study-abroad programs at US business schools. The research method then is discussed, followed by the results section and a discussion of the results. The paper ends with recommendations for future research.

Business School Study-Abroad Programs

Little empirical research exists regarding the use and structure of study-abroad programs by US Business Schools. Some articles describe faculty members' experiences with a specific type of study-abroad program (e.g. Keillor & Emore 2003; Wynne & Filante 2004; Garson 2005). Other articles describe how to plan or assess study-abroad programs (e.g. Duke 2000; Bailey & Harbeck 2002; Vande Berg 2003; Porcano, Snavely, Shull & Staton 2004; Maskulka & Stout 2006). Only Holland and Kedia (2003) report the results of a questionnaire survey designed to obtain general program information.

The purpose of Holland and Kedia's study was to determine how to make studying in foreign countries more attractive to students. They: (1) provide a profile of who studies abroad in business schools; (2) identify potential challenges to students who want to study abroad and

facilitating factors that would make programs more attractive to students; and (3) indicate which marketing and communication techniques work best. They do not investigate the extent to which US business schools use study-abroad programs and how those programs are configured structurally. Lacking is a large-scale study of other aspects of business study-abroad programs: structural issues, faculty compensation, student costs, program benefits, and problematic areas. Such information is helpful to those schools currently administering a study-abroad program and to those that might be considering starting one.

The current study reports the results of a survey designed to provide descriptive information about the nature and structure of and extent to which US business schools use undergraduate and graduate study-abroad programs, and, as such, expands on Holland and Kedia's work.

Research Design

The sample of US business schools was obtained from Hasselback (2003), which is a directory of all schools (AACSB accredited and non-accredited) with an accounting program. There are 840 US schools listed. A phone call to the dean's office of every US school listed in the directory determined if the school offered a foreign-site undergraduate or graduate business experience. One-hundred fifty-one schools (18%) indicated that they had some type of study-abroad arrangement; 136 undergraduate (16% of the 840) and 68 graduate programs (8% of the 840).

Two questionnaires were mailed to all 151 schools that had some type of study-abroad arrangement. One questionnaire surveyed undergraduate programs; the other surveyed graduate programs. The questionnaires were reasonably similar and contained two sections. The first section asked seven demographic questions (university size, business school size, AACSB accreditation status, etc.). The second section specifically addressed the study-abroad program offered by the business school, and contained three parts. The first part asked questions about the program's arrangements (when it is offered, its length, number of students and faculty participating, etc.). The second and third sections queried the specific arrangements for a single-site program and multi-site program, respectively.

Sixty usable undergraduate and 37 usable graduate questionnaires were returned, for a response rate of 44% (60/136) and 54% (37/68), respectively. Since the response rates were reasonably high, follow-up procedures were not used.

Results: Undergraduate Business Programs

The respondent group represents universities and business schools of all sizes. Universities with enrolments of 5,000-10,000 accounted for approximately 24% of the group; enrolments of 10,001-15,000, 15,001-20,000, 20,001-25,000, and greater than 25,000 each accounted

Panel A – Term Study-Abroad Program Occurs

| | Undergraduate Programs Frequency (%) | Graduate Programs Frequency(%) |
|--------------|---|---|
| Normal term | 30 (30%) | 11 (21%) |
| Term break | 16 (16%) | 10 (19%) |
| Summer term | 45 (45%) | 24 (45%) |
| Other | 5 (5%) | 4 (8%) |
| No response | 4 (4%) | 4 (8%) |
| Total | 100 (100%) | 53 (101%) |

Panel B – Study-Abroad Program Length

| | Undergraduate Programs Frequency (%) | Graduate Programs Frequency (%) |
|----------------------|---|--|
| Less than 2 weeks | 10 (11%) | 11 (21%) |
| 2-3 weeks | 29 (31%) | 16 (31%) |
| 3-4 weeks | 15 (16%) | 11 (21%) |
| 5-6 weeks | 15 (16%) | 2 (4%) |
| Greater than 6 weeks | 19 (20%) | 8 (15%) |
| No response | 4 (4%) | 4 (8%) |
| Total | 93 (98%) | 52 (100%) |

Panel C – On-Site Coordinator

| | Undergraduate Programs Frequency (%) | Graduate Programs Frequency (%) |
|----------------------------------|---|--|
| Faculty | 33 (55%) | 22 (59%) |
| Staff – non-student | 7 (12%) | 3 (8%) |
| Staff – student (not in program) | 7 (12%) | 1 (3%) |
| Staff – student (in program) | 3 (5%) | 0 (0%) |
| Faculty and staff – non-student | 0 (0%) | 5 (14%) |
| No response | 10 (17%) | 6 (16%) |
| Total | 60 (101%) | 37 (100%) |

Panel D – Percent of Instruction Taught

| | Undergraduate Programs Mean | Graduate Programs Mean |
|-------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| By your faculty | 56.4 | 50.2 |
| By faculty from other schools | 39.9 | 46.6 |
| By non-university personnel | 3.7 | 3.2 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Panel E – Average Number of Participants Per Year

| | Undergraduate Programs Mean | Graduate Programs Mean |
|----------|--|-----------------------------------|
| Students | 64.6 | 25.8 |
| Faculty | 3.2 | 2.3 |

Table 1: Program Attributes^{a,b}

^aRegarding Panels A and B, some schools have more than one study-abroad program and each program might be offered at a different time; thus, the total is greater than 60 and/or 37 for undergraduate and graduate programs, respectively.

^bRegarding Panels A, B and C, percents might not total to 100% due to rounding.

for 18%-20% of the group. Business schools with enrolments of 1,501-4,000 accounted for 42% of the group, and enrolments of 500-1,000, 1,001-1,500 and greater than 4,000 each accounted for 17%-21% of the group. Only one school did not have AACSB accreditation. Approximately 54% of respondent institutions use a central administrator to coordinate undergraduate international aspects of business school.

Tables 1 and 2 provide general program attributes for those schools with an undergraduate study-abroad arrangement. Forty-five percent of the respondents indicated that they used the summer term for a study-abroad program (Table 1, Panel A). Clearly, it is the most common term for the programs, followed by the regular term (semester or quarter). The most common length of the study-abroad program is two-three weeks (31%); overall, 76% of the programs are six weeks or less (Panel B, Table 1). In greater than one-half of the programs the faculty member is the on-site coordinator (who is responsible for day-to-day events [e.g., classroom facilities, field trips] and handles all administrative duties while on site) (Panel C, Table D). Courses are taught primarily by university faculty: 56% by the school's own faculty and 40% by faculty from other schools (Panel D, Table 1). Average annual study-abroad enrolment per school is 65 students, covered on average by three faculty members (Panel E, Table 1).

The faculty member and the central administrator are most commonly responsible for determining course and program offerings (Panel A, Table 2). A review of Panel B in Table 2 indicates that the most common semester-hour (quarter-hour) configuration is three-six credit hours (four-eight quarter hours) – 56% of the respondents use this arrangement. International business courses and management courses are offered most frequently, and decision sciences, accountancy, and management information systems (MIS) are the least offered courses (Panel C, Table 2). Finally, per Panel D of Table 2, programs are roughly split regarding single-site versus multi-site arrangements.

Table 3 deals with location attributes of the programs. 'Other university facilities' is by far the most common arrangement used for instructional purposes in single-site programs, whereas 'other university facilities' and 'hotels' are most commonly used for instructional purposes in multi-site programs (Panel A, Table 3). The most common student housing arrangements for single-site programs are 'other university facilities,' followed closely by 'housing in local residences,' whereas 'hotels,' followed by 'other university housing,' are the most common arrangements for multi-site programs (Panel B, Table 3). In both types of programs, faculty are most frequently housed in hotels, followed by other university facilities (Panel C, Table 3).

Table 4 addresses class attributes of the programs. Per Panel A of Table 4, in both types of programs, classes are most frequently taught Monday through Thursday. Classes are held very infrequently on Saturday and Sunday (although multi-site programs use these days

with some frequency). Morning classes are the most common and evening classes the least common in both types of programs (Panel B, Table 4).

In the single-site programs, more than 50% of class time is spent in lectures or exams, with 19% of the time devoted to professional site visits (Panel C, Table 4). Class composition is much different for multi-site programs; approximately 34% of the time is spent on lectures and exams, with 21% of the time devoted to professional site visits. However, multi-site programs spend a much greater amount of time on social/cultural field trips and professional presentations than do single-site programs (Panel C, Table 4).

Finally, per Panel D of Table 4, approximately 44% of the students' grade is based on exams, and another 29% is based on written projects in single-site programs. This weighting is reversed in the multi-site programs; approximately 49% of the grade is based on written projects and 21% is based on exams. Also, multi-site programs place greater weight on class participation and class presentations.

Table 5 presents the base cities used in each type of program. Clearly, each program uses a wide variety of cities. Overall, 83 different cities are used in single-site programs and 67 different cities are used in multi-site programs. European cities are the most common in both programs.

Results: Graduate Business Programs

Business schools with graduate programs of all sizes are represented in our sample; however, those with enrolments of greater than 400 accounted for 50% of the group. The remaining 50 percent was made up equally of graduate programs of 50-100, 101-250, and 251-400. All of the respondent schools are AACSB accredited, and all but one use a central administrator to coordinate graduate international aspects of the business school.

Tables 1 and 2 provide general attributes for graduate study-abroad programs. Per Table 1, summer term is the most common term (45% of respondents use this). The most common length of the graduate study-abroad program is two to three weeks, although less than two weeks and three-four weeks are also common.

The faculty member is the on-site coordinator in approximately 59% of the graduate programs, and courses are taught primarily by university faculty (50% by the school's own faculty and 47% by faculty from other schools). The average annual graduate enrolment per school is 26 students, covered on average by two faculty members.

Table 2 indicates that the central administrator and the faculty member are the most common people responsible for determining course and graduate program offerings. Fifty-four percent of the respondents use the three-six semester hours (four-eight quarter hours) configuration. International business courses, marketing and man-

Panel A – Who Determines Courses/Program Offerings

| | Undergraduate Programs Frequency (%) | Graduate Programs Frequency (%) |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| Central administrator | 31 (30%) | 12 (29%) |
| Associate dean | 24 (23%) | 4 (10%) |
| Faculty member | 36 (35%) | 11 (26%) |
| Department chair | 3 (3%) | 1 (2%) |
| Other | 0 (0%) | 7 (17%) |
| No response | 9 (9%) | 7 (17%) |
| Total | 103 (100%) | 42 (101%) |

Panel B – Average Number of Credit Hours Offered in Study-Abroad Program

| | Undergraduate Programs Frequency (%) | Graduate Programs Frequency (%) |
|--|---|--|
| Less than 3 semester hours (4 quarter hours) | 2 (3%) | 2 (5%) |
| 3-6 semester hours (4-8 quarter hours) | 34 (56%) | 20 (54%) |
| 7-9 semester hours (9-12 quarter hours) | 9 (15%) | 4 (11%) |
| Greater than 9 semester hours (greater than 12 quarter hours) | 11 (18%) | 6 (16%) |
| No response | 5 (8%) | 5 (14%) |
| Total | 61 (100%) | 37 (100%) |

Panel C – Frequency of Course Offerings in Last Three Years

| | Undergraduate Programs Mean | Graduate Programs Mean |
|--------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| Accountancy | 4.33 | 2.74 |
| Decision Sciences | 1.37 | 3.22 |
| Economics | 8.89 | 9.44 |
| Finance | 10.13 | 9.30 |
| International Business | 27.80 | 31.44 |
| Management | 22.89 | 19.37 |
| Management Information Systems | 4.50 | 5.63 |
| Marketing | 16.54 | 20.56 |

Panel D – Location(s) Used in Study-Abroad Program

| | Undergraduate Programs Frequency (%) | Graduate Programs Frequency (%) |
|---|---|--|
| One location (single-site programs) | 37 (48%) | 21 (50%) |
| More than one location (multi-site program) | 35 (45%) | 15 (36%) |
| No response | 5 (6%) | 6 (14%) |
| Total | 77 (99%) | 42 (100%) |

Table 2: Program Attributes^{a,b}

^aRegarding Panels A and B and D, some schools have more than one study-abroad program and each program might be offered at a different time; thus, the total is greater than 60 and 37 for undergraduate and graduate programs, respectively.

^bRegarding Panels A, B and D, percents might not total to 100% due to rounding.

Panel A – Facilities Used for Instructional Purposes

| | Undergraduate Programs | | Graduate Programs | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | Single-Site Programs Frequency (%) | Multi-Site Programs Frequency (%) | Single-Site Programs Frequency (%) | Multi-Site Programs Frequency (%) |
| Hotels | 8 (18%) | 17 (37%) | 6 (24%) | 6 (33%) |
| Your university facilities | 3 (7%) | 3 (7%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (6%) |
| Conference centers | 1 (2%) | 2 (4%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (6%) |
| Other university facilities | 31 (70%) | 18 (39%) | 17 (68%) | 8 (44%) |
| No response | 1 (2%) | 6 (13%) | 2 (8%) | 2 (11%) |
| Total | 44 (99%) | 46 (100%) | 25 (100%) | 18 (100%) |

Panel B – Facilities Used for Student Housing

| | Undergraduate Programs | | Graduate Programs | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | Single-Site Programs Frequency (%) | Multi-Site Programs Frequency (%) | Single-Site Programs Frequency (%) | Multi-Site Programs Frequency (%) |
| Hotels | 11 (19%) | 24 (50%) | 12 (41%) | 11 (58%) |
| Your university housing | 2 (4%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other university housing | 25 (44%) | 14 (29%) | 12 (41%) | 4 (21%) |
| Local residences | 18 (32%) | 5 (10%) | 3 (10%) | 2 (11%) |
| No response | 1 (2%) | 5 (10%) | 2 (7%) | 2 (11%) |
| Total | 57 (101%) | 48 (99%) | 29 (99%) | 19 (101%) |

Panel C – Facilities Used for Faculty Housing

| | Undergraduate Programs | | Graduate Programs | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | Single-Site Programs Frequency (%) | Multi-Site Programs Frequency (%) | Single-Site Programs Frequency (%) | Multi-Site Programs Frequency (%) |
| Hotels | 22 (46%) | 26 (60%) | 12 (44%) | 12 (63%) |
| Your university housing | 3 (6%) | 1 (2%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Other university housing | 18 (38%) | 9 (21%) | 9 (33%) | 4 (21%) |
| Local residences | 4 (8%) | 1 (2%) | 2 (7%) | 1 (5%) |
| No response | 1 (2%) | 6 (14%) | 4 (15%) | 2 (11%) |
| Total | 48 (100%) | 43 (99%) | 27 (99%) | 19 (100%) |

Table 3: Study-Abroad Program Location Attributes^a

^aRegarding Panels A, B and C, some schools use more than one location; thus, the undergraduate total is greater than 37 and 35, respectively, and the graduate total is greater than 21 and 15, respectively. Also, percents might not total to 100% due to rounding.

Panel A – Days Class Usually Taught

| | Undergraduate Programs | | Graduate Programs | |
|--------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | Single-Site Programs Frequency (%) | Multi-Site Programs Frequency (%) | Single-Site Programs Frequency (%) | Multi-Site Programs Frequency (%) |
| Monday | 34 (20%) | 26 (18%) | 18 (20%) | 12 (17%) |
| Tuesday | 35 (20%) | 24 (17%) | 18 (20%) | 12 (17%) |
| Wednesday | 35 (20%) | 26 (18%) | 18 (20%) | 12 (17%) |
| Thursday | 35 (20%) | 26 (18%) | 18 (20%) | 12 (17%) |
| Friday | 28 (16%) | 21 (15%) | 15 (16%) | 11 (15%) |
| Saturday | 3 (2%) | 9 (6%) | 1 (1%) | 6 (8%) |
| Sunday | 1 (1%) | 5 (3%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (6%) |
| No response | 2 (1%) | 8 (6%) | 3 (3%) | 3 (4%) |
| Total | 173 (100%) | 145 (101%) | 91 (100%) | 72 (101%) |

Panel B – Time Slots Class Usually Taught

| | Undergraduate Programs | | Graduate Programs | |
|--------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | Single-Site Programs Frequency (%) | Multi-Site Programs Frequency (%) | Single-Site Programs Frequency (%) | Multi-Site Programs Frequency (%) |
| Morning | 30 (45%) | 28 (46%) | 18 (45%) | 12 (46%) |
| Afternoon | 24 (36%) | 20 (33%) | 15 (38%) | 8 (31%) |
| Evening | 10 (15%) | 7 (11%) | 5 (13%) | 3 (12%) |
| No response | 2 (3%) | 6 (10%) | 2 (5%) | 3 (12%) |
| Total | 66 (99%) | 61 (100%) | 40 (101%) | 26 (101%) |

Panel C – Average Composition (Percent) of Class Time

| | Undergraduate Programs | | Graduate Programs | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | Single-Site Programs Mean | Multi-Site Programs Mean | Single-Site Programs Mean | Multi-Site Programs Mean |
| Faculty lecture and exams | 50.3 | 33.9 | 40.4 | 29.5 |
| Student presentations | 5.7 | 8.3 | 5.2 | 7.0 |
| Professional presentations | 12.3 | 18.2 | 14.1 | 29.5 |
| Professional site visits | 19.0 | 20.9 | 29.1 | 21.0 |
| Social/cultural field trips | 12.4 | 18.9 | 11.2 | 13.0 |
| Total | 99.7 | 100.2 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Panel D – Average Composition (Percent) of Grade

| | Undergraduate Programs | | Graduate Programs | |
|---------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | Single-Site Programs Mean | Multi-Site Programs Mean | Single-Site Programs Mean | Multi-Site Programs Mean |
| Exams | 44.4 | 20.8 | 28.0 | 20.0 |
| Quizzes | 5.2 | 1.3 | 5.0 | 3.3 |
| Written projects | 29.4 | 49.2 | 41.0 | 62.2 |
| Class presentations | 9.6 | 12.2 | 6.5 | 5.6 |
| Class participation | 11.9 | 16.6 | 19.5 | 8.9 |
| Total | 100.5 | 100.1 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Table 4: Study-Abroad Program Class Attributes^{a, b}

^aRegarding Panels A and B, some schools have more than one study-abroad program and each program might be offered at a different time; thus, the total is greater than 60 and 37 for undergraduate and graduate programs, respectively.

^bRegarding Panels A, B, C and D, percents might not total to 100% due to rounding.

| Single-Site Programs | | Multi-Site Programs | |
|----------------------|---------------|---------------------|----------------|
| A – L | M – Z | A – L | M-Z |
| Angers | Maastricht | Amsterdam | Madrid |
| Athens | Madrid | Athens | Mainz |
| Augsburg | Mexico City | Augers | Mexico City |
| Bangkok | Milan | Barcelona | Milan |
| Belize City | Mosbach | Bath | Monterrey |
| Bergamo | Monterrey | Beijing | Montreal |
| Birmingham | Nagasaki | Berlin | Munich |
| Brighton | Nancy | Bonn | Nancy |
| Brussels | Nantes | Brisbane | Ottawa |
| Budapest | Nuremburg | Bristol | Paris |
| Cadiz | New Brunswick | Brussels | Prague |
| Canberra | Osaka | Budapest | Quebec City |
| Concepcion | Oslo | Caen | Rennes |
| Copenhagen | Oxford | Canberra | Rio de Janeiro |
| Coventry | Paderborn | Cologne | Rome |
| Den Haag | Paris | Cortino | Rovaniemi |
| Frankfurt | Plymouth | Den Haag | Salamanca |
| Freiberg | Prague | Dublin | Salzburg |
| Fremantle | Quebec City | Duisberg | San Jose |
| Grenada | Rome | Dubrovnik | Sao Paolo |
| Glasgow | Rosario | Edinburgh | Santiago |
| Guadalajara | Salamanca | Florence | Seoul |
| Guerrero | Salzburg | Floriana | Seville |
| Halifax | San Jose | Frankfurt | Sydney |
| Heidenham | Sansepolcro | Geneva | Tokyo |
| Hong Kong | Santiago | Glasgow | Toulouse |
| Hull | Seville | Granada | Venice |
| Jena | Shanghai | Grenoble | Vienna |
| Kobe | Sheffield | Guadalajara | Vina del Mar |
| Koblenz | Singapore | Heidelberg | Zurich |
| Lancaster | St. Giles | Innsbruck | |
| Leewarden | Stockholm | Lake Lugarno | |
| Limerick | Strasbourg | Lauterbrunnen | |
| Louvain | Stuttgart | Lille | |
| London | Sydney | Limerick | |
| Luleo | Tokyo | London | |
| Lund | Valencia | Luton | |
| Luton | Valparaiso | | |
| Luxembourg | Vera Cruz | | |
| Lyon | Verona | | |
| | Victoria | | |
| | Wales | | |
| | Zalapa | | |

Table 5: Study-Abroad Undergraduate Program Cities

Single-Site Programs

A – L

Asolo
Beijing
Belize City
Bonn
Chalfond
Colima
Dublin
Hong Kong
Linkoping
London
Lucia-le-Neuve
Luton

M – Z

Maastricht
Madrid
Marseille
Milan
Oslo
Pontypridd
Pozan
Prague
Rio de Janeiro
San Jose
Sapporo
Singapore
St Giles
Tokyo
Toulouse
Valparaiso
Vera Cruz
Warsaw

Multi-Site Programs

A – L

Amsterdam
Barcelona
Beijing
Berlin
Brisbane
Brussels
Caen
Cambridge
Canberra
Dublin
Grenoble
Lisboa
London

M-Z

Madrid
Managua
Milan
Monterrey
Paris
Prague
Ravaniemi
Rennes
Rio de Janeiro
Rome
Santiago
Sao Paolo
Shanghai
Singapore
Sydney
Vienna
Viña del Mar

Table 6: Study-Abroad Graduate Program Cities

agement courses are offered most frequently, and accountancy, decision sciences and MIS are the least offered. Finally, one-half of graduate programs are single-site programs.

Table 3 shows that 'other university facilities' are most commonly used for instructional purposes in both single-site and multi-site graduate programs: 68% and 44%, respectively. 'Hotels' (41%) and 'other university facilities' (41%) are the most common student-housing arrangements for single-site graduate programs, but 'hotels' (58%) clearly are the most common arrangements for multi-site graduate programs. Faculty are most frequently housed in hotels, followed by other university facilities, regardless of program type.

Table 4 addresses class attributes of the programs. In both single-site and multi-site graduate programs, classes are most frequently taught from Monday through Thursday. Very infrequently are classes held on Saturday and Sunday (although multi-site programs use these days with some frequency). Morning classes are the most common and evening classes the least common in both types of graduate programs. In the single-site programs, more than 40% of class time is spent in lectures or exams and 29% of the time is devoted to professional site visits.

Class composition differs for multi-site programs; approximately 30% of the time is spent on lectures and exams and another 30% of the time is devoted to professional presentations. Finally, approximately 41% of the student's grade is based on written projects in single-site graduate programs and another 29% of the students' grade is based on exams. Written projects are given much greater weight in the multi-site graduate programs (approximately 62%) and 20% of the grade is based on exams. Single-site programs also place much greater weight on class participation.

Table 6 contains the base cities used in each type of graduate program. Clearly, each program uses a wide variety of cities. Overall, 30 different cities are used in single-site graduate programs and 30 different cities are used in multi-site graduate programs. European cities are the most common in both programs.

Faculty Compensation and Student Cost

Faculty compensation and student cost are very significant considerations in a study-abroad program. Discussions with faculty involved in such programs and internet searches of and phone calls to a random sample of the schools were performed to obtain information about these items.

In general, most faculty receive compensation in the form of salary and payment of travel expenses. However, the composition of the package and the amounts provided vary significantly. Some faculty salaries are based on fixed dollar amounts (and these amounts ranged significantly), regardless of the number of credit hours taught. Some salaries are based on a percentage of the faculty member's nine-month salary (and these amounts also ranged significantly), and the percentages vary based on the number of credit hours in the program and the percent used to multiply the credit hours. In addition, a faculty member is usually compensated if he/she performs administrative duties, and again, the amount of compensation for these duties varies greatly.

Travel expenses reimbursement also varies significantly. Some schools have the philosophy that the faculty member should not use personal funds to pay a cost that essentially was incurred because of his/her being associated with the program. Other schools have a completely different philosophy, and appear to treat the study-

abroad assignment as a 'privilege' bestowed on the faculty who are teaching, and as such tend to reimburse very minimal amounts.

Student cost also varies significantly and is difficult to determine because schools use varying definitions of 'program costs' versus 'personal expenses.' The four main components of student cost are: tuition and fees, airfare, program fees, and personal expenses. Tuition and fees vary based on the number of credit hours offered, the cost per credit hour, and the type of fees schools charge (registration, general, etc.). Airfare varies depending on departure and arrival cities and whether all students have to be on the same flight departing from the USA. Program fees vary greatly depending on what is included in this designation. Items that might be included are: cost of housing and meals provided, transportation provided while on location (e.g. Eurail pass), books and handouts, field trips provided, and other items provided (trip insurance, subway passes, museum passes, etc). Personal expenses also vary greatly based in part on what is included (and not included) in program fees (e.g., some schools include the Eurail pass as a program fee while others treat it as a personal expense), how much "free" time students have, and students' consumption habits.

Discussion

National data indicate that approximately 10% of all US college students study abroad. The results of this study suggest that business schools might be well above that average because 18% of all business schools contacted indicated that they had some type of study-abroad arrangement in place, with 16% offering an undergraduate program. This is further exemplified in that the average enrolment in business study-abroad programs is 65 undergraduate and 26 graduate students, with three faculty members involved with undergraduate study-abroad programs and two with graduate study-abroad programs. However, in general, business schools do follow the national norm with respect to the duration of their study-abroad programs (relatively short) and the most common term of study (summer).

The results of this study also provide insight to factors that affect program structure. A short program is better than a long program; it is less costly and easier to administer and coordinate. Summer term is most common because it is less disruptive on faculty and student schedules. Three- to six-semester hour (or quarter-hour equivalent) programs are most common because larger programs increase costs, create scheduling problems, and restrict student free time. Smaller and shorter programs also are more costly from a student academic-program perspective because some costs (e.g. airfare) are fixed.

The results also suggest that more technical courses such as accounting and decision sciences are not offered; however, an opportunity exists to develop courses in these areas that are better suited for short-term,

study-abroad programs. For example, a comparative accounting course that provides students with an introduction to accounting issues (measurement differences) across countries, provides some taxation comparisons and elementary international taxation issues, and takes advantage of professionals in the study-abroad country (countries) might be well received by an untapped group of students. Alternatively, a managerial accounting course dealing with comparative managerial and cost accounting practices across countries could be used. Besides having chapters in the USA, the Institute of Management Accountants (IMA 2007) has chapters in 12 other countries: Canada, Egypt, Germany, Japan, Netherlands, Palestine, Philippines, South Korea, Saudi Arabia, Taiwan, Turkey, and United Arab Emirates. Turkey is the most recent member, having launched its chapter in November 2006 (Tumay 2007). Interacting with professionals in some of these chapters as part of the study-abroad program would help create an excellent experience. Business schools might increase enrolments if they are able to develop courses in the technical areas that would fit the study-abroad model.

A significant consideration is whether to have a single-site or multi-site program. Surprisingly, business schools are almost equal in using a single-site program versus a multi-site program for undergraduate study-abroad. Graduate programs use single-site locations more frequently. Each type of program has advantages and disadvantages, and the results indicate that each provides a different student experience.

Multi-site programs generally are more difficult to organize and coordinate and can be more costly. The greater reliance on hotels can add cost to the program and complexity to the organizing and planning stages of the program. Because they are used in undergraduate programs with almost the same frequency as single-site programs and with reasonable frequency in graduate programs suggests that the perceived benefits of multi-site programs probably are greater than those of single-site programs.

The greater reliance on morning classes in general and particularly in multi-site programs is expected. This frees up the afternoon and evenings for students so they can explore the base city on their own. This is crucial if they have limited time in a city (which occurs in a multi-site program).

Facility usage should align with the type of program. Using another university's facilities is easier to coordinate and plan (and other universities are more amenable to this arrangement) if the program is on-site for longer periods rather than shorter periods. Greater reliance on hotels simplifies planning if the group is at multiple locations for short time periods.

Overall, the results provide descriptive evidence on structural issues of business study-abroad programs. These results in conjunction with Holland and Kedia's (2003) results provide information on many aspects of such programs. However, as noted in the next section, further study is needed.

Future Research

US business schools are using study-abroad programs to help internationalize their curricula and faculty. Many different organizational arrangements are used. It is clear that there remain many opportunities for schools to establish study-abroad programs. The results of the current study provide aggregate, descriptive information regarding study-abroad structural issues of US business schools. However, it is clear that certain aspects of the programs have not been studied empirically. This lack of information provides opportunities for future research in the area.

Some studies have identified benefits and problem areas of their own programs but generally have not quantified these benefits and problems; nor have they attempted to do so on a large-scale basis (i.e. looking at many programs). For example, how have faculty, students, and the school benefited from the program? Are the benefits transferable to other areas in the school? What problems consistently occur regardless of efforts to control them? Since study-abroad programs are being used by business schools with greater frequency, a large-scale study designed to specifically identify and quantify benefits and problematic areas based on what occurs in many programs (from planning through return follow-up) would be very useful.

Finally, as universities in other countries expand their programs to include foreign experiences, they will need guidance on general aspects of study-abroad programs. They also will need guidance on issues specific to non-USA universities. Existing research addressing US business study-abroad programs can provide helpful guidance; however, studies similar to the current study, and ones addressing study-abroad benefits and problematic areas, dealing with non-USA programs would provide useful information to these universities.

References

- Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business International (AACSB) 2006, *Eligibility Procedures and Accreditation Standards for Business Accreditation*, Revised January 2006, AACSB International (Tampa, FL), <http://www.aacsb.edu>,
- Bailey, B.A. & D.A. Harbeck 2002, 'Liability Issues Associated with Planning and Executing a Foreign Study Tour for Undergraduates,' *Journal of the Academy of Business Education*, Fall, 106-111.
- Barker, C.M. 2000, *Education for International Understanding and Global Competence*, Carnegie Corporation of New York, New York, NY.
- Collins, H.T., Czarra, F.R. & Smith, A.F. 1998, 'Guidelines for Global and International Studies Education: Challenges, Culture, and Connections,' *Social Education*, 62, 50, 311-317.
- Duke, C.R. 2000, 'Study Abroad Learning Activities: A Synthesis and Comparison,' *Journal of Marketing Education*, 22, 2, 155-165.
- Festervand, T.A. & Skelley, G.U. 2003, 'Study-Abroad Programs as a Faculty Development and Accreditation Tool,' *Journal of the Academy of Business Education*, Spring, 101-108.
- Friedman, Thomas L. 2005, *The World Is Flat: A Brief History of the Twenty-First Century*, Farrar, Straus and Giroux, New York, NY.
- Fugate, D.L. & Lassk, F. 2003, 'Are US Students Prepared for Careers in International Business? A Multinational Study of Worldview,' *Journal of the Academy of Business Education*, Fall, 53-62.
- Garson, B. 2005, 'Teaching Abroad: A Cross-Cultural Journey,' *Journal of Education for Business*, July/August, 322-326.
- Hasselback, J.R. 2003, *Accounting Faculty Directory 2003-2004*, Prentice Hall, Inc., Upper Saddle River, NJ.
- Hesel, R.A. & Green, M.F. 2000, 'College-Bound Students' Strong Interest in International Education Contrasts with Actual College Experience,' *StudentPOLL*, 4, 3, <http://www.artsci.com/studentonline.cfm>.
- Holland, K.M. & Kedia, B.L. 2003, 'Internationalizing Business Students through the Study Abroad Experience: Opportunities and Challenges,' *Advances in International Marketing*, 13, 115-139.
- Institute of International Education 2006a, 'Open Doors: Duration of Study Abroad,' IEE Network, <http://opendoors.iienetwork.org/?p=69716>.
- Institute of International Education 2006b, 'Open Doors: Fast Facts,' IEE Network, http://opendoors.iienetwork.org/file_depot/0-10000000/0-10000/3390/folder/48524/Open+Doors+2005_FastFacts_FINAL.pdf
- Institute of International Education 2006c, 'Open Doors: Fields of Study,' IEE Network, <http://opendoors.iienetwork.org/?p=69709>.

- Institute of International Education 2006d, 'Open Doors: Host Regions,' IEE Network, <http://opendoors.iienetwork.org/?p=69707>.
- Institute of International Education 2006e, 'Open Doors: Leading Destinations,' IEE Network, <http://opendoors.iienetwork.org/?p=60703>.
- Institute of Management Accountants (IMA) (2007), International Directory, http://www.imanet.org/membership_communitites_international_chapters.asp
- Keillor, B.D. & J.R. Emore 2003, 'The Structure and Process of Curriculum Integration in Study-Abroad Programs: The University of Akron International Business Model,' *Advances in International Marketing*, 13, 227-245.
- Kwok, C.C. & Arpan J.S. 2002, 'Internationalizing the Business School: A Global Survey in 2000,' *Journal of International Business Studies*, 33, 3, 571-581.
- Maskulka, T.A. & Stout, D.E. 2006, 'How to Design and Implement a Short Study-Abroad Tour,' *Retail Education Today*, 26, 4, 32-37.
- Porcano, T.M, Snavely, W.B., Shull, D.M. & Staton, W. 2004, 'Creating a Multi-Site Summer Study Abroad Program,' in Wankel, C. & DeFillipi, R (eds) *The Cutting Edge of International Management Education*, Information Age Publishing: Greenwich, CT.
- Praetzel, G.D., Curcio, J. & Dilorenzo J. 1996, 'Making Study Abroad a Reality for All Students,' *International Advances in Economic Research*, 2, 2, 174-182.
- Sindt, P. & Pachmayer, A. 2005, 'Identifying the Outcomes of Short Term Study Abroad,' Institute of International Education, <http://www.iienetwork.org/page85022/>
- Trevino, L.J. & Melton, M. 2002, 'Institutional Characteristics and Preconditions for International Business Education – An Empirical Investigation,' *Journal of Education for Business*, March/April, 230-235.
- Tumay, S. 2007, 'IMA Establishes Chapter in Istanbul, Turkey,' *Strategic Finance*, February, 19-20.
- Vande Berg, M. 2003, 'The Case for Assessing Educational Outcomes in Study Abroad,' *Advances in International Marketing*, 13, 23-26.
- Voris, W. 1997, 'A Retrospective International Business Education in the US over the Past Fifty Years,' *International Executive*, 39, 2, 271-282.
- Wynne, K. & Filante, R.W. 2004, 'An Innovative Approach to the Design and Implementation of an International Finance Course,' *Journal of Education for Business*, July/August, 230-235.