
Peter B. Gustavson School of Business

Faculty Publications

This is a post-review version of the following article:

Business students' choice of short-term or long-term study abroad opportunities

Stacey R. Fitzsimmons, David J. Flanagan & Xiaodan "Abby" Wang

2013

The final publication is available at Journal of Teaching in International Business
via:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08975930.2013.819710>

Fitzsimmons, S.R., Flanagan, D.J. & Wang, X.A. (2013). Business students' choice of short-term or long-term study abroad opportunities. *Journal of Teaching in International Business*, 24(2), 125-137.

Business Students' Choice of
Short-Term or Long-Term Study Abroad Opportunities

Stacey R. Fitzsimmons^a

David J. Flanagan

Xiaodan "Abby" Wang

Haworth College of Business
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, MI 49008 USA

- a. Corresponding author: Phone: +1 269-387-5751 email: stacey.fitzsimmons@wmich.edu

This is a pre-publication version of the manuscript. Please cite as:

Fitzsimmons, S.R., Flanagan, D.J. & Wang, X.A. (2013) Business students' choice of short-term or long-term study abroad opportunities. *Journal of Teaching in International Business*, 24, 125-137.

Business Students' Choice of
Short-Term or Long-Term Study Abroad Opportunities

Abstract

Recent years have seen a proliferation of short-term study abroad opportunities. Although they are both supplementing and replacing semester-long study abroad programs, research has focused primarily on semester (long-term) programs. We draw on the theory of planned behavior (TPB) to explore factors that predict why students choose long-term and short-term programs. Results indicate that students perceive more social pressure to engage in short-term programs, and higher barriers limiting participation in long-term programs. All TPB factors significantly predicted students' intentions to study abroad in both short-term and long-term programs with one exception; perceived behavioral control did not significantly predict intentions to participate in short-term programs. These findings can be used to improve marketing of short-term and long-term programs by addressing student concerns specific to each type of program, potentially increasing the number of students choosing to study abroad.

Keywords: Study abroad; Theory of Planned Behavior; Exchange; Short-term; Long-term

Address correspondence to Stacey R. Fitzsimmons, Haworth College of Business, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI 49008 USA

Email addresses: stacey.fitzsimmons@wmich.edu (first author), david.flanagan@wmich.edu (second author), xiaodan.wang@wmich.edu (third author)

1. INTRODUCTION

Current business students are being trained for an increasingly global work environment. Students, accrediting bodies, and the general public have all issued calls to help prepare students by further internationalizing business education (Kean & Hamilton, 2008; NAFSA, 2006). Business schools have long attempted to address this issue by promoting semester-long study abroad programs, where students move to the host country and attend university there instead of attending the home university. More recently, institutions have also started offering increasing numbers of short-term study abroad programs, ranging from one to eight weeks in length (Sachau, Brasher, & Fee, 2010). These programs are usually faculty-led, where a group of students from the home university travel abroad together, visiting several sites or working on an experiential project together in the host country. Indeed, out of 273,996 U.S. students who studied abroad in 2010/11, 58% attended short-term programs, up from 41% a decade earlier (Institute of International Education, 2009). As a relatively new phenomenon, research on short-term study abroad programs has focused primarily on examining student outcomes. Evidence is mixed, with studies finding both positive outcomes (Carlson, Burn, Useem, & Yachimowicz, 1990; Litvin, 2003) and no change in students (Ceasar & Jones-Rikker, 2001; Gullekson, Tucker, Coombs Jr., & Wright, 2011; Kitsantas, 2004). Perhaps in response to these mixed outcomes, a separate stream of research offers practical advice on how to build and run a study abroad program (Henthorne, Miller, & Hudson, 2001; Sachau et al., 2010). Although knowledge about how to run effective short-term programs, and the range of possible outcomes they predict, are both important, they do not explain why students choose short-term or long-term study abroad programs. Without a clear and theoretically-grounded understanding of potential reasons why students choose short- or long-term study abroad programs, marketing these new programs runs the risk of ‘missing the mark’, by inadequately addressing students’ concerns or appealing to their motivations.

In this study, we address this gap in the literature by applying the theory of planned behavior (Ajzen, 1991; Ajzen & Fishbein, 1977), comparing business students’ intentions to apply for short- or long-term study abroad programs, in order to measure the degree to which antecedent factors differentiate between these two categories of programs.

2. THEORY OF PLANNED BEHAVIOR AND STUDENT INTENTIONS TO STUDY ABROAD

The theory of planned behavior (TPB; Ajzen, 1985, 1991; Ajzen & Fishbein, 1977) is well-suited to answering the question about why students choose to apply for short-term or long-term study abroad programs; the theory has a long history of supportive evidence. Indeed, the TPB has been applied across

domains as varied as driving speed (Elliott, Armitage, & Baughan, 2003), leisure choice (Ajzen & Driver, 1992) and rule-following among residents at homeless shelters (Broadhead-Fearn & White, 2006), and a meta-analysis of studies applying the TPB found that it accounts for 39% of variance in intentions and 27% of variance in behaviors (Armitage & Conner, 2001). The TPB is an extension of Fishbein and Ajzen's earlier theory of reasoned action, which posited that intentions are the best predictor of behavior, and that attitudes and subjective norms together predict intentions (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). Attitudes are individuals' global assessments of a behavior as generally positive versus negative, while subjective norms are individuals' perceived social pressure to engage in a behavior from significant others. Although the theory of reasoned action has been found to predict both intentions and behaviors, when the action can be controlled by individuals, such as choosing a fast food restaurant for dinner, it is less successful at predicting actions beyond individuals' control, such as deciding to buy a house that is dependent on a bank's approval of the mortgage (Ajzen, 1985, 1991; Ajzen & Fishbein, 1977). In response to this limitation, Ajzen incorporated the concept of perceived behavioral control into the TPB (Ajzen, 1985, 1991), referring to the degree to which individuals perceive that they have the ability to enact the target action. Thus, the TPB posits that behavioral intentions are determined by three antecedent factors: attitudes, subjective norms and perceived behavioral control.

In the context of predicting students' intentions to study abroad, the TPB can be used to classify factors found in prior studies, that either prompt students to apply, or inhibit them from applying. Although there is a long history of studies predicting why students decide to study abroad, these studies have generally focused on more traditional, semester-long programs, or adopted a generic study abroad concept to encompass all types of programs. Since even the earliest studies found that motivations to study abroad are complex, with no one factor explaining the majority of intentions (Gullahorn & Gullahorn, 1958), we argue that it is important to differentiate between short- or long-term study abroad programs when examining student decision processes. To do this, we draw on prior research on student decisions to study abroad, and explore the data in two stages. In stage one, we develop and test hypotheses for mean differences in each antecedent factor across short-term versus long-term programs. In stage two, we explore the degree to which each factor influences intentions to apply for short-term or long-term programs.

2.1 Stage one: Hypothesis development

As mentioned above, prior studies have examined why students intend to study abroad, although they do not differentiate between short-term and long-term programs. By categorizing prior results into

the three factors from the TPB, we can develop arguments for expected mean differences in each factor, based on the type of study abroad program being considered.

2.1.1 Attitudinal factors influencing students' intentions to study abroad. Attitudes refer to individuals' global assessments of a behavior as generally having a positive versus negative valence (Ajzen, 1991). Prior studies have found that students are more likely to indicate they intend to study abroad when they develop goals or motivations to do so, indicating they value it highly (Kitsantas, 2004; Nyaupane, Paris, & Teye, 2011). The reasons why students develop positive attitudes toward study abroad programs can be categorized into two general factors: developmental factors, such as learning a language, career advancement, or developing professional skills; and 'fun' factors, such as opportunities for social engagements, adventure and excitement (Schroth & McCormack, 2000), or opportunities for new social, personal, linguistic or cultural activities (Wiers-Jenssen, 2003). A negative "fun" factor, impeding students' intentions to study abroad, is perceived riskiness (Luethge, 2004), where individuals who have never traveled to a specific region (or who have never traveled at all) are also more likely to perceive international travel as inherently risky, and thus less fun, compared to those who have traveled there before (Sonmez & Graefe, 1998).

We expect that students will have more positive attitudes about long-term programs than short-term programs, based primarily on the perception that long-term programs provide more extensive developmental opportunities. Long-term programs provide more opportunities for language learning, cultural immersion, and personal growth and independence, compared to short-term programs, and we would expect students to perceive this difference. In contrast, some students may perceive short-term programs to be more "fun" than long-term programs, based on lower levels of perceived riskiness (traveling with friends and a known faculty member, rather than traveling by oneself, is likely to be seen as less risky), combined with fun activities that are often bundled into short-term programs, such as scuba diving, exploring nightlife, or tourist activities (Sachau et al., 2010). However, other students may perceive long-term programs to be more fun than short-term programs, based on higher levels of freedom for long-term study abroad participants. Since we expect that students will have more positive attitudes about long-term programs with respect to developmental factors, and we expect no significant difference on fun factors, we expect that students will generally value long-term programs more positively than short-term programs:

H1: Student attitudes towards study abroad will be more positive for long-term than short-term programs.

2.1.2 Subjective norms influencing students' intentions to study abroad. Subjective norms refer to individuals' perceived social pressure to engage in a behavior from significant others (Ajzen, 1991). For

example, prior studies found that students are more likely to engage in study abroad when they perceive that potential employers value international experience among job applicants (Emanoil, 1999). It is important to note that perceived social pressure is more important than actual social pressure, with respect to influencing students' intentions. For example, although there is evidence that students who study abroad get more international job opportunities post-graduation, compared to those who do not (Wiers-Jenssen, 2008), students may or may not perceive that to be the case, and this perception is the driving force behind intentions.

Potential employers are not necessarily the most important stakeholder for undergraduate business students. Indeed, results from a qualitative study of American, French and Chinese students' intentions to study abroad indicate that family and friends are more likely to be important stakeholders than potential employers, for undergraduate students (Sánchez, Fornerino, & Zhang, 2006). Students from all three cultural groups stated they would be less likely to study abroad when none of their friends had studied abroad, or when they thought it would be a burden for their families if they studied abroad, due to being unavailable for an extended period of time. If students are primarily concerned about being unavailable for an extended period of time, they are likely to perceive a bigger burden for long-term programs than short-term programs. Thus, we expect students to perceive lower social pressure to attend long-term study abroad programs, compared to short-term programs.

H2: Students will perceive more social pressure to engage in short-term than long-term study abroad programs.

2.1.3 Perceived behavioral control influencing students' intentions to study abroad. Perceived behavioral control refers to a person's belief that they have the ability to successfully complete an endeavor (Ajzen, 1991). In the context of study abroad, a person with a high degree of behavioral control would believe that they can actually complete a study abroad program if they desire. Prior studies have found that students can face an array of challenges with regard to completing a study abroad, and that these challenges inhibit students from applying. Examples of possible barriers include managing logistics for distance learning students (Slotkin, Durie, & Eisenberg, 2012), limited money or time, work commitments that impede flexibility, or the possibility that a study abroad program will delay graduation (Henthorne et al., 2001; Marcum, 2001; Sánchez et al., 2006). Financial controls were common concerns among potential study abroad participants from the U.S., France and China (Sánchez et al., 2006). Specifically, students from all three countries were worried about going into debt, and not being able to meet financial obligations at home (Sánchez et al., 2006). Given that financial and time issues emerge most consistently from the literature on study abroad, they are likely to be especially influential. Thus, we expect students to perceive higher levels of perceived behavioral control with respect to short-term over

long-term programs, because there are lower time requirements to attend short-term programs, and shorter programs are often perceived to cost less than longer programs.

H3: Students' perceived behavioral control will be higher for short-term than long-term programs.

2.2 Stage two: Exploring each factor's influence

The three hypotheses developed here about expected mean differences between short-term and long-term programs were based on prior findings about the antecedents of students' intentions to study abroad. However, the mere existence of a mean difference in an antecedent factor does not necessarily influence students' intentions to study abroad. That is, it is possible that student attitudes have more influence on students' intentions to participate in short-term versus long-term programs, whereas perceived behavioral control may have more influence on intentions to participate in long-term programs. Given the dearth of prior evidence comparing students' intentions to participate in short-term versus long-term study abroad, our second stage of research is exploratory. After testing our hypotheses about mean differences for each factor across short-term and long-term programs, we will explore the degree to which each factor influences intentions to study abroad, for short-term and long-term programs. Our goal is to seek initial evidence about whether the components of the theory of planned behavior predict student intentions for both long *and* short programs in similar ways.

3. METHODOLOGY AND RESULTS

This study was conducted with a paper questionnaire, fully completed by 204 undergraduate business students at a university in the American Midwest (mean age = 20.4 years, standard deviation = 2.6 years, 137 male, 67 female). This sample size is similar to those from earlier papers on predicting intentions to study abroad (e.g. 125 and 188 participants in Goel, de Jong, & Schnusenber, 2011; Presley, Damron-Martinez, & Zhang, 2010, respectively). Participants were recruited from a sophomore-level required business course, and offered course credit in exchange for participation. Class time was given to complete the survey and all students were given an opportunity to participate.

3.1 Measures

Unless otherwise noted, all scales were measured with 5-point Likert-type scales developed by Presley, Damron-Martinez and Zhang (2010), where higher values indicate higher levels of the measured

construct (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree). Each scale was repeated twice, with reference to short-term and long-term programs. At the university where this research was conducted, short-term programs are two weeks long, while long-term programs last a semester, so this more precise wording (two-week versus semester-long) was used in lieu of short-term versus long-term. All alpha coefficients are standardized. *Intention to study abroad* (short-term alpha = .96; long-term alpha = .96) was measured with a three-item scale; a sample item is “I plan to go on a two-week study abroad program”. *Attitudes* were measured with a five-item scale (short-term alpha = .95; long-term alpha = .96); a sample item is “Semester-long study abroad programs are positive”. *Subjective norms* were measured with a three-item scale (short-term alpha = .69; long-term alpha = .84); a sample item is “Most people whose opinions I value would approve of my doing a two-week study abroad program”. Finally, *perceived behavioral control* was measured with a four-item scale (short-term alpha = .78; long-term alpha = .80); a sample item is “For me to do a semester-long study abroad program would be easy”. Thus, higher values for perceived behavioral control indicates *fewer* perceived barriers.

3.2 Analysis and results

Correlations, means and standard deviations appear in Table 1. Both short-term and long-term intentions to study abroad were positively correlated with their respective predictors, supporting the relationships implied by TPB. Specifically, short-term intention to study abroad was positively correlated with short-term attitudes ($r = .54, p < .01$), subjective norms ($r = .63, p < .01$) and perceived behavioral control ($r = .38, p < .01$), while long-term intention to study abroad was positively correlated with long-term attitudes ($r = .46, p < .01$), subjective norms ($r = .67, p < .01$) and perceived behavioral control ($r = .48, p < .01$). Age was negatively correlated with short-term perceived behavioral control ($r = -.24, p < .01$), indicating that older students saw more barriers to attending short-term programs than younger students, and gender was positively correlated with long-term attitudes ($r = .20, p < .01$) and negatively correlated with perceived behavioral controls ($r = -.15, p < .05$), indicating that while females had more positive attitudes about long-term programs, compared to males, they perceived more barriers to attending. Both gender effects are consistent with those found by Presley, Damron-Martínez and Zhang (2010). For this reason, we control for age and gender in all regression analyses.

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

We conducted tests of mean differences to test hypotheses about perceived differences in TPB predictors, across short-term and long-term programs (Table 2). Participants perceived significantly higher levels of subjective norms for short-term versus long-term programs ($t = 8.46, p < .01$), supporting hypothesis two. They also perceived significantly higher levels of behavioral control for short-term versus long-term programs ($t = 7.93, p < .01$), supporting hypothesis three. There was no significant difference in perceived attitudes for short-term versus long-term programs, indicating no support for hypothesis one. Finally, students were significantly more likely to report intentions to participate in a short-term study abroad program, than a long-term study abroad program ($t = 7.62, p < .01$).

INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

Correlations in table 1 provide initial evidence of how the TPB components relate to student intentions. They do not, however, allow us to examine relationships between each factor while holding other factors in the model constant. Thus, we also conducted regression analyses using student intentions as the dependent variable and TPB constructs as independent variables. In order to examine the explanatory variance of independent variables beyond our demographic controls, we conducted two regression models for each study abroad category, regressing intention to study abroad on a short-term program, and intention to study abroad on a long-term program, on independent variables, as presented in Table 3. Age and gender were entered as controls in model one, followed by three antecedent factors (attitudes, subjective norms and perceived behavioral control) in model two. Both control-only models predicted 0% of the variance in intention to study abroad (short-term adjusted $R^2 = .00, F = .59, p = ns$; long-term adjusted $R^2 = .00, F = .51, p = ns$). Together, the controls and three TPB factors explained 48% of variance in intention to study abroad on a short-term program (adjusted $R^2 = .48, F = 38.93, p < .01$) and 49% of variance in intention to study abroad on a long-term program (adjusted $R^2 = .49, F = 39.55, p < .01$). Specifically, attitudes (short-term $B = .53, p < .01$; long-term $B = .19, p < .05$) and subjective norms (short-term $B = .77, p < .01$; long-term $B = .57, p < .01$) were significantly related to intention to participate in both short-term and long-term programs, while perceived behavioral control was only significantly related to intention to participate in long-term programs (short-term $B = .10, p = ns$; long-term $B = .22, p < .01$). These results indicate general support for the TPB model. We discuss implications for individual predictors in the following section.

INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

4. DISCUSSION

As short-term study abroad programs become more popular, it is important to understand how antecedent factors influence students' decisions to attend either short-term or long-term programs. Thus, the purpose of this study was to examine and compare perceptions of antecedents, and the degree to which each factor influences students' intentions to attend short-term or long-term programs. Taken together, the results provide support for the general claim that there are significant differences in students' pre-application assessment of their intentions to attend short-term versus long-term study abroad programs, and that these differences can be partially attributed to differences in student perceptions of attitudes, subjective norms and behavioral control. In particular, students perceive higher levels of subjective norms pushing them to attend short-term programs (supporting H2), and also saw lower barriers to attending short-term programs (supporting H3), although they had equally positive attitudes about both types of programs (no support for H1), and were more likely to report intentions to attend short-term programs than long-term programs.

At an exploratory level, the results suggest that TPB antecedent factors may have differing impacts on intentions to study abroad, depending whether students are considering short-term or long-term programs. Specifically, while perceived behavioral control was higher for short term programs, it did not significantly predict intentions to participate in short-term programs. A possible explanation for this finding is that students who report low levels of behavioral control for short term programs (indicating higher perceived barriers), feel that barriers are usually surmountable, and thus they still feel capable of accomplishing a short-term study abroad program. As predicted, behavioral control had a significant impact on intentions to attend long-term study abroad programs. This is consistent with much of the literature. However, results should be interpreted with caution, in light of the limitations.

4.1 Limitations

The demographic of our sample is both a limitation – in that Midwestern American students may not be representative of a larger student body – and a strength – in that Midwestern American students may be among the most resistant to studying abroad, due to relatively low levels of international

experience prior to attending university (McKenzie, Lopez, & Bowes, 2010). All variables were reported by participants on the same survey instrument, so common method bias and self-report inaccuracies should both be considered when interpreting results. Keeping these limitations in mind, there are several theoretical and practical implications that can be drawn from these results.

4.2 Theoretical implications

Findings from this study indicate possible areas where future research could refine the application of the TPB. Applications usually consider each factor to be an amalgam of specific instances of that factor. For example, subjective norms are usually measured as a combination of perceived social pressure from each relevant stakeholder (e.g. Presley et al., 2010). However, there is no theoretical rationale why target individuals would perceive similar levels of social pressure from different stakeholders; they may perceive that parents, friends and significant others prefer that they stay home, while professors or employers prefer that they develop more international experience, and this possibility is observable in relatively lower standardized alphas for this construct. The findings from this study show that students perceive more social pressure to engage in short-term programs, and higher barriers limiting participation in long-term programs. An alternative explanation of this difference could be differences within TPB factors. By treating each factor as an amalgam of specific instances of that factor, we may miss the explanatory power of different sub-factors, which may impact outcomes differently across contexts. It may be useful in future studies to divide stakeholders into groups, rather than asking about all stakeholders together. Future applications of the TPB might consider looking beyond the amalgamated factors, also examining differences within factors. We argue that this may be especially appropriate for attitudes and subjective norms.

A similar argument can be applied to the TPB attitudinal factor. We had expected student attitudes towards study abroad to be higher for long-term over short-term programs, based on the assumption that students would perceive higher levels of personal development and learning in long-term programs. In contrast, we found no difference in student attitudes towards short-term and long-term programs. One possible reason for this finding might be that students saw both programs as positive, but for different reasons. Specifically, in the hypothesis development section of this paper, we identified two general types of attitudes with respect to study abroad programs: developmental factors, such as learning a language or developing professional skills; and “fun” factors, such as opportunities for new social engagements, new cultural activities, adventure and excitement (Schroth & McCormack, 2000; Wiers-Jenssen, 2003). We argued that students would likely value long-term programs primarily for

developmental reasons, and short-term programs primarily for ‘fun’ reasons. We had assumed that developmental factors would be a stronger indicator of value than fun factors, but that may not necessarily be the case, and it is possible that individuals’ contrasting evaluations of each factor washed out any overall mean differences in student attitudes towards short-term and long-term programs. Future researchers in this area might consider closely examining student attitudes towards short-term and long-term programs, with the objective of potentially dividing general TPB attitudes into sub-factors that help to explain why students perceive both types of programs to be equally positive.

Thus, there is evidence that future studies might benefit from within-factor analysis of both attitudinal factors and subjective norms. This type of close examination would potentially complement the usual higher-level analysis conducted with amalgamated factors, offering findings about how each of the general factors influence the dependent variable, and also the degree to which specific items drive each factor’s influence. This type of within-factor analysis may also have practical implications for study abroad program development or marketing, by providing evidence about specific areas of concern for students considering each type of study abroad program.

4.3 Practical implications

One of the most surprising results was that student intentions to study abroad on short-term programs were not significantly predicted by perceived behavioral control. This implies that students primarily consider social pressure and attitudes, when making decisions about whether to attend a short-term program, whereas they also consider their ability to carry out a long-term program. Thus, if student intentions to participate in long-term programs are influenced by perceived barriers, it would seem prudent for faculty champions and administrators to focus attention on removing or alleviating some of these perceived barriers for students. Given that students usually report time and money limitations as among the most important factors limiting their participation in study abroad programs (Sánchez et al., 2006), program administrators and faculty champions might choose to focus on these two concerns, illustrating why long-term programs are cost-effective and unlikely to hinder progress towards degree completion. In addition, faculty champions and administrators should also focus marketing of long-term programs on attitudinal and subjective norm factors, as is the case for short-term programs.

The same considerations about alleviating potential barriers to participation may be less important when designing short-term programs. That is, if student intentions to participate in short-term programs are not influenced by perceived barriers, then perhaps faculty champions and administrators marketing short-term programs to students can focus less attention on defraying concerns about these barriers; instead, they might be better served by focusing marketing of short-term programs on attitudinal and

subjective norm factors, such as advertising them as fun, developmentally useful, and socially expected. For example, programs might consider asking both prior participants and local employers to speak to potential participants, to reinforce the idea that attending a short-term program was both fun and useful in the eyes of prospective employers. The relationship between perceived behavioral control and intentions to attend study abroad programs might help to explain why short-term programs are increasingly popular.

As mentioned in our limitations section, it is important to note that we sampled students at a Midwestern U.S. business school. Our results may generalize to similar student populations; however, we encourage faculty and administrators promoting study abroad programs to periodically survey students at their own universities. Perceptions about study abroad could be different at various schools due to student experiences (orientation programs for instance) and cultural norms that have evolved among students. The methodology and factors examined in our study could be used as a basis for such a survey. By regularly examining student perceptions about short- and long-term study abroad programs and how those perceptions impact students' decision processes, researchers can help to develop and market study abroad programs that target local student populations.

Limitations notwithstanding, the results from our study indicate that those in charge of marketing study abroad programs to students would be well advised to focus more attention on defraying perceived barriers for long-term programs, and less for short-term programs. Meanwhile, both types of programs would benefit from marketing that emphasizes programs' positive value and stakeholder expectations that students participate in study abroad programs.

5. CONCLUSION

The three general factors of the theory of planned behavior significantly explained students' intentions to participate in both short-term and long-term study abroad programs. However, there were important differences in students' perceptions of each type of program, and these differences matter with respect to the degree to which each factor influences students' intentions to study abroad. Faculty champions and administrators of study abroad programs should keep these in mind when advertising programs to students, differentiating the way each type of program is marketed. As the internationalization of business programs continues to increase, more careful targeting of programs to address student concerns may encourage more students to engage in study abroad programs, enhancing students' globally-oriented skills and ultimately helping them succeed in an increasingly global workplace.

Table 1: Means, standard deviations and correlations

Construct	MEAN	STD	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.
Demographic variables											
1. Age	20.39	2.57									
2. Gender (1 = female; 0 = male)	n/a	n/a	-.13								
SHORT-TERM Study Abroad											
3. Intention to study abroad	2.90	1.12	-.07	.03							
4. Attitudes	4.16	0.69	-.09	.13	.54**						
5. Subjective Norms	3.70	0.68	-.09	.08	.63**	.43**					
6. Perceived Behavioral Controls	3.90	0.79	-.24**	-.10	.38**	.26**	.48**				
LONG-TERM Study Abroad											
7. Intention to study abroad	2.36	1.09	-.05	.06	.57**	.22**	.40**	.30**			
8. Attitudes	4.09	0.79	-.04	.20**	.32**	.51**	.38**	.24**	.46**		
9. Subjective Norms	3.16	0.99	-.01	.03	.41**	.23**	.46**	.38**	.67**	.49**	
10. Perceived Behavioral Control	3.49	0.92	-.09	-.15*	.22**	.02	.27**	.64**	.48**	.33**	.49**

n = 204 * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 2: Mean responses for short-term versus long-term study abroad programs
(standard deviations in parentheses)

Variables	Mean for SHORT- TERM	Mean for LONG-TERM	t-test for difference in means
Intention to study abroad	2.9 (1.12)	2.36 (1.09)	7.62**
Attitudes	4.16 (.69)	4.09 (.79)	1.44
Subjective Norms	3.70 (.68)	3.16 (.99)	8.46**
Perceived Behavioral Control	3.90 (.79)	3.49 (.92)	7.93**

n = 204 * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 3: Intention to study abroad regressed on attitudes, subjective norms and perceived behavioral controls

Independent variables	Intention to study abroad on a SHORT- TERM program		Intention to study abroad on a LONG- TERM program	
	Controls Only <i>B</i>	Full Model <i>B</i>	Controls Only <i>B</i>	Full Model <i>B</i>
<i>Control variables</i>				
Age	-.03	.01	-.02	-.01
Gender (1 = female; 0 = male)	.06	-.10	.12	.10
<i>Predictors</i>				
Attitudes		.53**		.19*
Subjective Norms		.77**		.57**
Perceived Behavioral Control		.10		.22**
Intercept	3.50**	-2.58**	2.67**	-.90
F-Value	.59	38.93**	.51	39.55**
Adjusted R ²	.00	.48	.00	.49

n = 204 * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Unstandardized betas coefficients reported in columns.

REFERENCES

- Ajzen, Icek, (1985), "From intentions to actions: A theory of planned behavior", in Kuhl, Julius and Beckmann, Jürgen (Eds.), *Action Control: From Cognition to Behavior*. (Springer-Verlag; Berlin, Germany).
- Ajzen, Icek, (1991), "The theory of planned behavior", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 50, 179-211.
- Ajzen, Icek, and B. L. Driver, (1992), "Application of the theory of planned behavior to leisure choice", *Journal of Leisure Research* 24 (3), 217-224.
- Ajzen, Icek, and Martin Fishbein, (1977), "Attitude-behavior relations: A theoretical analysis and review of empirical research", *Psychological Bulletin* 84, 888-918.
- Armitage, Christopher J., and Mark Conner, (2001), "Efficacy of the theory of planned behaviour: A meta-analytic review", *British Journal of Social Psychology* 40, 471-475.
- Broadhead-Fearn, Danielle, and Katherine M. White, (2006), "The role of self-efficacy in predicting rule-following behaviors in shelters for homeless youth: A test of the theory of planned behavior", *The Journal of Social Psychology* 146, 307-325.
- Carlson, Jerry S., Barbara B. Burn, John Useem, and David Yachimowicz, (1990), "Study Abroad: The experience of American undergraduates", (Greenwood Press; New York).
- Cesar, Douglas, and Catherine G. Jones-Rikker, (2001), "Study abroad programs and American student worldmindedness", *Journal of Teaching in International Business* 13 (1), 55-66.
- Elliott, Mark A., Christopher J. Armitage, and Christopher J. Baughan, (2003), "Drivers' compliance with speed limits: An application of the theory of planned behavior", *Journal of Applied Psychology* 88, 964-972.
- Emanoil, Pamela, (1999), "Study abroad expands cultural view, life skills, and academic experience", *Human Ecology Forum* 27, 10-14.
- Fishbein, Martin, and Icek Ajzen, (1975), "Belief, Attitude, Intention, and Behavior", (Wiley; New York).
- Goel, Lakshmi, Pieter de Jong, and Oliver Schnusenberg, (2011), "Toward a comprehensive framework of study abroad intentions and behaviors", *Journal of Teaching in International Business* 21, 248-265.

Gullahorn, John T., and Jeanne E. Gullahorn, (1958), "American objectives in study abroad", *The Journal of Higher Education* 29 (7), 369-374.

Gullekson, Nicole L., Mary L. Tucker, Garth Coombs Jr., and Scott B. Wright, (2011), "Examining intercultural growth for business students in short-term study abroad programs: Too good to be true?", *Journal of Teaching in International Business* 22, 91-106.

Henthorne, Tony L., Mark M. Miller, and Tim W. Hudson, (2001), "Building and positioning successful study-abroad programs: A "hands-on" approach", *Journal of Teaching in International Business* 12 (4), 49-62.

Institute of International Education. (2009). Americans studying abroad in increasing numbers Retrieved Jan 17, 2013, from <http://www.iie.org/Research-and-Publications/Open-Doors>

Kean, Thomas H., and Lee H. Hamilton, (2008), "Send more U.S. students abroad: We can't be competitive globally if we lack exposure beyond U.S. borders", *The Christian Science Monitor* June 12.

Kitsantas, Anastasia, (2004), "Study abroad: The role of college students' goals on the development of cross-cultural skills and global understanding", *College Student Journal* 38 (3), 441-452.

Litvin, Stephen W., (2003), "Tourism and understanding: The MBA study mission", *Annals of Tourism Research* 30, 77-93.

Luethge, Denise J., (2004), "Perceived risk and risk reduction strategies in study abroad programs", *Journal of Teaching in International Business* 15 (4), 23-45.

Marcum, John A., (2001), "Eliminate the roadblocks", *Chronicle of Higher Education* 47, B7-B9.

McKenzie, Russell, Tara Lopez, and David Bowes, (2010), "Providing international opportunities for business students: A guide to planning a short-term study abroad program at regional and small universities", *American Journal of Business Education* 3 (8), 59-65.

NAFSA, (2006), "Americans Call for Leadership on International Education", (NAFSA; New York).

- Nyaupane, Gyan P., Cody Morris Paris, and Victor Teye, (2011), "Study abroad motivations, destination selection and pre-trip attitude formation", *International Journal of Tourism Research* 13 (3), 205-217.
- Presley, Adrien, Datha Damron-Martinez, and Lin Zhang, (2010), "A study of business student choice to study abroad: A test of the theory of planned behavior", *Journal of Teaching in International Business* 21, 227-247.
- Sachau, Daniel, Niel Brasher, and Scott Fee, (2010), "Three models for short-term study abroad", *Journal of Management Education* 34, 645-670.
- Sánchez, Carol M., Marianela Fornerino, and Mengxia Zhang, (2006), "Motivations and the intent to study abroad among U.S., French, and Chinese students", *Journal of Teaching in International Business* 18, 27-52.
- Schroth, M. L., and W. A. McCormack, (2000), "Sensation seeking and need for achievement among study-abroad students", *Journal of Social Psychology* 140, 533-535.
- Slotkin, Michael H., Christopher J. Durie, and Jarin R. Eisenberg, (2012), "The benefits of short-term study abroad as a blended learning experience", *Journal of International Education in Business* 5 (2), 163-173.
- Sonmez, Sevil F., and Alan R. Graefe, (1998), "Determining future travel behavior from past travel experience and perceptions of risk and safety", *Journal of Travel Research* 37, 171-177.
- Wiers-Jenssen, Jannecke, (2003), "Norwegian students abroad: Experiences of students from linguistically and geographically peripheral European countries", *Studies in Higher Education* 28, 391-411.
- Wiers-Jenssen, Jannecke, (2008), "Does higher education attained abroad lead to international jobs?", *Journal of Studies in International Education* 12, 101-130.