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ABSTRACT

There is increasing student mobility around the world and a growing focus on transnational education. Until a decade ago in Australia and New Zealand the emphasis was on attracting international students to be full-fee paying (FFP) enrolments. Consequently, much of the research has focused on issues relating to the psychosocial and sociocultural adjustment, and learning and teaching needs of FFP international students. Recently, there has been a growing field of work from the US and Europe examining outbound student mobility programs including cultural and language tours, study abroad and student exchange. Although student exchange is purported to be an effective method for increasing the intercultural competence of domestic students to perform in the global marketplace, there is a paucity of research empirically examining the student exchange experience. Thus, this thesis examined student exchange in the Australian and New Zealand context.

This research project investigated the processes and outcomes of the student exchange experience for Australian and New Zealand university students. This thesis examined how many students participate in exchange programs; who these students are; why they participate and what impact this experience has in terms of intercultural competencies and international orientation. This research project is unique as it represents the first detailed national study of student exchange in both Australia and New Zealand.

Reflecting the longitudinal study in this thesis, a model was developed spanning the three phases of the exchange sojourn: pre-departure, in-country, post-exchange. The model incorporated the factors that influence Australian and New Zealand students to participate in an exchange program and the variables which affect their experiences in the host country. It was proposed that these factors influence the outcomes of the
exchange experience. Two additional models provided further details of the factors influencing the exchange decision-making process and students’ experiences in the host country.

Multiple methodologies were adopted across the four studies in this thesis in order to understand the factors at all phases of the exchange experience that may impact upon the outcomes of the sojourn. The first study encompassed an analysis of each institution’s strategic plan in regards to student mobility to consider organisational factors influencing participation in the exchange program. Additionally, Study One examined student exchange participation at Australian and New Zealand universities from 1996-2005. The second study had two purposes. Firstly, it examined the personal characteristics of exchange students before departing on their sojourn in order to establish a baseline of competencies. Second, Study Two compared these traits with those of non-exchange students to investigate personal drivers and barriers of mobility. The third study was comprised of interviews with students who were studying on an exchange program in Canada to identify the significant experiences of students in the host culture and to gain insight into how their experiences may have influenced the outcomes of the sojourn. The final study explored the changes in exchange students’ intercultural competencies by comparing their skills measured at the pre-departure stage with those reported approximately six months after returning home. Study Four also considered students’ pre-departure expectations and experiences in the host country.

The findings from Study One revealed that despite increasing attention on outbound student mobility at both the government and university level, in 2001 less than one percent of Australian and New Zealand university students engaged in exchange programs. Furthermore, only 23 out of 40 universities expressed student exchange as a strategic goal. No significant relationship was found between the
presence of a strategic goal of student exchange and the proportion of students participating in the exchange program. However, participation is not simply affected by the presence of a specific goal of mobility, but factors such as organisational culture, leadership and resourcing affect how policy is implemented. Further research examining the impact of these organisational factors is warranted.

The outcome of implementing a policy relating to student mobility is also dependent on the students. The results from Study Two indicated that \textit{a priori} exchange and non-exchange students were different groups, particularly in terms of intercultural competencies and demographics. Before their sojourn, exchange students presented with higher levels of cultural empathy, open-mindedness, social initiative, flexibility and emotional stability than their non-mobile peers; that is, exchange students possessed the necessary intercultural competencies to aid their adjustment in the host culture. The typical exchange student was female, from a middle-upper socio-economic background and enrolled in a dual degree. The reasons reported by exchange students for studying overseas included a desire to maximise their educational success and employment opportunities, to travel and to experience a new culture. In contrast, non-exchange students remained at home due to the cost of going abroad and a lack of awareness of exchange opportunities at the home university.

Study Three provided the link between the factors influencing a student to participate in the exchange program and the reported outcomes by examining their experiences in a host culture, Canada. Overall students reported satisfaction with their in-country experience and few participants identified that they experienced culture shock. This may reflect the perceived negative connotation of this phenomenon. Before departing on their sojourn, the exchange students reported that they had expected life in Canada to be the same as at home. However, they did report mild difficulties with
adjusting to differences in areas such as communication, accommodation, the climate, shopping, teaching and learning methods, and friendships with host nationals. Increasing the perceived value of pre-departure training and ensuring that orientation by the host institution focuses on practical and logistical issues may improve students’ expectations and adjustment. Future studies examining the processes of intercultural sojourn should consider more detailed qualitative analysis of students’ in-country experiences to gain a deeper understanding of the time abroad and how it may cause changes within the individual.

Study Four revealed that overall there was no change in exchange students’ levels of intercultural competencies, regardless of their host destination. However, there was a trend for students to become more flexible because of the exchange experience. In acknowledgment of the findings in the literature of the outcomes of exchange programs, it is speculated that students become more aware of pre-existing skills. While no significant changes in intercultural competencies were observed, further investigation of other skills such as intercultural sensitivity, intercultural communication competence and social self-efficacy is warranted. After their time abroad, the exchange students continued to be internationally oriented, expressing high desire for future work and travel overseas.

In addition to the theoretical models presented in this thesis, this research also has practical implications. The model and the results of these studies provide universities with a better understanding of how to manage their exchange programs. This work is equally relevant to government policy makers as they seek ways to enhance the international capabilities of future employees.
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CHAPTER 1 – STUDENT EXCHANGE PROGRAMS IN AUSTRALIAN AND NEW
ZEALAND UNIVERSITIES

Introduction

International education is a growing phenomenon with almost two million
students studying annually in countries other than their own (Bohm, Davis, Meares, &
Pearce, 2002; OECD, 2004a). While there has been a strong emphasis on research
examining international students in Australia and New Zealand (see Barker, 1993;
Barker, Troth, & Mak, 2002; Brown & Daly, 2005; Hellsten, 2002; Ho, Holmes, &
Cooper, 2004; Ministry of Education, 2004a; Todd & Nesdale, 1997; Volet & Ang,
1998; Ward, 2002, 2005), only limited attention has been given to short-term student
mobility programs. This thesis addresses this gap in the research literature by focusing
specifically on the student exchange experience.

The major focus of this thesis is to explore the complex processes and outcomes
of a short-term educational sojourn at the three stages of the sojourn namely pre-
departure, in-country and post-return. Thus, this thesis extends previous research on
cross-cultural adjustment and student mobility. The second focus is to understand
whether Australian and New Zealand university students develop intercultural
competencies as a consequence of studying overseas on the student exchange program.
Literature from the disciplines of cross-cultural psychology, international education and
international human resource management is reviewed to address the overriding
research question: ‘What is the process of the student exchange experience?’
This chapter outlines the context of the research question. The next section of Chapter One defines international education, provides the rationale underpinning internationalisation of education in Australia and New Zealand, and differentiates between international students and exchange students. Existing research on study abroad and student exchange programs is then examined in relation to the research question. Next, the issue of student exchange in Australia and New Zealand is considered in detail, as well as how the concept of intercultural competencies relates to this thesis. Finally, the structure of the thesis and an overview of the four research studies is presented.

International education in Australia and New Zealand

International education incorporates a range of initiatives including: attracting international students to study on campus; outbound student mobility opportunities; international curricula; and, developing international research teams (Leask, 2005). A review of the literature indicates that internationalisation of education provides benefits at three levels: the nation, the institution, and the individual. Firstly, it enhances the social and cultural development of the nation and contributes to the sending nation’s economy and international trade and relations (Australian International Education Foundation, 1998; International Trade Canada, 2005; Knight, 2004; Ministry of Education, 2004b; Nelson, 2003). Secondly, at the institutional level international education may augment a university’s profile and reputation and be used to generate income through fee-paying students (Knight, 2004). Thirdly, it is asserted that international education provides benefits to the individual students involved in terms of their education, foreign language proficiency and intercultural skills (Knight & de Wit,
Furthermore, Knight and de Wit (1995, p.11) proposed that “the more international the labour market becomes, as a result of …globalisation… the more a graduate has to compete with people from other countries and the more she has to work in an international environment”.

Despite the increasing numbers of international students studying at Australian and New Zealand universities, the literature suggests that local students demonstrate relatively poor intercultural competencies and limited knowledge of international issues (Fitzgerald, 1997; Industry Task Force on Leadership and Management Skills, 1995). While student exchange programs are proffered to be one of the most effective ways domestic students can become interculturally competent (Gochenour, 1993; Knight & de Wit, 1995; Lawson, 1969; Wallace, 1993), the acquisition of intercultural skills during the exchange experience has not been demonstrated empirically (Carlson, Burn, Useem, & Yachimowicz, 1990; Clyne & Rizvi, 1998; Knight & de Wit, 1995).

There are four categories of outbound student mobility in Australia and New Zealand. The first category incorporates exchange programs which are the focus of this thesis. Exchange programs enable students to study at a partner institution for one or two semesters. The management of this type of mobility program is dependent upon reciprocal agreements and an even flow of students between the two institutions. The second category is short-term study such as cultural tours. Often associated with language study, these tours are between two and six weeks in length. Internships and clinical placements are another form of student mobility. Examples of this are Speech Pathology and Occupational Therapy students from Charles Sturt University completing a five-week clinical placement in Vietnam. The final category is study abroad, which involves a student deferring their enrolment at the home university, studying overseas for one or two semesters and paying international student fees. This
program is often undertaken when the home institution does not have an exchange partnership with the host university.

**Defining exchange students**

It is important to highlight how this thesis differentiates between exchange students, international students and domestic or local students. Exchange students are defined here as students who study for a limited time (one or two semesters) at partner institutions overseas with the aim of transferring the credit of this study toward their degrees at the home universities. An exchange student may be either an international or domestic student.

In line with the definition by the Department of Education Science and Training (DEST, 2004), international students are defined in this thesis as individuals studying at Australian and New Zealand universities who possess temporary study visas and are full-fee paying (FFP). In contrast, domestic or local students include students born in Australia and New Zealand as well as students who have been granted citizenship or permanent resident status in Australia and New Zealand (DEST, 2004). Given that approximately 24% of Australians (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2006) and 23% of New Zealanders (Statistics New Zealand, 2007) were born overseas there is great ethnic diversity within the domestic or local student cohort.

**Australian and New Zealand international education policies and programs**

Australia has a relatively long history of international education. Before World War II, this consisted of Australian students obtaining postgraduate qualifications primarily from Europe and the United States of America (IDP Australia, 1995; Liddicoat, 2003). Over the last 50 years, overseas student policy has moved through
three distinctive stages—aid, trade and internationalisation (Baker, Robertson, Taylor, & Doube, 1996). The ‘aid’ era (1951-1984) was based upon the Colombo Plan through which education was provided to approximately 5000 students from developing countries in South and South East Asia as a form of aid. In 1979, public concern surfaced that bi-lateral education aid programs were being misused as a type of immigration program. As a result, the Overseas Student Charge was introduced and an unofficial country quota system was implemented, which reflected foreign policy priorities more specifically (Back & Davis, 1995). Five years later, the Committee to Review the Australian Overseas Aid Program (Jackson Committee, 1984) contended that education should be positioned as an export industry. Consequently, there was a move to the ‘trade’ stage (1985 - 1992) during which time the Australian government dropped the quota system and encouraged institutions to actively recruit international students who would be classified as ‘full-fee paying’. In fact, the term ‘full fee-paying’ was a misnomer because the government continued to subsidise what was actually the full cost of studying in Australia. Educational aid continued to be provided to students from developing countries, however this aid was carefully targeted. In this era of declining government support, universities responded by shifting their focus to more entrepreneurial activities to boost their finances (Marginson, 1993).

In 1992, the Australian government recognised that international education was an essential part of its international relations and that accepting overseas students at Australian institutions was only one aspect of the process. This was the start of the ‘internationalisation’ era. In 2003, the Australian government released a statement outlining its international education policy framework for the coming decade and the principles underpinning it. Upon closer inspection, this was an extension of the position put forward in 1992. The new policy framework was based on (a) valuing international
education for the benefits it brings to individuals and communities, (b) recognising the long-term contribution of international education to intellectual, social and cultural development, economic competitiveness, trade, foreign relations and national security; and, (c) enhancing the international profile of Australia's scientific and cultural capabilities (Nelson, 2003).

The shifts in international education policies in New Zealand appear to follow those in Australia (Patterson, 1996). The ‘aid’ era, characterised by the Colombo Plan, ended in 1987 with the first intake of FFP overseas students. This was driven by the government’s belief that “foreign students should pay the full cost of their education and not be a burden to domestic taxpayers” (Back, Davis, & Olsen, 1998 p.10). However, some policy analysts have asserted that this shift from ‘trade’ to ‘internationalisation’ is a far more recent trend in New Zealand (Butcher, 2000). Since 1993, the focus has moved towards ensuring that the tertiary education system helps to improve the country’s competitive advantage in the global economy (Patterson, 1996). In the White Paper outlining the policy directions for tertiary education for the next 20 years, the Ministry of Education (1998) put forward the goal of having a tertiary sector with an international focus. Yet until recently, incoming overseas students continued to be at the heart of international education as evidenced by the ‘Export Education in New Zealand’ report (2001) and one of its key initiatives, the Code of Practice for the Pastoral Care of International Students introduced in 2002 (Ministry of Education, 2005b). In 2004, the New Zealand government recognised the need to take a strategic approach. The term ‘international education’ was expanded to embrace offshore and student mobility programs. Moreover, the 2004 budget allocated $40million towards international education.
Australian and New Zealand government student exchange initiatives

In Australia and New Zealand there are two key government student mobility initiatives - UMAP and UMIOR. The University Mobility in Asia and the Pacific (UMAP) program was established in 1993, and the University Mobility in the Indian Ocean Region (UMIOR) program commenced seven years later. UMAP members include countries on the Pacific Ocean Rim from North and South America, Asia and the Pacific Islands. While both Australia and New Zealand participate in UMAP, only Australia is affiliated with UMIOR, which incorporates nations in the Indian Ocean region such as those from Africa, the Middle East and Asia. Both UMAP and UMIOR “aim to achieve enhanced international understanding through increased co-operation between universities and especially through increased mobility of university students and staff” (Australian Vice Chancellors' Committee, 2005c, p.1).

While UMIOR is not a funded project, over the last three years the Australian government has committed $1.4 million per year to student mobility through UMAP representing an increase of $360,000 in ten years (Australian Vice Chancellors' Committee, 2005b). Under the Australian UMAP Program each university receives $4000 funding to subsidise the cost of student participation (Department of Education Science & Training, 2005). In 2004, an income-contingent loan scheme entitled Overseas Study Higher Education Loan Program (OS HELP) was made available to full-time undergraduate students to assist them to study overseas for one or two semesters of their degree. Students can access a loan of up to $10,000, which is contingent on them having at least 12 months study remaining at the home university after the exchange experience (Nelson, 2003). Currently, this policy is being revised.

In New Zealand UMAP is not a funded program. Interestingly, Back et al (1998, p.33) contended that “good practise in internationalisation includes allocating funds
from the international student program to other organisational and program strategies”.
Following this position, it could be argued that some of the $1.5 million obtained through the New Zealand government’s export education levy could be re-directed towards encouraging outbound student mobility.

Participation in exchange programs

There is limited data available detailing the proportion of Australian and New Zealand university students who participate in exchange programs. IDP Australia (2004) estimated that over 2000 Australian students enrolled in full degrees were engaged in study overseas, with 83% of these students participating in an exchange program. Hamilton (1998 cited in Clyne & Rizvi, 1998) found that 0.2% of Australian undergraduate students participated in international educational opportunities including cultural tours, student exchange and internships. Back, Davis and Olsen (1998) reviewed exchange program participation rates in 20 New Zealand higher education institutions and noted that participation levels were also low with only 281 exchange students studying overseas in 1997.

Participation in study abroad in the USA and Canada is similar to that in Australia and New Zealand with less than one percent of American higher education students studying abroad each year and only eight percent of students studying a foreign language at the tertiary levels (Cushner & Karim, 2004; Fantini, Arias-Galicia, & Guay, 2001). By comparison, the European Union has a long established history of promoting mobility in higher education with student and staff mobility as the preferred methods of internationalisation (Teichler & Gordon, 2001). During the first fifteen years of the European Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students (ERASMUS)
program, over one million students participated (Langan, 2002 cited in McInnis, Coates, Hooper, Jensz, & Vu, 2004). It is reported that between 2% - 5% of European undergraduate students participate in exchange programs annually (Teichler & Jahr, 2001). However, it is argued that the true focus of internationalisation in the European education community is, in fact, Europeanisation (de Wit & Callan, 1995; Maiworm & Teichler, 1996). Maiworm and Teichler (1996) identified that when ERASMUS was initiated in 1987 one of the key objectives was to support regional mobility rather than global mobility. Indeed, Maiworm (2001, p.459) goes on to say that ERASMUS “was intended to increase the number of mobile students within the European Community”.

The student exchange experience

Existing research examining short-term student mobility programs has generally focused on one aspect of the sojourn, such as Chieffo’s (2000) investigation of student decision making. Alternatively, studies that investigated the outcomes of the sojourn were conducted retrospectively, with findings representing students’ perceived changes (e.g. Milstein, 2005; Van Hoof & Verbeeten, 2005). Carlson, Burn, Useem and Yachimowicz (1990) noted that research based on recall is limited as perceived change is different from actual change. Moreover, “there has been a consistent call for more rigorous research which would employ…longitudinal and experimental designs, valid and reliable instruments, multiple research (quantitative and qualitative) approaches, and larger samples” (Paige, Cohen, & Shively, 2004, p.254). The research program presented in this thesis attempts to address these shortcomings in a number of ways outlined below.
This research program employed a longitudinal research design across the three phases of the exchange sojourn—pre-departure, in-country and post-return. Research participants were enrolled in Australian and New Zealand universities. A quasi-experimental approach was adopted in Study Two using a large sample of 257 exchange students and a control group of 238 non-exchange participants. Although it can be difficult to maintain a sample over time (Barry, 2005), Study Four utilised a pre-test post-test design to empirically measure actual change in 71 students’ intercultural competencies as a consequence of the study period abroad.

There is a growing body of work focusing on the study abroad and student exchange experiences of American, British and European students (Milstein, 2005; Sussex Centre for Migration Research & Centre for Applied Population Research, 2004; Teichler & Jahr, 2001; Van Hoof & Verbeeten, 2005). In contrast, there is a paucity of research of student exchange at New Zealand universities and few studies have examined student exchange in the Australian context. Exceptions are the work of Clyne and Rizvi (1998), Davis, Milne and Olsen (1999) and Olsen (2006). While Clyne and Rizvi investigated the outcomes of student exchange at four Victorian universities, Davis et al examined the experiences of Australian exchange students including factors affecting student participation and perceived outcomes of the sojourn.

Recently, Olsen (2006) released data from surveys of Australian Universities International Directors quantifying the international study experiences of Australian students by experience, gender, duration, funding, level of study, field of education and destination. While the first of its kind, Olsen’s work considers student mobility in 2005 only. By contrast, this thesis is unique in that it provides a national record of participation in exchange programs for both Australia and New Zealand over a ten-year period (1996-2005). In turn, this provides a more accurate understanding of the changes
in student exchange in response to national and international events. Moreover, the current research program extends Olsen’s (2006) quantitative research by employing a mixed methods approach to analyse the national, organisational and individual variables influencing the student exchange experience across the three stages of sojourn.

This thesis will add to the body of knowledge surrounding tertiary student exchange, especially in the Pacific region, in two ways. Firstly, since most studies documented in the literature are from American and European contexts, the current research program was conducted within the context of Australian and New Zealand universities. Secondly, Australia and New Zealand’s geographic proximity and linguistic and cultural similarity, make it possible to draw comparisons between these countries, and to other regions such as North America and Europe (Mansfield, 1981).

Intercultural Competencies

Considerable research effort has been spent on empirical investigation of the competencies necessary for successful cross-cultural adjustment and multicultural effectiveness. For the purposes of this thesis, intercultural competencies are defined as “characteristics that an individual possesses which facilitate competent intercultural interaction” (Graf, 2004, p.201). There are three dimensions to an individual’s intercultural competencies: (1) the cognitive dimension (cultural knowledge); (2) the affective dimension (e.g. intercultural sensitivity); and (3) the behavioural dimension (skills to manage intercultural situations) (Bartel-Radic, 2006; Graf, 2004; Gudykunst, 1998; Matureev & Milter, 2004). This thesis focuses on the behavioural dimension of intercultural competencies. These competencies are cultural empathy, open-
mindedness, social self-efficacy and initiative, flexibility and emotional stability and are explained in detail in Chapter Two.

Most studies examining sojourners’ intercultural competencies have been speculative, focusing primarily on predicting success in the new culture, or expatriates have been interviewed to rate their perceived importance of intercultural competencies in their adjustment to the host culture (Arthur & Bennett, 1995; Black, Mendenhall, & Oddou, 1991; Caliguiri, 2000; Caliguiri, Joshi, & Lazarova, 1999; J. N. Martin, 1987; Van Oudenhoven & Van der Zee, 2002; R. I. Westwood & Leung, 1994). In contrast, this thesis has two foci in terms of students’ intercultural competencies. First, Study Two examined the relationship between students’ intercultural competencies and the decision to participate in an exchange program or remain at home. This predictive value of intercultural competencies will be discussed further in Chapter Two.

Second, Study Four investigated the changes in exchange students’ intercultural competencies as a result of studying abroad. Intercultural competencies are partially inherited but can be acquired through a learning process affected by intercultural interaction or experience (Funke, 1995 cited in Bartel-Radic, 2006, p. 649; King & Baxter Magolda, 2005). Chapter Four will elaborate on the development of exchange students’ intercultural competencies as a result of studying abroad.

**Problem Summary**

Today, organisations are seeking a competitive advantage in the global marketplace by employing graduates who are interculturally competent and possess international experience (Australian International Education Foundation, 1998; Finger & Kathoefer, 2005; Industry Task Force on Leadership and Management Skills, 1995;
Webb, Mayer, Pioche, & Allen, 1999). Thus, contemporary universities have been charged with the duty to prepare students to better meet the needs of business and society (Back et al., 1998; Beazley, 1992; Fantini et al., 2001; Higher Education Council, 1990; Knight & de Wit, 1995; Slee, 1989). It is argued that universities are failing to meet the needs of students and, in turn, employers, because many higher education graduates are unprepared to work in the global context (Fantini et al., 2001; K. Wilson, 1989). However, it is uncertain whether universities have the ability to develop students’ intercultural competencies, and whether exchange programs are the best method. Research of exchange programs has focused primarily on the American and European contexts and the benefits of the educational sojourn as perceived by the students.

In order to ascertain the role of university exchange programs in the development of graduates’ intercultural competencies, there is a need to understand: (a) who participates in exchange programs and the reasons why they participate; (b) their experiences in the host country; and, (c) the outcomes the sojourn has on their intercultural competencies. These issues reflect the three aims of the thesis and the process of the exchange experience as outlined in Figure 1.1.

**Aim One**

Most of the literature that describes the factors affecting the decision to go abroad does so from the perspective of long term sojourners such as business expatriates and international students (e.g. N. J. Adler, 1991; Gatfield, 1997; Kwok, 1972; Lim, 1992; Mazzarol & Soutar, 2002; Torbiorn, 1982; Wang & Bu, 2004). There is a paucity of work that conceptualises the student exchange decision-making process (Chieffo, 1992; Industry Task Force on Leadership and Management Skills (2005) is also known as the Karpin report)
Thus, the first aim of the thesis was to understand the process surrounding a student’s decision to participate in the exchange program. Studies One and Two investigated the factors that influence a student’s decision to participate in an exchange program or remain at home. While Study One focused on organisational and contextual factors such as the relationship between university policy and participation rates in exchange programs and geopolitical stability, Study Two considered the impact of individual factors including personal characteristics on the decision-making process.

Figure 1.1: The process of the exchange experience

Aim Two

While the literature regarding the cross-cultural adjustment of business expatriates, volunteer workers and international students is extensive (Bhaskar-Shrinivas, Shaffer, & Luk, 2005; Fish, 2005; Selmer, 2006; Selmer & Leung, 2003a; Shaffer, Harrison, & Gilley, 1999; Van Oudenhoven, Mol, & Van der Zee, 2003; Ward,
Bochner, & Furnham, 2001; Ying & Han, 2006), little research energy has been directed towards short-term sojourners such as exchange students. The second aim of the thesis, therefore, was to analyse the in-country experiences of exchange students. Study Three comprised a qualitative study examining the lived experiences of Australian and New Zealand exchange students in Canada. To provide further insight into the processes of the exchange experience, Study Four compared exchange students’ expectations and experiences of difficulties in the host country.

Aim Three

As mentioned earlier in this chapter, few authors have demonstrated empirically the reported benefits of an exchange experience. Thus, the final aim of the thesis was to investigate the outcomes of the exchange sojourn in terms of intercultural competencies and international orientation. Study Four utilised a pre-test post-test design to analyse changes in the intercultural competencies of exchange students as a consequence of the time abroad. Additionally, Study Four examined returned exchange students’ career and travel goals to consider the impact of the exchange experience on their international orientation.

This thesis will add to the body of knowledge surrounding tertiary student exchange, especially in the Pacific region. These studies will develop a model demonstrating the factors at each stage which impact on the student exchange experience. Moreover, two additional models will be developed to help predict student participation in the exchange program and identify factors affecting the in-country experiences of exchange students. These models will be based on research on international students and business expatriates including the work of authors including
Aycan (1997); Furnham (1988); Ward and Kennedy (1999); the Sussex Centre for Migration Research and Centre for Applied Population Research (2004); and, Black, Mendenhall and Oddou (1991). However, this thesis will extend previous research on cross-cultural adjustment and student mobility to consider the processes and outcomes of the short-term educational sojourn.

The results of the series of studies presented in this thesis have practical implications for Australian and New Zealand universities and government policy makers. For universities there are three specific benefits of these studies. First, this research will identify the personal factors which influence students to study abroad. In turn this will assist universities to better understand their target audience for exchange programs and also how and where to market exchange opportunities. Second, examining students’ experiences in-country will provide both the home and host institutions with guidance for enhancing pre-departure and in-country support. Finally, this thesis will provide universities with measurable outcomes of student exchange experiences. Taken together, if government policies encourage universities to promote student exchange, and if universities enhance their policies and programs in this area, then the goal of preparing graduates for the global marketplace and the flow-on benefits of more interculturally competent workers in society will be achieved.

Thesis Outline

This thesis is comprised of ten chapters. Chapter One outlines the nature of international education in Australia and New Zealand with a specific focus on student mobility. This outline highlights the gaps in the research literature that are addressed in this thesis.
The second section of thesis presents the literature review that led to the development of the theoretical models upon which the research program was based and the specific research questions and hypotheses to be considered in this thesis. Chapter Two discusses the contextual, organisational and individual factors that may influence the decision of Australian and New Zealand students to participate in the exchange program or remain at home. Additionally, the factors which may influence an exchange student’s decision regarding the host destination are also reviewed. Chapter Three considers the issues surrounding the student’s in-country experiences and finally Chapter Four details the potential outcomes of the exchange experience.

The third section of the thesis presents the research program which comprised four studies. While Chapter Five provides an overview of the research philosophy and methodology, Chapters Six, Seven, Eight and Nine represent each of the four studies (see Table 1.1). Study One (Chapter 6) examined the relationship between a university’s strategic plan regarding outbound student mobility and participation rates in the exchange program. Study Two (Chapter 7) had two objectives. First, it compared the characteristics and competencies of exchange students at the pre-departure stage and a control group of non-exchange students. Second, Study Two investigated the individual factors which influenced students’ decision to study abroad or remain at the home campus. The third study (Chapter 8) was comprised of interviews with Australian and New Zealand university exchange students who were studying in Canada. The interviews provided insight into the students’ experiences while on exchange. Chapter Nine details the final study in which the intercultural competencies of exchange students at the pre-departure stage were compared with those at the post-sojourn stage.
Table 1.1 Integration of Research Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study One</th>
<th>Study Two</th>
<th>Study Three</th>
<th>Study Four</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Research Aim | • Explore student participation in Australian and New Zealand university exchange programs  
• Analyse university strategic goals regarding student exchange | • Analyse factors influencing student participation in exchange programs | • Investigate experiences of Australian and New Zealand exchange students in Canada | • Analyse what changes in intercultural competencies occur as a result of the exchange experience  
• Compare student expectations and experiences of the sojourn |
| Sample | 40 universities in total  
• 5 New Zealand universities  
• 35 Australian universities | 495 students in total  
• 257 exchange students from 2 New Zealand universities and 9 Australian  
• 238 non-exchange students from 1 New Zealand and 3 Australian and universities | 17 exchange students in Canada  
• 4 New Zealanders  
• 13 Australians | 58 exchange students |
| Sampling Method | All universities in Australia and New Zealand were invited to participate in the study | Purposive sampling  
• All outbound exchange students engaged in exchange program in 2002 and 2003 at participating universities  
Quota sampling  
• Non-exchange students enrolled at 4 Australian universities and 1 New Zealand university | Purposive sampling  
• Exchange students who participated in Study Two and were studying at one of two participating Canadian universities | Purposive sampling  
• Exchange students who participated in Study Two |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study One</th>
<th>Study Two</th>
<th>Study Three</th>
<th>Study Four</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Methodology</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Methods</strong>&lt;br&gt;Quantitative&lt;br&gt;- Postal surveys in 2001&lt;br&gt;- Emailed surveys in 2005</td>
<td>Quantitative&lt;br&gt;- Postal surveys to exchange students&lt;br&gt;- Surveys distributed in lectures to non-exchange students</td>
<td>Qualitative&lt;br&gt;- Face-to-face semi-structured interviews</td>
<td>Quantitative&lt;br&gt;- Postal surveys at pre-departure&lt;br&gt;- Emailed surveys 12-18 months after pre-departure survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Analysis</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Descriptive statistics&lt;br&gt;- Paired sample t-tests&lt;br&gt;- ANOVA&lt;br&gt;- Chi-square</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics&lt;br&gt;- ANOVA&lt;br&gt;- MANOVA&lt;br&gt;- Chi-square</td>
<td>Content analysis</td>
<td>Exploratory factor analysis&lt;br&gt;- Descriptive statistics&lt;br&gt;- Paired sample t-tests&lt;br&gt;- Repeated measures ANOVA&lt;br&gt;- MANOVA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finally, Chapter Ten discusses the findings and conclusions of all four studies to achieve several objectives. These include: (a) responding to the research questions and hypotheses established in Chapters Two, Three and Four; (b) considering the results in relation to the theoretical model formulated and (c) discussing the theoretical and practical implications of the work in this thesis. Chapter Ten also reviews some strengths and limitations of the research program and suggests future research avenues.

Conclusion

In summary, this research is unique providing theoretical as well as applied contributions in several ways. This study represents the first time that national measures of student participation in exchange programs at Australian and New Zealand universities have been obtained. In addition to providing data over a ten-year period, this research will permit comparisons to other regions such as North America and Europe. Through using a quasi-experimental design and pre- and post-test measures of intercultural competencies, this work responds to the gaps in the literature by comparing exchange students and non-exchange students, and examining changes within individuals. Further, the qualitative investigation of students’ in-country experiences will provide insight into the processes of short-term sojourn.

This chapter has provided the context of the research program, an overview of the four studies, and the structure of the thesis. It has argued that international education in general and student exchange in particular, are growing areas of interest for both theoretical and practical reasons. The next section of the thesis reviews the literature relating to the student mobility decision-making process, in-country experiences and personal outcomes of an international sojourn. This review of research
will guide the development of the theoretical models underpinning the four studies and the research questions and hypotheses.
SECTION II – LITERATURE REVIEW

The next section of this thesis critically examines literature from cross-cultural psychology, international education and international human resource management to examine: (a) what determines student exchange decisions (Chapter 2); (b) the nature of student exchange experiences in the host country (Chapter 3) and, (c) the outcomes of the exchange sojourn in terms of intercultural competencies (Chapter 4). The goal of the next three chapters was to formulate a theoretical model (see figure 1.1) that enabled the major research aim of the thesis to be addressed, ‘what is the process of the student exchange experience?’ This theoretical model also guided the specific research questions that underline the four studies in this thesis. These questions are presented in Chapters Six, Seven, Eight and Nine.

The overall structure of this section was based upon the three phases of the student exchange sojourn. The first stage, presented in Chapter Two is the pre-departure phase in the home country. At this time, sojourners must make the decision to go abroad after either being chosen by an organisation or by self-selecting. The sojourner may undergo training and preparation for their experience. Chapter Three presents the second stage, when the sojourner is in the host country and must adjust to the novel environment. In the final stage, the sojourner has returned to the home culture and is re-adjusting to this environment and evaluating the outcomes of the experience. This will be discussed in Chapter Four.
CHAPTER 2 – FACTORS INFLUENCING THE STUDENT MOBILITY DECISION

Introduction

This chapter reviews the factors that influence a student’s decision to participate in an exchange program. A sojourner’s decision to go abroad may be influenced by the belief it presents an opportunity for developing international skills or a desire to travel, meet new people, develop language skills and or to learn about other cultures (N. J. Adler, 1991; Chieffo, 2000; Clyne & Rizvi, 1998; S. B. Goldstein & Kim, 2006; Mazzarol & Soutar, 2002). Both expatriates and students also indicate that an overseas sojourn provides possibilities for career development and improves marketability in the global workforce (N. J. Adler, 1991; Carlson et al., 1990; Clyne & Rizvi, 1998; Gatfield, 1997; Kwok, 1972; Lim, 1992; Mazzarol & Soutar, 2002; Torbiorn, 1982; Wang & Bu, 2004). These factors will be discussed later in this chapter in terms of factors influencing participation in the exchange program and choice of host destination. Consideration also will be given to why other students remain in their home country.

Most of the literature that describes the factors affecting the decision to go abroad does so from the perspective of long term sojourners such as business expatriates and international students (N. J. Adler, 1991; Gatfield, 1997; Kwok, 1972; Lim, 1992; Mazzarol & Soutar, 2002; Torbiorn, 1982; Wang & Bu, 2004). There is a paucity of work theoretically conceptualising the student exchange decision-making process (Chieffo, 2000; Clyne & Rizvi, 1998; S. B. Goldstein & Kim, 2006). One exception is the Sussex Centre for Migration Research and Centre for Applied Population Research (2004). Aspects of the Sussex Centres’ (2004) model were

---

2 This will be referred to as the Sussex Centres’ model
utilised and combined with the research on expatriates and international students to develop the model underpinning Studies One and Two (Fig 2.1). The aim of the model outlining the process of deciding to participate in an exchange program was to gain a better understanding of the sojourn decision for students.

Figure 2.1: The decision to participate in an exchange program

Individual factors influencing the sojourn decision

As seen in Figure 2.1, there are seven key individual factors which impact on the decision-making process:

1. *Personal characteristics* which includes five aspects of a student’s profile identified by the Sussex Centres’ (2004). A student’s profile incorporates intercultural competencies and four demographic characteristics of gender, socio-economic background, ethnicity and previous mobility. A student’s discipline of study is another personal characteristic worth investigating
because previous research has identified a bias in the fields of study of exchange students (e.g. Clyne & Rizvi, 1998; Orahood, Kruze, & Easley Pearson, 2004).


3. *Culture and travel* stems from the few studies which have reported that exchange students study abroad because they have a desire to ‘see the world’ (Clyne & Rizvi, 1998; Opper, Teichler, & Carlson, 1990; Van Hoof & Verbeeten, 2005; Wiers-Jenssen, 2003; Young & Harper, 2004).

4. *Language* which includes the Sussex Centres’ (2004) proposed factors of improved language competence (driver) and language proficiency (barrier).

5. *Relationships* was not included in the Sussex Centres’ (2004) model as the authors did not find any significant differences between UK exchange and non-exchange students in terms of the impact of personal relationships on their decision to study abroad. However, since studies by Chieffo (2000), Lakshmana Rao (1979), Wang and Bu (2004), and Wiers-Jenssen (2002) contradicted these findings, the factor of relationships was included in the model of the decision to participate in an exchange program.

6. *Financial constraints* which is a barrier to mobility in the Sussex Centres’ (2004) model.

7. *Education* which includes three barriers listed in the Sussex Centres’ (2004) model. These barriers are credit transfer worries/ lack of recognition of study abroad, perceived prolongation of degree and uncertainty about mobility opportunities.

Each of these will now be elaborated further.
Personal characteristics

Intercultural Competencies

A range of competencies for multicultural effectiveness are described in the literature. These include flexibility, open-mindedness, self-confidence, self-efficacy, interpersonal skills, cultural empathy and an ability to cope with ambiguity and stressful situations (Brislin, Cushner, Cherrie, & Yong, 1986; Cushner & Karim, 2004; Furnham, 1988; Gong & Fan, 2006; Kealey, 1990; Torbiorn, 1982; Waxin, 2004). Shaffer, Harrison, Gregersen, Black and Ferzandi (2006) reported that in order to achieve cross-cultural success, sojourners need to be open to new experiences, willing to take risks, flexible, curious and eager to learn. This thesis will focus on five intercultural competencies which are frequently cited in the literature: cultural empathy; open-mindedness; flexibility; social initiative and self-efficacy; and, emotional stability. These competencies will be examined as predictors of the decision to study abroad in Study 2. The development of these intercultural competencies during the exchange experience is also investigated in Study 4. It is accepted that if a sojourner possesses these competencies, they are more likely to be able to successfully function in the host culture and feel satisfied with their experience (Van der Zee & Van Oudenhoven, 2000). The remainder of this section will describe each of the five competencies in detail and consider whether students with greater intercultural competencies are more likely to participate in exchange programs than their counterparts.

Cultural empathy

Van der Zee and van Oudenhoven (2000) argued that cultural empathy is probably the most frequently cited facet of intercultural effectiveness. Cultural empathy “refers to the ability to empathise with the feelings, thoughts and behaviours of
members from different cultural groups” (van der Zee, Zaal, & Piekstra, 2003, p.578). It is a skill that can be developed (Ridley & Lingle, 1996; van Oudenhoven, van der Zee, & van Kooten, 2001). Culturally empathetic individuals acknowledge and respect cultural differences (Hammer, 1989 cited in Cui, van den Berg, & Jiang, 1998). Moreover, cultural empathy is a necessary competency for effective interactions with host nationals and successful adjustment in the host culture (Cui & Awa, 1992; Ruben, 1976). Respondents in Arthur and Bennett’s (1995) study ranked cultural empathy as the fifth most important factor contributing to success abroad. Similarly, cultural empathy was the most frequently mentioned competency for managing a multicultural workgroup (Chang & Tharenou, 2004).

Open-mindedness

Cope and Kalantzis (1997) proposed that openness and tolerance to cultural differences are keys to internationalisation. Similarly, More Bueno and Tubbs (2004) noted that open-mindedness is one of the most important global leadership competencies. Van Oudenhoven and Van der Zee (2002, p. 680) defined open-mindedness as “an open and unprejudiced attitude towards outgroup members and towards different cultural norms and values”. Open individuals are more ready to accept difference between cultures (Bhagat & Prien, 1996; Bing & Lounsbury, 2000). When in the host culture, openness to new experiences and acceptance of differences in values and behaviours will enhance a sojourner’s adjustment (Caliguiri, 2000; Gudykunst & Hammer, 1988; J. N. Martin, 1993; Ting-Toomey, 1999). In turn, this can assist with forming relationships with host nationals and achieving success in the work environment (Waxin, 2004).
Flexibility

Flexibility, adaptability and tolerance to ambiguity are similar traits to the construct of open-mindedness (Arthur & Bennett, 1995; Leiba-O'Sullivan, 1999; Ting-Toomey, 1999). In the new environment, flexibility is a key cross-cultural competency through which sojourners are able to adjust their behaviours, learning from their mistakes and adopting new approaches to tasks and situations (Arthur & Bennett, 1995; Ting-Toomey, 1999; Van der Zee & Van Oudenhoven, 2000; R. I. Westwood & Leung, 1994). In his study of Canadian Technical Advisors working in Nordic countries, Kealey (1990) found that flexibility was one of the key skills identified for cross-cultural effectiveness. Moro Bueno and Tubbs (2004) and Adler and Bartholomew (1992 cited in Townsend & Cairns, 2003) identified that flexibility is essential for the transnational manager and global employee. Furthermore, Van der Zee and van Oudenhoven (2000) stressed that flexibility is “particularly important when the assignee’s expectations of the situation in the host country do not correspond with the actual situation” (p. 681). When an individual is culturally flexible, he/she can react better to ambiguous situations (Shaffer et al., 2006). Ambiguity tolerance is necessary for multicultural effectiveness (Ashwill, 2004).

Social initiative and self-efficacy

An ability to establish and maintain relationships with host nationals is amongst the most important skills for sojourners in the host country (Ashwill, 2004; Matureev & Milter, 2004). Agreeableness reflects a tendency to have effective interpersonal relationship with host nationals (Shaffer et al., 2006). The trait of extraversion assists a sojourner to develop and maintain interpersonal relationships with host nationals (Shaffer et al., 2006). In contrast, ethnocentrism inhibits relationships with host
nationals. Ward and her colleagues (e.g. Searle & Ward, 1990; Ward & Kennedy, 1996) have strongly established the association between social skills and psychological wellbeing of international students. The better sojourners are able to integrate into the host culture, the better their psychological and socio-cultural adaptation (Berry, 1990). Making and maintaining contacts with host nationals, interacting with locals and forming friendships all contribute to reduced stress for the sojourner, and, in turn, better adjustment (Caliguiri, 2000; Searle & Ward, 1990; Ting-Toomey, 1999). Cross-cultural interaction and friendships influence the personal and academic adjustment of international students (Barker et al., 2002; Brown & Daly, 2005; Ward, 2005).

People who are self-efficacious in social situations will be more proactive in interacting with others and persist when they experience difficulties or failure (Bandura, 1986, 1997). Hagedoorn and Molleman (2006, p. 644) defined social self-efficacy (SSE) as “the extent to which an individual believes that they are capable to exercise control over their reactions and openness to others”. Social self-efficacy influences an individual’s ability to obtain social support and preference regarding with whom to interact (Lang, Featherman, & Nesselroade, 1997).

In her study of adolescents, Connolly (1989) found that social self-efficacy was associated with social engagement and mental health. Participants with low SSE were less likely to engage with peers, be less competent in social interactions, and experience greater anxiety and withdrawal. Likewise, other authors (e.g. Hermann & Betz, 2006; McFarlane, Bellissimo, & Norman, 1995) have reported a negative correlation between social self-efficacy, loneliness and depression. Wei, Russell and Zakalik (2005) noted that college students who experienced loneliness tended to not possess the necessary social skills to develop supportive interpersonal relationships. Furthermore,
Matsushima and Shiomi (2003) found that by enhancing social self-efficacy of Japanese high school students, individuals coped better with their stress.

**Emotional stability**

Emotional stability refers to a tendency to remain calm, even tempered and relaxed when dealing with stressful situations (Leiba-O'Sullivan, 1999; Van der Zee & Van Oudenhoven, 2000). Sojourners who remain calm in such stressful situations are more likely to adjust to the host culture and experience greater satisfaction in their new environment (Aycan, 1997). For example, Caligiuri (2000) and Shaffer et al (2006) found that expatriates who scored higher on the dimension of emotional stability had less desire to terminate their overseas assignment than those less emotionally stable. Ones and Viswesvaran (1999 cited in Shaffer et al., 2006) found that emotional stability was the second most important competency affecting a sojourner’s adjustment.

Dwyer (2004) suggested that *a priori* students who study abroad are a more tolerant group. Bakalis and Joiner (2004) found that students who were high on openness and had a high tolerance to ambiguity were more likely to study abroad. The authors called for further research to identify other intercultural competencies that lead to student participation in mobility programs. Recently, Goldstein and Kim (2006) conducted a longitudinal study to identify variables that predict participation by US college students in study abroad programs. Their research examined student expectations and participation in study abroad programs of 179 undergraduates in their first and final year at university. The results indicated that intercultural variables such as ethnocentrism and prejudice predicted positive expectations of study abroad rather than academic or career goals. Students with low levels of ethnocentrism and prejudice were
more likely to have positive expectations of study abroad and in turn, tended to participate in exchange programs.

As discussed above, intercultural competencies are necessary for effectiveness in and satisfaction with the host country. Yet, it is unclear if these are learned competencies developed through pre-departure training or whether sojourners differ in terms of intercultural competencies from those who remain at home. This thesis will compare the intercultural competencies of exchange students and non-exchange students. It was proposed that before their overseas sojourn, exchange students would be more interculturally competent than non-exchange students. Specifically, it was hypothesised that:

Before departing on the exchange program, exchange students would report higher levels of intercultural competencies than non-exchange students.

The above discussion has focused on a student’s intercultural competencies. The factor of Personal Characteristics proposed in the model of the decision to participate in a student exchange program (Fig 2.1) also includes a student’s demographic characteristics. While the Sussex Centres (2004) included demographic characteristics in their model of mobility decision-making process, these factors have not been specifically examined to identify differences between mobile and non-mobile students. There is a dearth of published literature specifically examining the demographic characteristics of exchange students. Rather, this information is reported indirectly through describing respondents to surveys. Thus, the relationship between a student’s demographic characteristics and their participation in an exchange program is unclear. This thesis will investigate the demographic characteristics (gender, socio-economic
background, ethnicity, previous mobility and discipline) of exchange students and compare these with the characteristics of non-exchange students to ascertain the association between these factors and the decision to participate in the exchange program or remain at home.

Gender

From available studies, it appears overwhelmingly that most exchange students are female (Carlson et al., 1990; Clyne & Rizvi, 1998; Dolby, 2004; Hart, Lapkin, Swain, Moscoe, & Warden, 1994; Lincoln Fellowship Commission, 2004). For example in her review of the participation of American students in study abroad and exchange programs in 2001/2002, Dolby (2004) noted that almost two thirds of students were female. Similar findings were reported by Clyne and Rizvi (1998) in their study of four Australian universities. Therefore it was anticipated that more females would participate in exchange programs at Australian and New Zealand universities than males.

Socio-economic background

While tertiary education has been made more accessible to a wide range of students (Marginson, 2000; McInnis & James, 1995), affordability of extra-curricular educational activities such as the student exchange program is an issue to be considered. Clyne and Rizvi (1998) noted that Victorian university exchange students tended to be private-school educated and self-fund their sojourn. These findings are suggestive of the influence of socio-economic status in regards to who is financially capable of undertaking the opportunity of overseas study. Outgoing ERASMUS students from the United Kingdom are more likely to be from families in the higher social classes when
compared with non-mobile students (Sussex Centre for Migration Research & Centre for Applied Population Research, 2004). Moreover, a bias towards higher socio-economic groups was noted in Inkson and Myer’s (2002) interview study of New Zealanders who chose to work abroad. In Study Two, it was anticipated that the mode household income of Australian and New Zealand exchange students would be above the average household income of the general population of AUD$38,999 (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2003) and NZ$39,600 (Statistics New Zealand, 2004) respectively.

**Ethnicity**

The literature from North America and Australia examining students studying abroad has outlined that the typical exchange student is Caucasian (Clyne & Rizvi, 1998; Dolby, 2004; Lincoln Fellowship Commission, 2004). While Dolby (2004) found that 82.9% of American exchange students were Caucasian, all of the exchange students in Clyne and Rizvi’s (1998) study were born in Australia and monolingual. Certainly, these findings do not reflect the ethnic mix of the broader community. In addition to the 18% of FFP Australian university students enrolments (Department of Education Science & Training, 2004) and 9% of international students at New Zealand universities (Ministry of Education, 2006a), almost one quarter of Australians and New Zealanders were born overseas (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2006; Statistics New Zealand, 2007). Therefore, this thesis will examine the ethnicity of participants in the exchange program.

**Previous mobility**

Exchange students in Clyne and Rizvi’s (1998) study reported being well traveled. As will be discussed below, a desire to travel and an interest in experiencing
other cultures are reasons to study abroad cited by sojourners (N. J. Adler, 1991; Clyne & Rizvi, 1998; Holdaway, Bryan, & Allan, 1988; Opper et al., 1990; Van Hoof & Verbeeten, 2005). However, Goldstein and Kim (2006) argued that the role of previous travel in the decision to study abroad is an inconsistent one. While previous travel may enhance students’ interest in other cultures and provide them with the necessary skills to be competent in the new culture, awareness of cultural differences and problems with cross-cultural adjustment may decrease interest in future overseas experiences such as student exchange. This thesis will compare whether before participating in the exchange program, exchange students had travelled overseas more than non-exchange students. Furthermore, investigation of exchange students’ desires to experience another culture and travel will assist in understanding the role of previous travel when they were deciding to study abroad.

*Discipline of study*

American exchange students tend to be completing social sciences/ humanities or business majors (Orahood et al., 2004). Clyne and Rizvi (1998) reported that the typical Australian exchange student was completing a business qualification. Two explanations for the bias of field of study of exchange students are proposed. Firstly, the social sciences and business disciplines are generally more popular within the university population. For example, in Australia 28.3% of students are enrolled in business courses while 21.5% are studying in the field of humanities and almost one in five New Zealand students are enrolled in business degrees and 22.1% of students are studying social sciences (Department of Education Science & Training, 2006; Ministry of Education, 2006b). Secondly, Goldstein and Kim (2006) argued that humanities and social science majors are more flexible in their academic requirements than disciplines
such as physical science and maths. Furthermore, this may explain the gender imbalance discussed earlier because there is greater representation of female students in these fields of study (Department of Education Science & Training, 2005; Bloomfield 2004 cited in S. B. Goldstein & Kim, 2006; Ministry of Education, 2006b).

Given the anticipated greater proportion of female exchange students in Australia and New Zealand, it was expected that Study Two would find proportionately more Australian and New Zealand exchange students were enrolled in business and humanities courses than the general university population.

The above discussion has considered the demographic characteristics which may influence a student’s decision-making process. Based upon the review of the literature, it appears that exchange students are a different group from non-exchange students. Specifically, there seems to be a bias in the Australian, UK and American exchange student population in terms of gender, socio-economic status, ethnicity, previous mobility and discipline of study. Studies have shown that an exchange student is more likely to be a Caucasian female from a family with a high household income, have previously travelled and be studying either business or humanities/social sciences. However, few studies have examined why there are differences in the personal characteristics of exchange and non-exchange students. This thesis attempts to address this gap in the literature as Study Two will compare the characteristics of exchange students and non-exchange students and analyse how factors such as financial constraints and education act as drivers of or barriers to mobility. The next section of this chapter reviews six drivers and barriers of mobility to consider what factors may influence a student’s decision to participate in a student exchange program or remain at home.
Career development

One of the most important reasons for studying at university, whether it is in the home country or abroad, is to gain a qualification to enhance future job opportunities (Barker, 1990; Furnham, 1988; Krause, Hartley, James, & McInnis, 2005). Similarly in the context of university exchange programs, students believe that a period of study overseas will strengthen their position in the marketplace, making them more attractive to future employers (Carlson et al., 1990; Clyne & Rizvi, 1998; Van Hoof & Verbeeten, 2005; Wiers-Jenssen, 2002; Young & Harper, 2004). Furnham (1988, p.46) contended that mobile students are “concerned with tangible payoffs in terms of career advancement, prestige and upward mobility”. This reflects Mazzarol and Soutar’s (2002) argument about sojourning students wanting to improve their socio-economic status.

In her study of the international career plan of MBA students, Adler (1991) found that respondents had a strong desire to work overseas. In fact, 84% of MBA students in the USA, Canada and Europe wanted an expatriate assignment at sometime in their career with almost half of these students planning to pursue an international career. Reviewing the career aspirations of Canadian undergraduates students, Wang and Bu (2004) found that business students desired an overseas assignment at some point in their career. European and American students also expressed a desire to work abroad (Carlson et al., 1990; Teichler & Jahr, 2001; Wiers-Jenssen, 2003).

One of the key reasons to accept an overseas assignment cited was to advance one’s career (N. J. Adler, 1991). In her study of Norwegian exchange students studying abroad, Wiers-Jenssen (2002) found that three-quarters of respondents felt that future employers would see overseas study as an advantage. Australian students also proposed that, from the perspective of recruiters, the period of study abroad would give them an
advantage over their peers (Clyne & Rizvi, 1998). Ninety percent of ERASMUS students from the UK indicated that they felt that the study abroad was worthwhile in relation to developing an international career (Sussex Centre for Migration Research & Centre for Applied Population Research, 2004). However, it is difficult to determine if this outcome is achieved as it may be harder to track the movements of more mobile graduates. This will be discussed further in Chapter Four.

Study Two investigated how, at the pre-departure stage, Australian and New Zealand university exchange students’ perceived the exchange experience would assist them with future employment. It was anticipated that participants would report that they were motivated to study abroad because it would assist with future employment at home and overseas.

Culture and Travel

Exchange students report strong aspirations to travel and experience other cultures (Clyne & Rizvi, 1998; Van Hoof & Verbeeten, 2005). Van Hoof and Verbeeten (2005) studied the reasons both incoming and outgoing exchange students at the Northern Arizona University participated in the exchange program. They found the top two reasons cited by students were that the exchange program was a good opportunity to live in another culture and a good opportunity to travel. Outbound exchange students at four Australian universities reported that they chose to study abroad because they wanted to see the world and desired building relationships with people from different cultures (Clyne & Rizvi, 1998). Similarly, participants in Young and Harper’s (2004) study were interested in travelling and wanted a cultural experience.

Wiers-Jenssen’s (2003) investigation of the experiences of Norwegian students revealed that students chose to study abroad primarily for extra-curricular reasons.
These factors included an interest in studying in a different environment, and they desired experiencing a different culture, breaking from the usual surroundings and wanting a new perspective of their home culture. Interestingly, international students in Canada stated that they were motivated to study overseas for similar reasons (Holdaway et al., 1988). Therefore it was anticipated that the results of Study Two would show that Australian and New Zealand exchange students would be highly motivated to study abroad because of a desire to travel.

Language

Improving language competence is one of the components proposed in the model of the exchange student decision-making process (refer Fig. 2.1). Maiworm’s (2001) and Teichler and Jahr’s (2001) studies of former ERASMUS students who participated in the program in 1988-89 revealed that students were motivated to engage in an exchange program so that they could develop their proficiency in a second language. Norwegian exchange students also studied abroad to develop their foreign language skills (Wiers-Jenssen, 2003). Interestingly, Goldstein and Kim (2006) found no significant difference between those students who studied abroad and those who remained at the home institution in terms of their second language competence. Yet students who had an interest in learning another language were more likely to study abroad.

Fluency in the host language can facilitate sojourner adjustment (Fish, 2005; Hautaluoma & Kaman, 1977; Masgoret, 2006; Selmer, 2006; Shaffer et al., 1999). Specifically, host language competence assists socio-cultural adjustment because it provides sojourners with the social rules and perceptual skills necessary for interpersonal interactions (Barker, 1993; Jones, ; Shaffer et al., 1999). Masgoret (2006)
studied the role of language attitudes of British university students working as English instructors in a four-week program in Spain. She found that there was a positive association between communication competence and sociocultural adjustment. Selmer (2006) reported similar findings when examining the experiences of English-speaking expatriates in China. In contrast, Peace Corps volunteers in Afghanistan reported that language problems caused difficulties with relationships with locals (Hautaluoma & Kaman, 1977).

According to the Sussex Centres’ (2004) model, foreign language competency may act as a barrier to mobility. Numerous researchers have noted that a lack of a second language is one of the top reasons students do not study outside of the home country (Clyne & Rizvi, 1998; Holdaway et al., 1988; Lakshmana Rao, 1979; Mazzarol & Soutar, 2002). While possessing a language other than English is one of the key learning goals in the Australian and New Zealand secondary education sector, it is not mandatory for students to learn another language (Department of Education Training & Youth Affairs, 2005; Ministry of Education, 2002). It has been argued that when compared to most OECD countries, Australian students receive far less LOTE instruction than their overseas peers (Department of Education Training & Youth Affairs, 2005). This would seem to be equally true for New Zealand. In 2002 the Curriculum Stocktake report to the New Zealand Minister of Education suggested that “schools should be required to provide instruction in another language for students in years 7 to 10 (except for Māori immersion settings), but it should not be mandatory for all year 7-10 students to learn another language” (Ministry of Education, 2002, para. 27).

The Australian LOTE review conducted in 2003 concluded that it is difficult to know the exact number of students engaged in LOTE programs (Department of
In 2003, only 13.2% of year 12 students were engaged in LOTE programs with the most popular second languages studied by Australian students being Japanese, French, German and Chinese (Department of Education Training & Youth Affairs, 2003). Similarly, in New Zealand, three of the most popular languages studied in secondary schools are French, Japanese and German. In the context of the Treaty of Waitangi, Te Reo Maori is the second most common LOTE studied by New Zealand students (Ministry of Education, 2004d).

Given the low level of LOTE education in Australia and New Zealand, it is important to understand the impact of this on the host destinations of exchange students. However, there is a lack of research examining student destinations. Proficiency in a second language could be a factor which influences an exchange student’s decision regarding their host destination. Study Two will consider to what extent knowledge of the host country language influenced students’ decisions regarding their exchange destination. Since Anglophone countries are culturally and linguistically close to Australia and New Zealand, it was hypothesised that:

*More Australian and New Zealand exchange students would study in English-speaking countries than non-English speaking countries.*

*Relationships*

For international students enrolling in foreign universities, the education purchase is a joint-family decision (Lim, 1992). In the same way, the recommendations of significant others and their attitudes towards study abroad may influence a student’s decision to participate in an exchange program. Students are more likely to participate in the exchange program if their family or friends have recommended it (Chieffo, 2000; Cushner & Karim, 2004; Kwok, 1972; Malicki, 2003; Mazzarol & Soutar, 2002; Wiers-
Jenssen, 2003). According to Mazzarol and Soutar’s (2002) model of the factors motivating students to seek an overseas education, an international student will select their host country based upon personal recommendations from their family and friends. At one Australian university, there was a high referral rate from friends with 35% of exchange students reporting they participated in the program because their friends recommended it (Malicki, 2003). Young and Harper (2004) reported that friends and parents are most influential in the decision of Australian exchange students to participate in the exchange program. Recommendations from family and friends were important to 28% of Norwegian students in Wiers-Jennsen’s (2002) study.

Bochner (1982) observed that university student exchange occurs at an impressionable stage. Reflecting the enrolment requirements at the home institution, American exchange students are in their junior year (Lincoln Fellowship Commission, 2004), while Australian and New Zealand students are approximately 20 to 21 years of age (Clyne & Rizvi, 1998). At this age, students are moving through the psychological phase of late adolescence to early adulthood (Furnham, 1988). This new phase brings with it another range of factors to influence any life decisions, including the decision to move away from family and friends to an unknown environment. This may explain why the input of family and friends is so important in the decision-making process (Chieffo, 2000; Cushner & Karim, 2004; Kwok, 1972; Lim, 1992; Mazzarol & Soutar, 2002; Wiers-Jenssen, 2003).

Students are discouraged from studying abroad with concerns for relationships at home and the host destination (Clyne & Rizvi, 1998; Lakshmana Rao, 1979; Sussex Centre for Migration Research & Centre for Applied Population Research, 2004). While these sojourners worry about making new friends while abroad, concern about separation from family may prohibit a student from choosing to engage in the exchange
program (Lakshmana Rao, 1979). The Sussex Centres’ (2004) surveyed UK students who had been abroad to determine problems with the exchange experience. Twenty percent of respondents expressed a problem with being away from their boy/girlfriend and 8.9% felt that being away from the family home was problematic.

Study Two considered the importance of recommendations from family and friends when Australian and New Zealand exchange students are deciding to study abroad. Furthermore, Study Two examined to what extent family commitments act as a barrier to those students who chose to remain at the home campus. The literature reviewed above suggests that relationships would influence the decision-making process of Australian and New Zealand students.

Financial constraints

Financial reasons are most commonly cited for non-mobility (Cushner & Karim, 2004; Lakshmana Rao, 1979; New Zealand Vice Chancellors' Committee, 2002). Research suggests that financial issues include travel costs (Mazzarol & Soutar, 2002), living costs in the host culture (Kwok, 1972) and loss of earnings at home (Holdaway et al., 1988; Van Der Meld, 2003). Moreover, students may be concerned with the costs of moving away from the parental home (Sussex Centre for Migration Research & Centre for Applied Population Research, 2004). Certainly few Australian high school graduates choose to study at a university outside of their own state (Australian Vice Chancellors' Committee, 2004b, 2005a). However it is unclear as to whether this low-level of domestic mobility is due to issues relating to leaving the family home or for financial reasons.

Exchange students tend to be self-funded (Clyne & Rizvi, 1998). Australian exchange students in Clyne and Rizvi’s (1998) study reported that their six month
period of overseas study cost approximately $10,000. International students in Canada reported that their ability to fund their study abroad was affected by a loss of income from an inability to work while abroad (Holdaway et al., 1988). When combined with loss of income at home and the inability to work while on exchange, the study experience could represent a significant financial burden to students. Certainly, non-exchange students in Van der Meld’s (2003) study did not participate in the exchange program because they could not afford to lose their regular income from their employers at home. Therefore, it was anticipated that Study Two would reveal that financial constraints related to the exchange program would have a significant effect on a student’s decision to remain at the home campus.

Geographic location of the home and host country can also dissuade students from studying overseas (Mazzarol & Soutar, 2002; Sussex Centre for Migration Research & Centre for Applied Population Research, 2004). For example, Asian students chose to study in Australia due to its proximity to home and thus reduced travel costs (Kwok, 1972). Yet as proposed earlier, Australian and New Zealand students may choose to study in countries which are linguistically and culturally similar rather than in neighbouring countries of Asia. Thus, given that exchange students have already decided to study abroad, it was expected that Study Two would not show a strong relationship between financial constraints and host destination. Rather, as discussed earlier, this decision would be influenced more by the linguistic and cultural similarity of the host country.

Education

The Sussex Centres’ (2004) model noted that the relevance of the exchange program to the discipline of study is a driver of mobility. Alternatively worries about
recognition of study abroad and a perception that their degree will take longer to complete act as barriers to students participating in the exchange program. Differences in the scheduling of the academic year may heighten concerns about prolonging studies (Farquhar & Rix, 1985).

In his investigation of the factors influencing Asian Americans to study abroad, Van der Meld (2003) noted that students chose to remain at home because study abroad did not fit in their program or they had specific curricular requirements on the home campus. Australian students in Young and Harper’s (2004) study also were concerned with the impact the exchange program would have on their academic progress. Study Two investigated the effect of the availability of courses at the host institution on a non-exchange student’s decision to remain at home. It was expected that this factor would act as a barrier for non-exchange students. Study Two also examined how this factor would influence an exchange student’s decision regarding their host destination.

A lack of awareness of mobility opportunities also prevents students from participating in the exchange program (Sussex Centre for Migration Research & Centre for Applied Population Research, 2004). In Malicki’s (2003) study, only 68% of students indicated that they could easily obtain up-to-date information about the program. Similarly, Asian American students did not study abroad as they were unaware of the exchange programs (Van Der Meld, 2003). It was anticipated that Study Two would show that one of the key reasons non-exchange students did not participate in the exchange program was because of a lack of knowledge about the program.

Contextual factors influencing the sojourn decision

It is thought that international factors such as the geopolitical context, and national and institutional schemes and policies may influence a student’s ability to
participate in exchange programs. Study Two analysed the impact of the institutional goal of student exchange on participation.

**International context**

Chapter One outlined the context in which student mobility occurs. International education is being driven by three things: (1) international trade and relations; (2) the increasing need for graduates with international skills; and, (3) shifts in public opinion of cross-cultural interactions, overseas travel and study (American Council of Education, 2000; Australian International Education Foundation, 1998; Bonham, Edmonds, & Mak, 2006; Henderson, 2006; Institute of International Education, 2004a, 2004b; International Trade Canada, 2005; Law, 2006; Ministry of Education, 2004c; Nelson, 2003; Van Oudenhoven & Hofstra, 2006; Wang & Bu, 2004). While international factors were not the focus of this thesis, it was proposed that issues such as cost and safety would influence the destination choice of exchange students. Furthermore, these variables will inform the discussion in Chapter Ten.

**National context**

Chapter One also described the changes in international education policies in Australia and New Zealand. Since the 1990’s, there has been a shift from the ‘trade’ approach of international education where full fee-paying international students were recruited to Australian and New Zealand campuses. Now the policies incorporate a wider range of initiatives that include establishing campuses offshore, teaching international curricula and encouraging domestic student mobility (Baker et al., 1996; Ministry of Education, 1998; Nelson, 2003). Given that these changes in the Australian and New Zealand government’s international education policies and programs may
have potentially influenced student participation in exchange programs, there was a need to consider the changes in student participation in university exchange programs.

**Institutional context**

One of the aims of this thesis was to examine the strategic goals of Australian and New Zealand universities in terms of domestic student mobility and determine the relationship with participation in exchange programs. The institutional context also incorporates factors such as the organisational culture, the commitment and enthusiasm of staff, promotion of exchange opportunities, selection mechanisms and criteria, a range of relevant and attractive agreements with host partners, recognition of overseas study, financial support, and a credit transfer system (Sussex Centre for Migration Research & Centre for Applied Population Research, 2004). Although these factors were not examined explicitly, they do need to be recognised to better understand the impact of the university’s strategic goal of student exchange and participation in exchange programs.

It was proposed that the way in which the exchange program is managed reflects (a) how the institution interprets and implements the government’s international education policy and (b) the university’s culture (Knight & de Wit, 1995). This is evident in the university’s policy (Sussex Centre for Migration Research & Centre for Applied Population Research, 2004), and more specifically in the academic programs and services which support student mobility and the organisational strategies which will help to integrate mobility into the university's administrative processes and structures. Thus, the implementation of student mobility as a strategic goal can be used to explain differences in student participation at various universities. However, the number of Australian and New Zealand universities who have student exchange as a strategic goal
is unknown. Study One examined how many universities had a specific goal of student exchange. When the policy provides specific objectives, accountability and details resourcing, implementation may be more successful (Brunetto & Farr-Wharton, 2005a; Johnston & Moore, 1990). Thus, it was hypothesised that:

*Universities that had a specific goal of student mobility would have proportionately more students participating in the exchange program.*

The Australian higher education system is quite diverse, with different types of universities reflecting different origins and traditions, structures and programs and missions and goals. Marginson (2000) argued that there are four major types of public universities in Australia. The first type of university, the *Sandstone*, is aligned with the traditional ‘Oxford-Cambridge’ model. The second type of institution, the Technical University or *U-tech* refers to those with a tradition of technical training. The third type of university is the *New University*. These formed after the 1987 Dawkins’ reforms and mainly comprise former Colleges of Advanced Education. The final group of universities are the *Wannabee Sandstones*, who formed before 1987 and aim to have the same social and academic standing as the Sandstones.

The diversity in organisational culture also can be seen in the diverse student cohorts. For example, Sandstone universities attract a higher proportion of research postgraduate students and, have a greater proportion of full-time students than the other types of institutions. On the other hand, a greater percentage of students at New universities come from low socioeconomic backgrounds (Department of Education Science & Training, 2005). As proposed earlier, socio-economic status and financial constraints will influence whether a student participates in a student exchange program. Thus, it was hypothesised that:
New universities would have proportionately less students participating in the exchange program than the other types of universities.

Conclusion

Chapter Two has considered the drivers and barriers of student participation in Australian and New Zealand university exchange programs (see Fig 2.1). This thesis proposes that the decision to participate in an exchange program is dependent on both individual factors such as intercultural competencies and demographic characteristics, and contextual factors such as national and institutional student exchange policies and programs and the home university at which a student is enrolled. These variables were investigated in Studies One and Two.

Study One focused on the contextual factors impacting on the decision-making process for exchange students such as university strategic goal of student exchange, national LOTE policies and geopolitical stability. Study One represented the first national collection of data investigating exchange program participation rates, and details of participating students and host destinations. This thesis argues that success of an exchange program, measured in terms of participation rates, is dependent on the implementation of a strategic goal specific to student exchange. It was hypothesised that:

Universities that had a specific goal of student mobility would have proportionately more students participating in the exchange program.
It was further posited that the cohort of student attending the university also would influence participation rates. Since a greater proportion of students from low socio-economic backgrounds attend New universities, it was hypothesised that:

*New universities would have proportionately less students participating in the exchange program than the other types of universities.*

In the context of low levels of second-language learning in Australia and New Zealand, it was hypothesised that:

*More Australian and New Zealand exchange students would study in English-speaking countries than non-English speaking countries.*

Study Two analysed the individual factors which moderate a student’s decision to participate in the exchange program or remain at home including: personal characteristics; career development; culture and travel; language; relationships; financial constraints and education. Following Dwyer’s (2004) position that before studying abroad, exchange students are a different group from non-exchange students, it was hypothesised that:

*Before departing on the exchange program, exchange students would report higher levels of intercultural competencies than non-exchange students.*

Next, Chapter Three will discuss the experiences of students when in the host country. This discussion will firstly consider the factors at the pre-departure stage which will influence the in-country experience. Then Chapter Three will focus on the organisational and contextual factors in-country which will influence the exchange student’s experience.
CHAPTER 3 – EXCHANGE STUDENTS’ EXPERIENCES IN THE HOST COUNTRY

Introduction

This chapter reviews the pre-departure and in-country factors that may influence the experiences of an exchange student in the host country. The literature analysing sojourners’ experiences while abroad is extensive (e.g. Aycan, 1997; Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005; Fish, 2005; Kim, 2001; Masgoret, 2006; Pitts, 2006; Selmer, 2006; Selmer & Leung, 2003a; Shaffer et al., 1999; Van Oudenhoven & Hofstra, 2006; Van Oudenhoven et al., 2003; Ward et al., 2001; Ying & Han, 2006). However, most of this research on sojourner adjustment has analysed the determinants and consequences of cross-cultural adjustment of immigrants, international students, business expatriates, military and volunteer workers. There is limited focus on short-term sojourns such as student exchange. Furthermore, few authors have examined exchange students’ specific experiences in the host culture. This thesis will fill some of these gaps in the literature with Study Three investigating the experiences of exchange students in Canada and Study Four comparing exchange students’ expectations and experiences of difficulties in the host country.

In this thesis, it was proposed that the student exchange experience is moderated by organisational and contextual factors (see Fig. 3.1). Organisational factors comprise “social and academic support systems” (Cushner & Karim, p.292) such as pre-departure training and orientation programs. As suggested in Chapter Two the support programs within the student’s home university reflect the organisational culture, leadership and resourcing. Contextual factors include “host culture demographics; the nature of host
culture interactions; the degree of ethnocentrism and host culture attitudes towards outsiders; and the length of stay in the host culture” (Cushner & Karim, 2004, p.292).

As seen in Figure 3.1, it was argued that the organisational variables of *pre-departure training and orientation*, and the contextual factors of *cultural distance* and *nature of host culture interactions* influence students’ expectations and experiences of difficulties while in the host culture. Furthermore, Aycan (1997) and Black et al (1991) proposed that these factors affect a sojourner’s experience both before departing the home country (anticipatory adjustment) and after arriving in the host country (in-country adjustment).

Figure 3.1: The student exchange experience in the host country

The first section of this chapter will focus on the issue of cross-cultural adjustment and culture shock as these influence a student’s experiences in the host
culture. Then the chapter will discuss pre-departure training as an organisational factor that assists an exchange student to develop appropriate expectations regarding their time in the host culture. The in-country organisational and contextual factors that affect the student exchange experience will also be discussed. The organisational factor is the in-country orientation support provided by the host university. The contextual factors include the cultural novelty and the amount of interaction with host nationals.

Sojourner adjustment

Sojourner adjustment is a dynamic multidimensional phenomenon (Ady, 1995; Aycan, 1997; Berry, Kim, & Boski, 1988; Black, 1988; Black et al., 1991; Black & Mendenhall, 1991; Kim, 2001; Ward & Kennedy, 1996, 1999). Consequently, it is difficult to define as it has been operationalised in many different ways including the acquisition of culturally acceptable skills and behaviours (Bochner, McLeod, & Lin, 1977), functioning appropriately in the host country (Kline Harrison, Chadwick, & Scales, 1996), and feeling accepted by host nationals (Brislin, 1981). The experience of exchange students is “unique as they must adapt to a new culture as well as function in an academic setting” (Ryan & Twibell, 2000, p.431). Adjustment of exchange students encompasses succeeding with their studies (work adjustment), an ability to successfully interact with locals (sociocultural adjustment) and a feeling of psychological well-being (psychological adjustment) (Aycan, 1997; Black et al., 1991; Black & Mendenhall, 1990; Church, 1982; Kealey, 1988; Van der Zee & Van Oudenhoven, 2000; Ward & Kennedy, 1996).

Koskinen and Tossavainen (2003) concluded that the study abroad experience is intense with many students experiencing culture shock. When individuals encounter a
new culture, they experience a range of emotional reactions known as culture shock, due to a lack of understanding of the verbal and nonverbal communication of the host culture, its customs and its value systems (P. S. Adler, 1975; Furnham, 1988; Kim, 2001). Culture shock is marked by feelings of isolation and homesickness, depression, insomnia, physical ailments, and excessive consumption of food and/or alcohol (P. S. Adler, 1975; Church, 1982; Oberg, 1970). Consequently, culture shock is viewed negatively as an illness or disease (Oberg, 1970) or problem of adjustment (Furnham & Bochner, 1986). Ting-Toomey (1999) contended that if culture shock is managed effectively, the outcomes for the sojourner can be positive. In order to understand how to maximise the outcomes for exchange students, it is important to understand the factors which will influence their experiences in the host country. Thus, it was seen that investigation in this thesis of the experiences of short-term sojourners like exchange students was worthwhile. Specifically, it was beneficial to understand whether exchange students perceived that they experienced culture shock, what caused stress in the host country and what strategies students used to cope with stress and culture shock.

Pre-departure factors impacting upon sojourner adjustment

*Organisational factors*

Cushner and Karim (2004) listed the culture of the home organisation as a variable influencing the adjustment of exchange students. It was argued in Chapter Two that an institution’s culture will influence the structure and management of the exchange program, including the social and logistic support provided to outgoing students. Aycan (1997) noted that pre-departure support from the home organisation reduces the time the expatriate has to spend on these issues, reduces anxiety about the
sojourn and thus enhances adjustment. Some of the issues with which students may require assistance include accommodation, medical and travel insurance, visa requirements including work permits where possible, and enrolment advice to meet home course requirements (Daskal Albert, 1986).

Pre-departure training is also a key determinant of successful adjustment (Ady, 1995; Aycan, 1997; Black et al., 1991; Waxin, 2004). In their review of the cross-cultural training literature, Black and Mendenhall (1990) concluded that training is effective in enhancing a sojourner’s adjustment in the host culture. Specifically, cross-cultural training is believed to increase confidence (Black & Mendenhall, 1990) and reduce anxiety (Shaffer et al., 1999), assist with the development of accurate expectations before departing the home country (Black et al., 1991; Tomich, Mc Whirter, & Darcy, 2003), enhance the transition to the host culture (Roskams & Dallo, 1990), and generally improve the sojourner’s ability to act effectively in the new environment (Black & Mendenhall, 1990; D. L. Goldstein & Smith, 1999). Studies have shown that training programs offered to overseas students studying in Australia and New Zealand result in improvements in adjustment and academic success (Barker et al., 2002; Daly & Brown, 2004). Several authors (D. L. Goldstein & Smith, 1999; Gudykunst, Guzley, & Hammer, 1996; Robertson & Andrew, 1990; Roskams & Dallo, 1990) have proposed that pre-departure training and on-arrival orientation are essential to familiarise the sojourner to both the country and institution.

Despite its benefits, Gudykunst et al (1996) noted that expatriate training is brief and received by less than 25% of managers. Furthermore, Mak (2000, p.2) concluded that “cross-cultural training tends to relate to expatriate workers and peacekeepers rather than students”. Pitts (2006) argued that due to their short duration, it is difficult to provide the kind of training that exchange students require. However it is unclear as to
what training exchange students receive before being sent abroad. This area was examined in this thesis.

Pre-departure training can shape a sojourner’s expectations of their experiences in the host country. Realistic expectations facilitate anticipatory adjustment (Aycan, 1997; Furnham, 1988; Rogers & Ward, 1993; Searle & Ward, 1990). If sojourners can anticipate the impending changes, they will experience less culture shock and thus in-country adjustment will be better. This thesis examined exchange students’ pre-departure expectations in terms of the extent of difficulty they will experience in the host country. Additionally, students’ expected levels of difficulty were compared to the difficulties students’ recalled experiencing in the host country once they returned home.

In-country factors impacting upon sojourner adjustment

Organisational factors

Support from the host organisation provides sojourners with information about what is acceptable behaviour (Black et al., 1991). In the context of student exchange, organisational support includes academic and social support and logistical assistance provided by the host university to incoming students. This support most frequently occurs in the form of orientation. Barker, Mak and colleagues (Barker, 1990; Barker et al., 2002; Mak, 2000; Mak & Barker, 2000) confirmed that orientation programs are essential in relation to the transition of international students. Such programs should orient the individual to both the country and institution (Roskams & Dallo, 1990).

Ying and Han’s (2006) recent longitudinal study of Taiwanese students studying in America indicated there would be great merit in orientation programs which involve domestic students. Taiwanese students who interacted with American students in a
social context reported better adjustment and feelings of well-being than those students who only interacted with co-nationals. Moreover, orientation to the host culture should be incremental to meet the different needs of the sojourner over time (Gudykunst et al., 1996; Robertson & Andrew, 1990). This includes on-arrival orientation to provide immediate logistical information and ongoing training and support to develop skills to interact with host nationals and enhance adjustment (D. L. Goldstein & Smith, 1999).

There is a lack of published work discussing orientation programs for short-term sojourns such as student exchange. An exception is the work of La Brack (1993 cited in Koskinen & Tossavainen, 2003) who criticised universities for the lack of properly planned and conducted orientation programs. This thesis examined the orientation programs provided by the two Canadian universities to Australian and New Zealand students. This research included investigating the type and timing of orientation and the content of programs.

*Contextual factors*

It is well established that the cultural and linguistic similarity of the host and home countries affect sojourner adjustment (Black et al., 1991; Fish, 2005; Gudykunst & Hammer, 1988; Masgoret, 2006; Palthe, 2004; Searle & Ward, 1990; Selmer, 2006; Shafffer et al., 1999; Tomich et al., 2003; Ward & Kennedy, 1999; Waxin, 2004). The more different the host culture is from the home culture, the more difficult the sojourner’s adjustment. The larger the perceived differences between the home and host country, the greater the uncertainty about how to behave (Gudykunst & Hammer, 1988). Furthermore, host language competence assists sociocultural adjustment because it provides sojourners with the social rules and perceptual skills necessary for
interpersonal interactions (Barker, 1993; Jones, 1994; Shaffer et al., 1999). Therefore it
was hypothesised that,

Students who studied in countries which were culturally and
linguistically similar to Australia and New Zealand would have expected
at the pre-departure stage to experience fewer difficulties while in the
host country than those students who studied in countries which were
culturally and linguistically distant.

The amount and type of contact with host nationals (Cushner & Karim, 2004;
Fish, 2005; Masgoret, 2006; Tomich et al., 2003) also influences sociocultural
adjustment (Ward & Kennedy, 1999). While a review of the literature shows that the
interaction between international and domestic students is low (see Ward, 2005 for a
review), there is a paucity of research investigating the relationships between local and
exchange students in the host country. Thus, this thesis examined the friendships of
Australian and New Zealand exchange students in Canada. Beaver and Tuck (1998)
asserted that domestic students are focused on gaining their qualifications and are less
likely to seek contact with international students. It was expected that the participants in
Study Three would have greater interaction with other Australians and New Zealanders
and other exchange students than with host nationals.

Conclusion

This chapter has discussed sojourner adjustment and culture shock, and the
organisational (pre-departure training and orientation programs) and contextual
(cultural distance, nature of host culture interactions) factors which influence students’
expectations and experiences of difficulties within the host culture. Study Three
explored the experiences of Australian and New Zealand exchange students in Canada. This included considering whether participants experienced culture shock and the antecedents and signs of difficulties adjusting in the host country. Study Three also examined the pre-departure training Australian and New Zealand exchange students undertook at their home institution and the orientation programs undertaken at the host university and the nature of the friendships experienced by participants in Canada. Study Four compared the pre-departure expectations of difficulties in the host country with the actual experiences to determine their expectations of experiences in the host country. Since the novelty the language and culture of the host country may affect cross-cultural adjustment, it was hypothesised that,

> Students who studied in countries which were culturally and linguistically similar to Australia and New Zealand would have expected at the pre-departure stage to experience fewer difficulties while in the host country than those students who studied in countries which were culturally and linguistically distant.

Next, Chapter Four will discuss the outcomes of the student exchange experience. Specifically, the discussion will focus on four topics: intercultural competencies; career; international orientation; and education. These constructs reflect the factors introduced in Chapter Two which influence the decision to participate in the student exchange program.
CHAPTER 4 – OUTCOMES OF THE EXCHANGE EXPERIENCE

Introduction

This chapter discusses the final stage of the student exchange experience. While numerous studies have reported the benefits of study abroad that are perceived by students, the acquisition of skills is assumed rather than proven (Carlson et al., 1990; Clyne & Rizvi, 1998; Sussex Centre for Migration Research & Centre for Applied Population Research, 2004; Van Hoof & Verbeeten, 2005). In his study of returned exchange students, Abrams (1979) found that over half of the participants considered their exchange experience as one of the most important in their lives. However, the ways in which the sojourn affects the individual student are unclear. Study Four aimed to respond to this gap in the literature through examining the intercultural competencies exchange students may develop as a consequence of their time abroad.

Based on a review of the study abroad and student exchange literature, I have categorised three factors that are affected by the sojourn. These are:

1. Intercultural competencies;
2. Career goals; and
3. International orientation.

These three factors reflect the constructs of intercultural competencies, career development and culture and travel introduced in Chapter Two, which motivate students to participate in exchange programs. Chapter Four discusses these three factors in the context of outcomes of the student exchange experience.

Intercultural Competencies

Personal enrichment and development are frequently cited as consequences of study abroad (Carlson et al., 1990; Teichler & Jahr, 2001; Van Hoof & Verbeeten,
For example in Van Hoof and Verbeeten’s (2005) investigation of student opinion on international exchange programs, 90% of respondents reported that their study abroad experience was very-extremely relevant for their personal development. Milstein’s (2005) review of the empirical studies which have examined the personal impact of an international sojourn identified effects such as attitude change, personal growth and enhanced awareness and understanding of oneself. For example, Hansel and Grove (1985, 1986 cited in Milstein, 2005) found that high school exchange students showed greater increases in personal growth subsequent to their sojourn than those students who remained at home. Respondents in Van Hoof and Verbeeten’s (2005) study who were from US institutions or studied on exchange at US institutions, felt that their international education experience assisted them to become more mature and “worldly adults” (Van Hoof & Verbeeten, 2005, p.56). However as this discussion shows, the construct of personal development has been conceptualized in many different ways. In this thesis, personal development was examined in terms of development of intercultural competencies.

Hammer, Bennett and Wiseman (2003) argued “that greater intercultural sensitivity is associated with greater potential for exercising intercultural competencies” (p. 422). Recently several studies (Anderson, Lawton, Reseisen, & Hubbard, 2006; Engle & Engle, 2004; Medina-Lopez-Portillo, 2004; Paige et al., 2004) have considered the relationship between study abroad and the development of intercultural sensitivity to determine the impact of the study abroad experience. Using Hammer and Bennett’s (2002) Intercultural Development Inventory, Anderson et al (2006) found that after four weeks in Europe a small sample of American students had increased in their cross-cultural sensitivity. Similarly, Paige and his colleagues (2004) reported significant improvements in US students’ sensitivity.
Many studies examining the outcomes of an overseas study experience are based on recall (Church, 1982; Milstein, 2005; Van Hoof & Verbeeten, 2005). For example, Milstein (2005) surveyed 212 Japanese Exchange and Teaching (JET) Alumni after their sojourn to investigate their perceived changes in communication self-efficacy. Interestingly, 95.5% of respondents reported a perceived increased in self-efficacy after the sojourn. However, this method is limiting because perceived change does not necessarily reflect actual change (Carlson et al., 1990). Consequently, Study Four employed a pre-test post-test design to quantify the changes occurring as a result of the overseas study experience.

Few studies have employed longitudinal research to empirically measure changes in exchange students’ intercultural competencies. The work of Kumagai (1977) and Stitsworth (1989) suggest that an exchange sojourn results in changes in students’ affective intercultural competencies. Kumagai (1977) conducted a longitudinal investigation of the personalities of male Japanese students who had studied in America for a period of one year. Using a Japanese version of the California Psychological Inventory (CPI), she surveyed participants at four time periods: (T1) pre-departure, (T2) upon arrival in the USA, (T3) one year after being in the USA and (T4) after returning to Japan. After comparing the results of the CPI at T1 and T4, Kumagai (1977) purported that the sojourn experiences had no significant impact overall on students' personalities. However there were significant changes in three personality traits: Sense of Wellbeing, Achievement via Conformance and Femininity. These changes were attributed to differences in the American and Japanese culture which strengthened the Japanese trait of conformity, provided an appreciation of the home culture and thus increased a sense of well-being, and increased students’ acknowledgement of the various roles of women.
Stitsworth (1989) also utilised the CPI to compare the personality changes of US exchange students studying in Japan on a one-month homestay with a control group who remained at home. This study analysed a younger cohort and participants were primarily female. Measurements were obtained at three different times: six weeks before departing on the sojourn (T1); upon immediate return to the USA (T2) and four months post-return (T3). Stitsworth (1989) found that at T2 students were more flexible and independent than the control group. Interestingly, students who were the first in their family to go abroad and those who were self-funded, changed the most. However these differences had disappeared by T3.

An aim of this thesis was to examine whether students’ intercultural competencies change as a consequence of the study period abroad. There is ongoing debate as to whether intercultural competencies are stable personality traits or dynamic knowledge and skills which can be developed through training and experience (Black & Mendenhall, 1990; Kealey, 1990; Mak & Buckingham, 2007; O'Sullivan, 1999; O'Sullivan, Appelbaum, & Abikhzer, 2002; Van der Zee & Van Oudenhoven, 2001). Kealey (1990) noted that there has been limited investigation into whether intercultural competencies can be developed. According to Black and Mendenhall’s (1990) taxonomy of cross-cultural competencies, emotional stability, extraversion, agreeableness, openness to experience and conscientiousness are stable competencies. However, recent studies have shown increases in university students’ intercultural competencies scores as a result of completing the ExcelL (Excellence in Experiential Learning & Leadership) intercultural skills program (Barker et al., 2002; Daly & Brown, 2004; Mak & Buckingham, 2007; Woods, Barker, & Daly, 2004). For example, in Daly and Brown’s (2004) study international students reported higher scores on open-mindedness, social initiative and emotional stability at the post-intervention stage.
than before commencing the ExcelL program. No changes were observed in the control group. Similarly, Mak and Buckingham (2007) found students’ social self-efficacy scores increased as a result of training while there were no changes in the control group. These findings suggest that intercultural competencies are dynamic as they can be trained. Certainly, Graf (2004) argued that experiential training can develop intercultural competencies although affective and behavioural changes take time to develop.

One of the goals of Study Four was to understand how student’s intercultural competencies change as a result of the exchange sojourn. Given that intercultural competencies may be acquired and developed through experience (O'Sullivan, 1999), it was hypothesised that:

*Exchange students would report higher levels of intercultural competencies at the return stage of the sojourn than at the pre-departure stage.*

Kim and Ruben (1988) posited that growth occurs as a consequence of stress. In response to stress caused by cultural change (P. S. Adler, 1975; Ryan & Twibell, 2000), the sojourner makes adjustments in their behaviour and attitudes in order to accommodate the situation and re-establish their internal equilibrium (P. S. Adler, 1975). Kim and Ruben’s (1988) work resonates with Mezirow’s (1991) Transformative Learning theory. Through making meaning of their experiences, sojourners are able to learn, grow and develop. Taylor (1994, p.159 cited in Mohan and Cushner, 2004, p.7) argued that “when an individual has an experience that cannot be assimilated into his or her meaning perspective, either the experience is rejected or the perspective changes to accommodate the new experience”. Students who develop most as a consequence of the sojourn are “those whose paradigms shift and whose thinking is modified because of
the new experiences” (Mahon & Cushner, 2004, p.7). Thus, Adler (1975) contended that culture shock should be seen in the broader context of intercultural learning.

Chapter Three introduced the belief that studying in a culturally distant country would create more stress in the individual than in a country which has few cultural differences (e.g. Black et al., 1991; Redmond, 2000 cited in Cushner & Karim, 2004; Waxin, 2004). A sojourn in a country which is linguistically similar would also create less stress (Fish, 2005; Kim, 2001; Selmer, 2006). Thus, it was proposed that if an Australian or New Zealand exchange student studied in a country which was both culturally distant to their home country and where English was not the primary language, they would experience greater stress. Furthermore in accordance with the work of Kim and Ruben (1988) and Mezirow (1991), it was anticipated that the exchange student would, in turn, experience more growth than if he/she had been in a culturally similar English-speaking country.

**Career Goals**

As discussed in Chapter Two, one of the key reasons for studying abroad cited by exchange students is to enhance their employability both in the home country and the global marketplace. Exchange students have reported that they have studied abroad because they desired an international career and believed an overseas study experience would make them more attractive to future employers (Carlson et al., 1990; Chieffo, 2000; Clyne & Rizvi, 1998; Furnham, 1988; Teichler & Jahr, 2001; Van Hoof & Verbeeten, 2005; Wiers-Jenssen, 2002). Up to two years after returning from their overseas study, students surveyed by Van Hoof and Verbeeten (2005) rated their international experience as very-extremely relevant to their future job opportunities.
American students from the University of Delaware reported a similar belief regarding the career advantages possible as a result of the exchange experience (Chieffo, 2000).

However it is unclear if, after returning to their home country, exchange students continue to desire to work overseas and if they have specific plans regarding this. Thus, one of the aims of the thesis was to understand exchange students’ goals in terms of employment in the host country and other countries after they have studied abroad. Since career development was described in Chapter Two as a driver of the decision to study abroad, it was expected that Australian and New Zealand exchange students would be highly likely to seek employment overseas.

*International Orientation*

Exchange students are highly motivated to travel and experience a different culture. Previous studies (Clyne & Rizvi, 1998; Holdaway et al., 1988; Van Hoof & Verbeeten, 2005; Wiers-Jenssen, 2003) suggest that these aspirations continue after their exchange sojourn. Former exchange students tend to be more mobile after graduating. In his review of American exchange alumni, Abrams (1979) identified that a greater proportion of ‘mobile’ graduates have lived abroad than their non-mobile peers. Similarly in their study of former ERASMUS students Teichler and Jahr (2001) found that the international professional mobility of these students was greater than the average professional mobility of European graduates at that time. Nine percent of ERASMUS graduates were employed in their host country, and nine percent in a third country. Returned exchange students in Van Hoof and Verbeeten’s (2005) study reported that their exchange experience helped them to be able to live and work in foreign environments.
As mentioned above, this thesis investigated whether, like the Norwegians and Americans, Australian and New Zealand exchange graduates desired to continue being internationally mobile. Specifically, Study Four considered the likelihood that a student planned to travel back to the host country or to other countries. In Chapter Two it was anticipated that Australian and New Zealand exchange students would be highly motivated to participate in the student exchange program because of a desire to travel. Thus, it was further expected that after their exchange experience, Australian and New Zealand exchange students would be highly likely to plan to travel overseas again, to both the host country and other countries.

Conclusion

This chapter has discussed three aspects of individual outcomes of the student exchange experience. These outcomes were intercultural competencies, career goals and international orientation. Study Four examined the intercultural competencies of exchange students pre-and post-sojourn. Since intercultural competencies are dynamic, it was hypothesised that:

*Students would report higher levels of intercultural competencies at the return stage than at the pre-departure stage.*

Another objective of Study Four was to understand students’ goals for international and domestic work and travel after participating in the exchange program. Travel and experiencing other cultures and career development were drivers of mobility outlined in Chapter Two. So, it was anticipated that after returning to their home country, students would report a high likelihood of working and travelling overseas.
In the next section of the thesis, the research program will be presented. Chapter Five outlines the research methodology underpinning this thesis. Then each of the four studies will be discussed in Chapters Six – Nine.
SECTION III - THE RESEARCH PROGRAM

The next section of this thesis presents an overview of the research methodology used in this thesis (Chapter 5) and describes the method and findings of the four studies. This research program was comprised of a longitudinal investigation examining the three phases of an international sojourn - pre-departure, in-country and post-return. Studies One (Chapter Six) and Two (Chapter 7) considered the pre-departure factors that influence a student’s decision to participate in an exchange program. Study One explored the relationship between a university’s strategic goal of student exchange and participation rates in exchange programs. Complementing the consideration of organisational and contextual factors in Study One, Study Two analysed the individual factors which influence a student to participate in an exchange program. Next, Study Three (Chapter 8) investigated the experiences of Australian and New Zealand exchange students in Canada. Finally, Study Four (Chapter 9) analysed the changes in intercultural competencies which occurred as a result of the exchange experience and students’ international orientation and career goals.
CHAPTER 5 – RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The primary aim of the research program was to explore the student exchange experience. Postpositivism was considered an appropriate research paradigm for this thesis because there is a need for both quantitative and qualitative methods to examine the complex processes that constitute the student exchange experience (Creswell, 2003; Paige et al., 2004). In order to achieve the objectives of the research program, a mixed method design consisting of four sequential studies, was employed. This chapter provides a rationale for the mixed method research design of the thesis and outlines the methods utilised to explore the research questions and hypotheses of the four studies. First, the philosophy of inquiry underpinning this research will be outlined. This is followed by a discussion of the research methodology and research design. The third section provides an overview of the data analyses conducted in the four studies. The chapter concludes with consideration of ethical issues.

Philosophy of Inquiry

A research paradigm is a “basic set of beliefs that guides action” (Guba, 1990, p.17) consisting of the researcher’s epistemological, ontological and methodological principles. There are four alternative research paradigms: positivism and postpositivism, both of which have been aligned traditionally with the natural sciences (Neuman, 2000) and the more recently adopted approaches of constructivism and critical theory (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994; Neuman, 2000). Table 5.1 summarises the beliefs of each of these paradigms.
Table 5.1 Basic Beliefs of Alternative Inquiry Paradigms (taken from Guba & Lincoln, 1994, p.109)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Positivism</th>
<th>Postpositivism</th>
<th>Critical Theory et al</th>
<th>Constructivism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ontology</td>
<td>Naïve realism – “real” reality but apprehendable</td>
<td>Critical realism – “real” reality but only imperfectly and probabilistically apprehendable</td>
<td>Historical realism – virtual reality shaped by social, political, cultural, economic, ethnic and gender values; crystallized over time</td>
<td>Relativism – local and specific constructed realities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistemology</td>
<td>Dualist/ objectivist; findings true</td>
<td>Modified dualist/ objectivist; critical tradition/ community; findings probably true</td>
<td>Transactional/ subjectivist; value-mediated findings</td>
<td>Transactional/ subjectivist; created findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Experimental/ manipulative; verification of hypotheses; chiefly quantitative methods</td>
<td>Modified experimental/ manipulative; critical multiplicity; falsification of hypotheses; may include qualitative methods</td>
<td>Dialogic/ dialectical</td>
<td>Hermeneutical/ dialectical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Postpositivism was an appropriate paradigm underpinning this research program, because it recognises the contextually bound nature of research findings (Clark, 1998) and the impact of the researcher’s values, which are reflected in the selection of the study topic (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). Postpositivism arose from criticism of the positivist approach to obtaining the absolute truth through scientific measures (Clark, 1998; Ponterotto, 2005). The position of postpositivists is that of critical realism (Ponterotto, 2005). That is, “true” reality cannot be perfectly perceived but rather knowledge is circumstantial, so multiple methods are used to capture as much of reality as possible (Broudy, Ennis, & Krimerman, 1973; Denzin & Lincoln, 1994;
Guba & Lincoln, 1994; Phillips & Burbules, 2000; Williams, 2006). A key distinction between positivism and postpositivism is that the former seeks theory verification, while postpositivism is based upon theory falsification (Lincoln & Guba, 2000). Both positivism and postpositivism aim to predict and control the phenomena being investigated (Ponterotto, 2005). Postpositivism is based on the assumption that the use of scientific method in quasi-experimental survey will control subjectivity in qualitative methodologies (Clark, 1998; Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). On the other hand, positivists believe that the truth can be obtained independent of the researcher through scientific approaches (Clark, 1998).

Quantitative and qualitative research

Denzin and Lincoln (2000) simplified the difference between quantitative and qualitative research methods as being “a distinction between numerical and non-numerical data” (p.2). Quantitative methods involve quantifying observations, usually with large samples and using statistical methods to measure and analyse causal relationships between variables (Ponterotto, 2005). In contrast, qualitative research emphasizes processes and meanings and is context specific (Babbie, 2001).

While quantitative research is ideal for testing and validating theories and hypotheses constructed before the data is collected, “the researcher may miss out on phenomena occurring because of the focus on theory or hypothesis testing rather than on theory or hypothesis generation” (R. B. Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004, p.19). In contrast to qualitative research, quantitative data collection and analysis are reasonably quick and less time consuming (Hoppe-Graff & Lamm-Hanel, 2006) and the results are relatively independent of the researcher (R. B. Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004). Furthermore, quantitative research allows the measurement of the responses of a larger
range of participants to a limited set of questions, thus facilitating comparison and statistical aggregation of the data (Creswell, 2003; Patton, 1990).

Contrary to existing research practice in the area of study abroad and student exchange, Hashimoto (2003) argued for more qualitative studies to understand ‘how’ the reported outcomes of student exchange programs occur. Similarly, Usunier (1998) identified the need for qualitative research to understand and improve the adjustment of sojourners. Qualitative methods typically produce a wealth of detailed information about a much smaller number of people (Patton, 1990). Usually data is collected in natural settings and the researcher can identify contextual factors which affect the phenomena being investigated (Guba & Lincoln, 1994; R. B. Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004). However, qualitative research is sometimes criticised for its subjective nature (Patton, 1990). Qualitative research can provide the emic perspective (R. B. Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004), which means the findings are not generalisable but are unique to the participants in the study. Unlike the processes used in quantitative research, qualitative data collection methods and analysis are time consuming and costly (Hoppe-Graff & Lamm-Hanel, 2006; R. B. Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004).

Mixed-methods research

Reviewing the strengths and weaknesses of both quantitative and qualitative research methods suggests that combining both approaches provides a more complex and deeper understanding of the phenomenon (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Greene & Caracelli, 2003; Morse, 2003; Neuman, 2000). Mixed methods research commonly refers to the integration of quantitative and qualitative methods (Hanson, Creswell, Clark, Petska, & Creswell, 2005). Creswell and his colleagues (Creswell, Plano Clark, Gutmann, & Hanson, 2003) defined mixed methods research as “the collection or
analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data in a single study in which the data are collected concurrently or sequentially, are given a priority, and involve the integration of the data at one or more stages in the process of research” (p.212).

Mixed methods is an effective technique to elaborate on the findings of previous studies, improve validity, gain a deeper understanding of the phenomena and thus allows researchers to be more confident with their results (Creswell, 2003; Hanson et al., 2005; Jick, 1979; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003). According to Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004) the goal of using mixed methods “is to draw from the strengths and weaknesses of both quantitative and qualitative research” (p. 15). Greene and Caracelli (2003) contended that mixed methods takes advantage of both the generalisability of quantitative approaches and the detailed, contextual nature of qualitative findings. Subjectivity of the research may be reduced as researchers may use the results from one approach to expand on and validate their findings collected through the other approach (Punch, 2005; Sale, Lohfeld, & Brazil, 2002). In other words, the same phenomena can be viewed from different perspectives (Creswell et al., 2003).

Yet, several authors (Creswell, 2003; Jick, 1979; Morse, 2003) have noted that time and financial constraints may prevent effective use of multiple methods. Moreover, it is difficult to replicate mixed methods research (Jick, 1979). A central criticism of mixed methods research is referred to as the incompatibility thesis which states that positivist (quantitative) and constructivist (qualitative) paradigms are so different that they are incompatible (R. B. Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2003). This criticism is subsiding and there is a trend to move away from pure quantitative research to use mixed methods far more frequently in the social sciences (Hanson et al., 2005; Hoppe-Graff & Lamm-Hanel, 2006; Neimeyer & Diamond, 2001; O'Neill, 2002; Ponterotto, 2005). This change is in response to calls for
increased methodological diversity (Hanson et al., 2005; Neimeyer & Diamond, 2001) and a greater balance between qualitative and quantitative methods (O'Neill, 2002). Furthermore, there is a growing belief that mixed methods is a research paradigm in its own right (R. B. Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004; Ratner, 1997).

Mixed methods were employed in this thesis to gain a better understanding of the complex process of the student exchange experience and the outcomes of the sojourn. Studies One, Two and Four primarily relied on quantitative surveys to examine the changes in students’ intercultural competencies. Study Three’s qualitative approach of interviewing exchange students while abroad provided more detailed understanding of how such changes occurred. Thus, the two approaches complemented each other to gain a deeper understanding of the phenomenon.

Research Methodology

The type of research question is a key factor to consider when deciding which research technique to use (Sale et al., 2002; Yin, 2003). Studies One, Two and Four employed quantitative approaches. Questionnaires were used in Study One to understand what changes had occurred in the participation rates of Australian and New Zealand university exchange programs and in what countries Australian and New Zealand exchange students studied in 2001. Study Two used questionnaires to compare the demographic characteristics of Australian and New Zealand exchange students with students who remained at the home university. A survey also provided insight into the factors that influence a student’s decision to participate in a student exchange program. Study Four examined to what extent students’ pre-departure expectations of difficulties in the host country differed from their actual experiences. Additionally, Study Four
analysed what intercultural competencies exchange students possess before and after their sojourn, and after participating in an exchange program, what are student’s goals in terms of career and travel.

A questionnaire is the best method when seeking answers to questions of ‘how many’, ‘where’ and ‘what’ (Patton, 1990). Furthermore, Babbie (1990 cited in Creswell, 2003) proposed that questionnaires are ideal to make generalisations from a sample to a population. Questionnaires are easy to administer, relatively cheap, and good for collecting data on non-contentious and straightforward topics (Kidder, 1981; Moore, 2000). Surveys are suitable when the research is influenced by a limited budget and participants are geographically dispersed (Kidder, 1981). Postal surveys permit access to respondents regardless of geographical distance so this was seen as the most effective method to include all universities across both countries.

Distributing surveys via electronic mail was deemed an excellent way to contact students at the second time period in Study Four. The first survey was distributed by post before the exchange students went abroad. Cobanoglu, Warde and Moreo (2001) purported that repeat surveys distributed by post are better than e-mail distribution because people change their e-mail address more often than their postal address. In contrast, Schaefer and Dillman (1998 cited in Dillman, 2000) found that the response rate to e-mail surveys overall was the same as mail. They also noted that surveys distributed via e-mail were returned more quickly with 76% of responses received within four days. Therefore, it was felt that using e-mail for survey distribution was the most appropriate method for several reasons. Firstly, students may have changed their physical address at the completion of the studies or upon returning from overseas and secondly, university students today tend to rely on e-mail as a primary form of communication (Couper, 2001; Dillman, 2000; Kypri & Gallagher, 2003). Additionally,
it is acknowledged that e-mail has the potential for overcoming geographic barriers and survey implementation time can be reduced to days or hours (Dillman, 2000; J. Dwyer, 2005).

Study One also examined the strategic plans of Australian and New Zealand universities to determine the presence or absence of goals relating to the student exchange program. The content of goals was not analysed. Rather the aim was to understand in 2001 how many universities expressed student exchange as a strategic goal. Thus, this was a quantitative approach.

The objective of Study Three was to explore in more depth the issues of students’ experiences in order to understand more fully the outcomes of the sojourn. Therefore, Study Three involved interviewing a small cohort of students to understand their experiences in the host country with a view to explaining the broader outcomes of student exchange programs. Interviews are appropriate when there is a need to establish trust, the material is sensitive and most of the questions are open and require an extended response with prompts and probes (Fontana & Frey, 1994; Gillham, 2000). A face-to-face interview allows the researcher to check the participant’s understanding and assists with the development of the social relationship between the interviewer and interviewee (Gomm, 2004; Shuy, 2002).

As noted above, one of the disadvantages of qualitative research is the subjectivity of the process. It is difficult for the researcher to draw comparisons across participants because interviewees may provide different amounts of information on various topics and require different probes (J. C. Johnson & Weller, 2002). Subjectivity can be minimised by standardising the interview questions. However, this technique then moves the research to be a more positivist than an interprevist approach (Ponterotto, 2005).
The interviews for Study Three were conducted at the host universities in Canada. While this was a resource intensive strategy involving travel to two universities in western and eastern Canada, the costs involved were balanced with the unique opportunities to interview students in situ. Guba and Lincoln (1989) emphasised the importance of conducting an interview in the same time frame and context as that which the research is seeking to understand. Similarly Shuy (2002) felt that participants are more likely to give more accurate responses because they are in the natural context.

**Research Design**

The most common approach employed to assess the effects of an overseas study experience is to survey students subsequent to the sojourn (Church, 1982; Milstein, 2005; Van Hoof & Verbeeten, 2005). However as Carlson et al (1990) identified, this is limiting because recall of events and attitudes are often inaccurate and thus the perceived change may not reflect actual change. Rather Van Hoof and Verbeeten (2005) argued for research to examine students before and after their sojourn to consider actual changes. Responding to the need for longitudinal research to assess the effects of an exchange experience (Clyne & Rizvi, 1998; Van Hoof & Verbeeten, 2005), this thesis spans all three stages of the exchange experience from pre-departure to in-country and post-return. While it is acknowledged that it is difficult to maintain a sample over time (Barry, 2005), longitudinal research is essential to understand the complex process of the exchange experience.

In line with the postpositivist paradigm, Study Two employed a quasi-experimental design to compare the personal characteristics of exchange and non-exchange students (Ponterotto, 2005). A quasi-experimental design mimics the aims and methods of experimental research (Gerring, 2001) in which there is an experimental
group and a control group. However, exchange students are a self-selecting group and thus it is not possible to randomly assign participants to a control or experimental group (Campbell & Stanley, 1963). Thus in the quasi-experimental design of Study Two, the exchange students comprised the ‘experimental’ group while the non-exchange students were the ‘control group’.

Data Analysis

Quantitative data analysis was conducted using SPSS for Windows Version 11.5. Null hypothesis testing was the dominant data analysis procedure with traditional statistical significance criteria applied (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). However, this approach to null hypothesis testing has become quite controversial (Sterne & Davey Smith, 2001). While debate continues, the traditional criteria of p<.05 cutoff was used in this study. This limits the probability of the findings occurring by chance to less than 5%. Results of p<.10 were reported as they are “acknowledged as theoretically interesting (but not statistically significant) since they indicate a trend toward significance which may be useful to pursue in future research” (A. J. Martin, 2001, p.53). In light of the APA’s Task force on statistical inference report (Wilkinson, 1999), the precise level of p was reported and the effect size also was documented.

Studies One and Two used MANOVA because the dependent variables were likely to be correlated and thus this technique controlled for Type I errors (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Main effects or overall model fit was assessed with Pillai’s Trace criterion as it is deemed “to have acceptable power and to be the most robust statistic against violations of assumptions” (Coakes & Steed, 2003, p.182).
Ethical Considerations

Griffith University's Human Research Ethics Committee approved all stages of the research. A requirement of this approval for Studies Two, Three and Four was that approval was also obtained from the Human Research Ethics Committee at each participating university. In addition to receiving information sheets that described the purpose of the study, the procedures, participants’ rights, the measures taken to ensure confidentiality and researcher contact information, participants signed consent forms.

Institutions participating in Study One received summaries of the research. When requested, copies of the research from Studies Two, Three and Four were provided to participants.

To ensure confidentiality and anonymity, identifying case data was removed and kept separate from the survey and interview data. Participants were identified through case numbers. Completed surveys were kept in a locked filing cabinet and all electronic data was secured by a password.

Conclusion

As discussed in Chapter Two, a longitudinal analysis of the outcomes of student exchange experience is long overdue. Previous studies have considered international sojourn at different parts of the exchange process (e.g. judgment of the outcomes of the exchange experience post-sojourn or reasons at the pre-departure stage for studying abroad). However, no research to date has looked at all phases of the exchange process. This thesis utilised a mixed-methods research design within the post-positivism
paradigm. The longitudinal quasi-experimental study investigated exchange at three phases - pre-departure, in-country and post-return.

Study One used a quantitative approach to examine student participation in Australian and New Zealand university exchange programs. Studies Two and Four also were quantitative. Study Two investigated the drivers and barriers of student mobility. Study Three used a qualitative approach in the form of semi-structured interviews of exchange students in Canada to provide insight into the experiences in the host culture. Study Four analysed the changes in students’ intercultural competencies as a consequence of the sojourn.

This chapter has outlined the philosophy of inquiry and detailed the research methodology. Chapters Six to Nine will discuss each of the four studies.
CHAPTER 6 – STUDY ONE: THE IMPACT OF A UNIVERSITY’S STRATEGIC PLAN ON STUDENT EXCHANGE PARTICIPATION

Introduction

This chapter presents the first study of this thesis, which examined the impact of institutional and national factors on student participation in exchange programs. As discussed in Chapter Two, there is a paucity of research on outbound student mobility programs as part of university strategies. The report by McInnis and his colleagues (2004) discussed industrial countries’ government policies of student mobility, however, the authors did not consider the impact of such policies at the institutional level nor on students’ decision to participate in exchange programs. Thus, Study One provided the first national analysis of university exchange programs in Australia and New Zealand, including participation rates and details of host destinations. Study One examined the relationship between changing Australian and New Zealand government international education policies, national policies on LOTE learning, universities’ strategic goals of student exchange and student participation in exchange programs.

Chapter One provided an overview of the changing Australian and New Zealand governments’ international education policies. An aim of Study One was to obtain a longitudinal view of the impact of changing government policies on student mobility. This has never been achieved before. Thus, the first research question in Study One was,

*Between 1996 - 2005, what changes (growth/decline) have there been in student participation in university exchange? (RQ1)*

Any observed changes in student participation should also be considered in the context of changing geopolitical instability.
The second aim of Study One was to investigate how student participation in exchange programs may reflect the university’s strategic goals. It was proposed that the way in which the exchange program is managed reflects (a) how the institution interprets and implements the government’s international education policy and (b) the university’s culture. Thus, the second research question asked,

*How many universities have expressed student exchange as a strategic goal? (RQ2)*

Since the specificity of a policy influences how it is implemented, (Brunetto & Farr-Wharton, 2005a; Johnston & Moore, 1990) it was hypothesised that

*Universities that have a specific goal of student mobility would have proportionately more students participating in the exchange program (H1).*

Different student cohorts make up the student bodies at the various types of Australian universities. More students at New universities tend to be from low socio-economic backgrounds than students enrolled at other types of universities (Department of Education Science & Training, 2005). So, it was hypothesised that

*New universities would have proportionately less students participating in the exchange program than the other types of universities (H2).*

There is a lack of research examining student destinations, thus it is important to understand where exchange students choose to study and to consider this in the context of low levels of LOTE education in Australia and New Zealand and changing geopolitical stability. Given that a lack of knowledge of a second language is a confirmed barrier to student mobility (Clyne & Rizvi, 1998; Davis et al., 1999; New Zealand Vice Chancellors' Committee, 2002; Sussex Centre for Migration Research & Centre for Applied Population Research, 2004), it was hypothesised that
More Australian and New Zealand exchange students would study in English-speaking countries than non-English speaking countries (H3).

Method

Study One collected two types of data to address the research questions and hypotheses described above. First, each university’s exchange program coordinator was surveyed in 2001 and 2005 to examine student participation rates from 1996-2005 and host destinations. The second aspect of Study One involved analysis of the strategic plans of Australian and New Zealand universities’ in 2001 for the presence or absence of a goal relating to student exchange.

Participating universities

All public universities in New Zealand (n=8) and Australia (n=37) were invited to participate in the study. Across the two countries, 40 surveys were returned. Five New Zealand universities participated in this survey, indicating a response rate of 78%, while 95% (N=35) of Australian public universities completed the questionnaire. Following Marginson’s (2000) typology of Australian universities, there was good representation of each of the types of universities- nine Sandstone universities, eight Wannabee Sandstone institutions, five U-techs and 13 New universities. (see Table A1 in Appendix).

Coding of university strategic plans on student mobility

As the first survey of universities was conducted in 2001, all participating institutions were able to provide numbers of participating exchange students for that
year. Access of data from previous years (pre-2001) was difficult for some organisations and not all universities participated in the survey in 2005. Consequently, the strategic plans of universities in 2001 were reviewed to enable analysis of the impact of policy on participation rates. The strategic plans were accessed via the institutions’ websites.

Two independent raters analysed the strategic plans for specific statements regarding exchange programs as organisational goals. When student mobility was stated explicitly as an objective of the university, this was recorded as EXCH (exchange). An example of this is University J’s aim to encourage ‘students to undertake an international study experience’. If there was no mention of student mobility, or when the strategic plan used only general statements regarding internationalisation (e.g. ‘to promote internationalisation of teaching and learning’ in University S’ strategic plan), the raters noted that there was no strategic goal in this area (NOT EXCH). Inter-rater agreement was 100%.

Survey procedure

A questionnaire was distributed via email to the Student Exchange Coordinator at each university. Follow-up emails prompting participants to return the survey were sent two and four weeks later. Participants completed a questionnaire that was comprised of two sections. The first section included questions about the number of students participating in the program overall and also the number of students on exchange in each country in 2001. In order to examine historical trends, the second section of the survey asked participants to provide details of the total number of students participating in programs during 1996-2000.
To permit a longitudinal analysis of student mobility in Australia and New Zealand, the survey was repeated in 2005. On this occasion, participants were asked to provide information about the total number of students participating in programs from 2002-2005.

Results

Participation rates

There was great diversity in the number of students enrolled at Australian and New Zealand universities. Thus, to make comparisons between institutions regarding participation in exchange programs, analysis was conducted as a percentage of the total enrolments rather than actual student numbers. Although Davis and her colleagues (1999) argued that analysis of participation rates in mobility programs should be based upon completing undergraduates, discussion at the recent National Forum on Outbound Student Mobility (2006) centered on the importance of considering participation as a proportion of total enrolments not just undergraduates. This was justified as student exchange is open to both undergraduate and postgraduate students. Accordingly, Study One has used total enrolments as the basis to consider the proportion of outbound exchange students.

Table 6.1 details the growth in student participation in university exchange programs since 1996. In 2001, 2433 Australian students and 164 New Zealand students engaged in international exchange programs. This represented 0.34% of total Australian enrolments and 0.2% of total New Zealand enrolments for 40 universities who participated in the study and provided data for 2001. The number of participants from Australian universities ranged from 1 (0.02% of enrolments) at one university that had just commenced their program, to 239 participants (0.7% of enrolments). A lesser range
was noted with the New Zealand universities; the smallest proportion was 0.13% of enrolments equating to five students and the largest outgoing cohort was 67 participants (0.38% of enrolments).

Table 6.1: The growth of university exchange programs in Australia and New Zealand since 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Australian students</th>
<th>New Zealand students</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N¹ Total students</td>
<td>% enrolled</td>
<td>N¹ Total students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>32 3444 0.43</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 400 0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>30 3083 0.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 295 0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>31 2794 0.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 245 0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>31 2662 0.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 142 0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>35 2433 0.34</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 164 0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>29 1787 0.28</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 107 0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>24 1454 0.27</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 61 0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>20 1104 0.27</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 34 0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>13 721 0.24</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 16 0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>12 434 0.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 20 0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The number of participants changed each year because when surveyed in 2005 and 2001, institutions were unable to consistently provide data on previous years’ exchange programs.

An examination of the data in Table 6.1 shows the percentage of students participating in exchange programs has increased between 1996 and 2005. To investigate whether this change in student participation rates was significant (RQ1), a repeated measures ANOVA was conducted examining participation rates of 21 institutions over four time intervals (1999, 2001, 2003, 2005). These times were chosen to maximise the number of institutions who provided data across the ten-year period. The results of the repeated measures ANOVA revealed that the change in the
proportion of students participating in an exchange program over this time was significant, $F(3,60) = 9.25, p = .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .32$.

Paired-sample t-tests were then conducted to consider the changes within these time intervals; i.e. between 1999-2001, 2001-2003 and 2003-2005. Paired-sample t-tests comparing changes in participation rates from 1999-2001 and 2003-2005 were significant; $t(20) = 2.22, p = .04$ and $t(20) = 3.49, p = .002$. Thus, significantly more students participated in the exchange program in 2001 than in 1999, and in 2005 than in 2003. No significant differences in participation rates between 2001 and 2003 were noted.

Further testing of Australian universities was conducted to examine whether New universities were more likely to have a lower participation rate than other universities. The results of the one-way ANOVA revealed that there was a significant difference in participation rate of the different types of universities, $F(3,34) = 3.90, p = .02$, partial $\eta^2 = .48$. Post-hoc analysis using Tukey’s HSD test revealed that there was a significant difference between Sandstone ($X = .50, \text{S.D.} = .13$) and New universities ($X = .22, \text{S.D.} = .19$), $p = .01$. No significant differences between New universities and Wannabee Sandstone ($X = .37, \text{S.D.} = .26$) or U-techs ($X = .28, \text{S.D.} = .10$) were noted. This gives partial support for H2. Australian students participating in exchange programs were more likely to be enrolled in Sandstone rather than New universities.

*Universities’ strategic goals of student exchange*

In 2001, outgoing student mobility was a strategic goal of 21 (60%) Australian universities and only two (40%) New Zealand universities. Table 6.2 shows the mean exchange program participation rate in 2001 in relation to the presence or absence of a goal of student mobility. A t-test revealed no significant relationship between
universities having a specific goal of student exchange in their strategic plan and participation rates in the student exchange program, \( F(1, 39) = 2.63, p = .11, \) partial \( \eta^2 = .07 \). Thus, H1 was rejected. Universities that had a strategic goal relating to student exchange were not more likely to have proportionately higher numbers of outgoing exchange students.

Table 6.2 Participation rates and student mobility as a strategic goal in Australian and New Zealand universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Goal</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exchange present</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange absent</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Australian and New Zealand university exchange student destinations

Twenty-nine institutions provided data on exchange students’ destinations. As the numbers of students at each destination was quite low for specific countries, student destinations were analysed by categorising countries into geographic region: North America, the United Kingdom (UK), Asia, Continental Europe, Latin America, the Middle East, Africa and the Pacific. It was deemed necessary to separate the United Kingdom from Continental European nations primarily on a linguistic basis. While it is acknowledged that many European universities teach in English, for the purpose of this study it was considered that the host nation’s language would be an issue influencing students’ decisions regarding destination (New Zealand Vice Chancellors' Committee, 2002; OECD, 2004b).
As can be seen in Table 6.3, the two regions where most Australian exchange students studied were North America and Europe. New Zealand students at participating universities studied in North America and Asia. Specific countries are listed in Table A2 in the Appendix. In both Australia and New Zealand, the USA was the most popular destination, constituting 26.5% (N=499) of Australian exchanges and 31.5% (N=46) of New Zealand exchanges. Canada was the second destination most frequented by Australian students, while 15.8% (N=17) of New Zealand exchange students were in Japan. By region, Continental European countries certainly were popular destinations for Australian students. Representing the most common LOTE taught within Australian schools, over one third of Australian exchange students studied in France or Germany. In contrast, 15% of New Zealand exchange students chose to study in Japan. This reflects the large Japanese language programs of two of the universities who participated in this study.

A Wilcoxon signed-rank test compared the percentage of exchange students travelling to English-speaking countries and those travelling to non-English speaking countries at each university. A paired-samples t-test was not appropriate as the variables are correlated (Coakes & Steed, 2003). The Wilcoxon signed-rank test revealed that there was no significant difference between the numbers of students travelling to English-speaking countries (N=1086, 54.6%) and non-English speaking countries (N=904, 45.5%). Thus, H3 was not supported.
Table 6.3: Destinations of Australian and New Zealand exchange students by region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Australian exchange students</th>
<th>New Zealand exchange students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>% of total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

The general aim of Study One was to examine the student exchange programs of Australian and New Zealand universities and consider the institutional and national factors affecting student participation. This included analysing changes in participation rates in exchange programs between 1996-2005, how many universities express a specific goal of student mobility in their strategic plans and students’ preferred host destinations. Overall, the findings of Study One suggest that contextual factors have influenced student participation in exchange programs between 1996-2005. There was no significant relationship between the presence of a specific strategic goal of student exchange and exchange program participation rates, which suggests that other factors influence student participation. As will be discussed below, the success of the exchange program may be moderated by organisational factors such as leadership and organisational culture. Moreover as proposed in Figure 2.1, the characteristics of the
individual students will also strongly influence participation in the exchange program. This was considered further in Study Two.

Changing participation rates in exchange programs

From 1996 - 2005, there was significant growth in the participation rate of student exchange programs in Australia and New Zealand. There was similar growth in both countries suggesting that there was no relationship between participation and government policies or programs. While the New Zealand government does not allocate funding towards UMAP, the Australian government provides $1.4 million a year to all public universities. Yet, the participation rate in New Zealand has trebled, from 0.12% to 0.45%, while the Australian participation rate has doubled from 0.19% to 0.43%. It could be speculated that the funding provided in Australia was not of a significant level to be deemed a priority by university senior management. This issue is discussed in more detail below in relation to how a strategic goal of student exchange is implemented within the university.

Overall, the findings of Study One show that despite greater government focus on internationalisation and student exchange opportunities through an increase in the number of UMAP agreements, very few Australian and New Zealand students participate in student exchange programs. Less than one percent of Australian and New Zealand students participate in a student exchange program by the time they complete their studies. The 2005 mean participation rate was only 0.43% and 0.45% of total university enrolments for Australia and New Zealand respectively. Although similar in number to the American, British and Canadian tertiary education systems, this is significantly less than that of Continental European students (Cushner & Karim, 2004; Fantini et al., 2001; Sussex Centre for Migration Research & Centre for Applied
It may have been predicted that students would be less inclined to study abroad since the ‘9/11’ terrorist attack in the USA because the changing geopolitical climate is a component of the context in which the student mobility decision is made. While there was significant growth from 1999 to 2001 and 2003 to 2005, there was no significant growth from 2001 to 2003. Similar to the data found in the Open Doors (2004b) report on American students, fewer exchange students studied abroad in 2002 after the ‘9/11’ terrorist event. However by 2004 participation had increased from the 2001 rate. Thus, the results of Study One confirm Wang and Bu’s (2004) findings that overall exchange students were not adversely affected by the events of 9/11. In the last five years there have been further changes in international geopolitical environment, which do not seem to have affected participation in the exchange program. These events include the invasion of Afghanistan, terrorist bombings in Bali, London and Madrid, the war in Iraq, the outbreak of Sudden Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) and Avian Influenza (Bird flu), and the Boxing Day Tsunami in 2004 (Bonham et al., 2006; Henderson, 2006; Law, 2006).

In the context of such low participation rates in New Zealand universities’ student exchange programs, it interesting to consider that there was a notable absence of an international education policy with no resourcing allocated towards outbound student exchange. Rather, within the tertiary education statement, the Ministry of Education (1998) identified the need for New Zealand to have a tertiary sector with an international focus. In the Ministry of Education’s White Paper (1998), there is limited discussion of the various components of international education or the methods by which an international focus may be achieved. It is perhaps not surprising then that only...
two New Zealand tertiary institutions in this study stated student exchange as an objective in their strategic plans. However, the New Zealand government has recently released a discussion document regarding the new international education agenda (Ministry of Education, 2007). It is proposed that student exchange is one of the methods by which the goal of New Zealand students being “equipped to thrive in an inter-connected world” (Sec2:14) may be achieved. It will be interesting to see how this new government policy is implemented, including the resourcing through national programs such as UMAP.

*International exchange programs as a strategic goal*

It was proposed that universities with a goal of student exchange expressed in their strategic plan would have more students participating in the exchange program (H1). However, the difference in participation rates between universities with a specific goal of student exchange and those universities without a specific goal of student exchange was not significant. Although internationalisation was a cornerstone of each university’s strategic plan, student exchange was a specific goal for approximately only half of the universities. Therefore, it may be speculated that universities are focusing on other parts of internationalisation such as full-fee paying overseas students. Furthermore, the low numbers of universities stating student mobility as a strategic goal and the ways in which student mobility as a goal is implemented within the institution may reflect the organisational culture and leadership (Brunetto & Farr-Wharton, 2005; Johnston & Moore, 1990). Davis et al (1999, p.88-89) outlined that “a successful exchange program requires a culture almost certainly developed top-down, where international skills are valued and where a period of time overseas for credit is seen as important in formation of these skills; academic champions; and, targets and
performance indicators”. Future research should examine the culture of and leadership within universities to analyse the impact of these factors on the success of the student exchange program.

The success of a policy's implementation within an organisation is also affected by the level of resourcing provided by the policy-makers and it is argued that resource allocation is indicative of government priorities (Brunetto, 1999; Brunetto, 2000; Brunetto & Farr-Wharton, 2005; van Horn & van Meter, 1975; Wilson, 1990; Yanow, 1993). Certainly, “a policy that is not resourced has little chance of achieving its stated goals”, (Brunetto, 1999, p123). To recap the financial resourcing of student mobility programs, the Australian government provides $1.4 million per year under the UMAP program while nothing is directed to the UMior program or other exchange agreements. In 2004, the New Zealand government announced a $40 million international education package however, there is no statement regarding how much funding is allocated to student exchange programs. At present, the main program of student mobility, UMAP, is not a funded activity. Without financial support from the government, university senior management will not view the policy as a high priority (Yanow, 1993). For example, Australian and New Zealand universities will not see exchange students as being as attractive as full-fee paying overseas students and consequently limited resources, including staff, will be directed towards student mobility programs (Malicki, 2003). Rather, international education resources would be directed towards income-generating activities (OECD, 2004a).

In partial support of Hypothesis 2, New universities were more likely to have proportionately fewer students participating in the exchange program than Sandstone universities. As discussed in Chapter One, Australian universities reflect different organisational cultures and are comprised of different cohorts of students (Department
of Education Science & Training, 2005; Marginson, 2000). For example, New universities tend to have a greater percentage of students from low socio-economic backgrounds than other types of institutions (Department of Education Science & Training, 2005). Study Two, presented in Chapter Four, will investigate how different student characteristics including socio-economic status influence participation in the exchange program.

It is acknowledged that a limitation of Study One was that the focus was on the strategic plan of each institution. The review of the universities’ strategic plans was based on analysing the presence or absence of student exchange as a goal. As discussed above additional factors influence successful policy implementation. There is a need to examine awareness and understanding of the institution’s policies and goals regarding student exchange of university staff. The next step in analysing how student exchange policy affects student participation should reflect the work of Brunetto (1999) and consider the responses of employees in the organisation who must implement the policy, accountability, resourcing and leadership.

Destinations for students participating in exchange programs

Although it was predicted that Australian and New Zealand exchange students would study in linguistically and culturally similar countries, it was surprising to find that overall there was no significant difference between the proportion of students who studied in English speaking countries and those who studied in non-English speaking countries (H3). Studying in a country that is culturally and linguistically similar to the home culture may assist sociocultural and psychological adjustment (Black et al., 1991; Clyne & Rizvi, 1998; Searle & Ward, 1990; Selmer, 2006). Certainly, the USA, Canada and the UK were popular destinations for Australian and New Zealand students. In each
of these countries, English is readily spoken both in the classroom and in the broader community. However, the literature (Clyne & Rizvi, 1998; Van Hoof & Verbeeten, 2005; Wiers-Jenssen, 2003; Young & Harper, 2004) suggests that one of the reasons exchange students study abroad is to experience new cultures. So, perhaps students are motivated more to study at universities in non-English speaking and culturally distant countries to experience a new culture rather than being concerned about factors which may affect their cross-cultural adjustment. Study Two examined the extent to which the student’s knowledge of the language and the culture and the cultural similarity of the host country influenced their decision regarding their exchange destination.

Moreover although LOTE learning is low in Australia and New Zealand (Department of Education Training & Youth Affairs, 2003, 2005; Ministry of Education, 2004d), it has been argued that exchange students choose to study abroad in order to increase their foreign language skills (Maiworm, 2001; Sussex Centre for Migration Research & Centre for Applied Population Research, 2004; Teichler & Jahr, 2001; Wiers-Jenssen, 2003). It is interesting to note that exchange students’ most popular destinations where English was not the first language (e.g. Japan, Germany and France), reflected the most common LOTE programs in Australian and New Zealand secondary schools (Department of Education Training & Youth Affairs, 2003; Ministry of Education, 2004d). In addition to Study Two’s examination of how a student’s knowledge of the host country’s language affects their destination regarding their exchange destination, it would be worthwhile investigating the relationship between government policies on second-language learning and student mobility. It may be speculated that greater government focus on LOTE education would increase participation in study abroad and encourage students to study in a range of non-English speaking countries to enhance their language skills.
It is important to note that students can only study at institutions with whom their home university has an agreement. Thus, a limitation of Study One was that it did not examine the locations of partner institutions. This issue warrants further investigation as it may be speculated that Australian and New Zealand universities establish exchange agreements in non-English speaking countries that reflect the LOTE courses offered at the home institution. For example, the high proportion of New Zealand exchange students in Japan in 2001 reflects the popular Japanese language course at one university.

Conclusion

Study One has examined the contextual factors that may influence an Australian or New Zealand university student’s decision to participate in an exchange program. In the context of greater government focus on international education and specifically student mobility, there was significant growth in the proportion of students participating in exchange programs between 1996-2005, but overall participation rates are very low. Interestingly, both English speaking and non-English speaking destinations were equally as popular with students. The findings of Study One did not indicate that the presence of a specific goal of student exchange in university strategic plans impacted on student participation rates. Rather, referring back to the model proposed in Chapter Two (see Figure 2.1), both organisational and individual characteristics influence a student’s decision to participate in the exchange program. Future investigation of the organisational factors of organisational culture, leadership and resourcing is warranted.

Study Two, presented in Chapter Seven, examined why a student would choose to participate in an exchange program. Specifically, the next stage of this research
program investigated how demographic factors and intercultural competencies may influence the decision to participate in exchange programs and how exchange students differ from their peers who remain at the home institution. Additionally, Study Two considered the individual factors which influence an exchange student’s decision regarding their host destination.
CHAPTER 7 – STUDY TWO: DRIVERS AND BARRIERS OF PARTICIPATION IN
STUDENT EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

Introduction

Study One, presented in Chapter 6, revealed that despite increased government focus on student mobility and universities incorporating overseas study as a strategic goal for students, very few Australian and New Zealand university students engage in educational exchange programs. While it is acknowledged that factors such as organisational culture, leadership and resources affect the implementation of a policy (Brunetto & Farr-Wharton, 2005b), the outcome of the policy relating to student mobility is also dependent on the students (Chieffo, 2000; Clyne & Rizvi, 1998; Teichler & Jahr, 2001).

As discussed in Chapter Two there are many factors influencing the decision to study abroad (Chieffo, 2000; Cushner & Mahon, 2002; Mazzarol & Soutar, 2002; Teichler & Jahr, 2001; Van Hoof & Verbeeten, 2005; Wiers-Jenssen, 2002). The model of the student decision-making process (see Fig 2.1) proposed seven categories of drivers and barriers to mobility. These components of the model were (1) the student’s personal characteristics; (2) career development; (3) foreign language competence; (4) education; (5) financial constraints; (6) personal relationships; and (7) culture and travel. The objective of Study Two was to analyse which of these factors which influence the decision making process of Australian and New Zealand students, with a particular focus on the student’s personal characteristics. It was anticipated that the findings of Study Two would help universities recognise ways in which mobility can be encouraged by understanding which students participate in exchange programs, what factors motivate them to do so and what prevents other students from studying abroad.
The first aim of this study was to compare the intercultural competencies and demographic characteristics that typify exchange students compared to non-exchange students. Study Two investigated the demographic characteristics of exchange students and compared these with the characteristics of non-exchange students. Specifically five factors were analysed to determine the extent to which these characteristics may influence the decision to study abroad. These factors were gender, socio-economic background, ethnicity, previous mobility and discipline of enrolment. The first research question in Study Two asked,

What are the demographic characteristics of Australian and New Zealand exchange students as compared to non-exchange students? (RQ3)

Study Two also compared the intercultural competencies of exchange students and non-exchange students across five dimensions: cultural empathy, open-mindedness, flexibility, social initiative and emotional stability, which assist adjustment to the host culture and satisfaction with their cross-cultural sojourn (Van der Zee & Van Oudenhoven, 2000). Reflecting the literature discussed in Chapter Two, it was proposed that at the pre-departure stage exchange students will possess relevant skills which are necessary to aid coping and adjustment in a new culture, while non-exchange students will not. Specifically it was hypothesised that,

Before departing on the exchange program, exchange students would report higher levels of intercultural competencies than non-exchange students will (H4).

The second aim of Study Two was to understand the factors which influence a student’s decision to participate in the exchange program. As outlined in Chapter Two, six constructs to the student decision making model were examined. These were career
development, foreign language competence, education, financial constraints, personal relationships, and culture and travel. The second research question of Study Two asked,

*What factors influence a student’s decision to participate in a student exchange program or to remain at home? (RQ4)*

The final objective of Study Two was to investigate the factors which influence an exchange student’s decision regarding their host destination. Thus, the third research question was,

*What factors influence an exchange student’s decision regarding their host destination? (RQ5)*

**Method**

Study Two employed a quasi-experimental design to address the three research questions and one hypothesis described above. Two sets of data were collected. First, the exchange students were surveyed before they departed on their international sojourn to analyse the factors which influenced both their decision to participate in the exchange program and their decision regarding host destination. Second, a control group of non-exchange students was surveyed to consider what variables were related to their non-participation in the exchange program.

**Procedure**

*Exchange students*

Nine Australian and two New Zealand universities agreed to support this study. Of the Australian institutions, there were five Sandstones (see Table A1 in Appendix: Universities A, C, D, F, P); two Wannabe Sandstones (Universities J & N); one U-tech
(K) and one New university (R) (Marginson, 2000). This indicates a skew towards Sandstone universities which may imply different cohorts of students (Department of Education Science & Training, 2005).

Surveys were administered by two different means: (1) personally by exchange program staff during the pre-departure training sessions, or (2) mailed by the home university directly to the student’s postal address for those students who did not attend the pre-departure session. In order to maintain students’ anonymity in the study, all participants were approached by the exchange coordinator at their respective institutions. To increase the response rate students were provided with a reply-paid envelope to return the survey directly to the researcher (Kanuk & Berenson, 1975 cited in Bordens & Abbott, 2005). Therefore, neither the researcher nor the university knew the identity of participating students.

A purposive sampling technique (Moore, 2000) was used to ensure that students who were engaged in exchange programs in 2002 and 2003 participated in the study. Nine hundred questionnaires were distributed to the participating universities. A total of 257 questionnaires were received from undergraduate students enrolled in Australian and New Zealand universities representing a response rate of 28.5%.

While it is acknowledged that incentives and follow-up mailings are two effective methods for increasing response rate (Edwards et al., 2002; Larson & Chow, 2003), this research was limited by budget and timing of survey administration. In considering that surveys of interest to participants are more likely to be returned (Edwards et al., 2002), it was expected that the response rate would be higher since exchange students were questioned about their impending sojourn. However, the response rate is comparable to surveys of other sojourners (for a review see Black & Stephens, 1989; Fish & Wood, 1997)
Since more Australian and New Zealand exchange students study overseas in the semester which runs from September-December, the study was conducted in late May – early July in both 2002 and 2003. This timing coincided with the universities’ pre-departure sessions. However, it should be acknowledged that timing was not ideal as students were undergoing end-of-semester assessment and attendance at the pre-departure sessions was not compulsory. This may provide some explanation of the response rate being lower than expected. Anecdotal evidence suggests that it is common for students to travel as soon as final examinations are completed in June until the start of the overseas study period in September. Thus, students who did not attend the pre-departure session may not have received the survey in the post as they were already overseas.

Non-exchange students

A purposive sampling technique (Moore, 2000) was used to obtain non-exchange students studying with the disciplines of Arts or Commerce. As discussed in Chapter Two, ‘Commerce’ and ‘Society and Culture’ are the two most popular fields of study in both Australian and New Zealand universities. Furthermore, Daly and Barker (2005) reported that most exchange students were enrolled in Arts/ Humanities or Business/ Commerce programs. Therefore, an attempt was made to obtain a control group of non-exchange students who represented the popular fields of study. Additionally, non-exchange students were matched to the exchange student sample based upon their year of enrolment. Australian and New Zealand universities specify that exchange students must have completed one year of study at the home university. Thus, exchange students tend to be enrolled in their second and third years of tertiary education.
Four hundred and forty students enrolled in their second year of study at one New Zealand and four Australian universities were surveyed. The four Australian universities were representative of each of Marginson’s (2000) typologies. Questionnaires were distributed and collected during lectures, with a response rate of 54% (N=238). Students who had applied for, or previously participated in either the university exchange program or another similar program were excluded from the sample. A total of 234 valid questionnaires were obtained. FFP international students were not excluded from the study as they were eligible to participate in the exchange programs.

Survey Instrument

The exchange and non-exchange students completed similar questionnaires comprised of four sections (see Appendix B2). The first section of the survey utilised the Multicultural Personality Questionnaire (MPQ) (Van der Zee & Van Oudenhoven, 2000) to measure self-reported cross-cultural competencies. The MPQ was comprised of 91 items that describe “concrete behaviours or tendencies” (Van Oudenhoven & Van der Zee, 2002, p.684) across five dimensions: Cultural Empathy, Open-mindedness, Social Initiative, Flexibility and, Emotional Stability. Respondents used a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = Totally not applicable to 5 = Completely Applicable. The scale for Cultural Empathy measured an individual’s ability to empathise with people from different cultural backgrounds. The scale contained 18 items such as ‘I am the sort of person who understands other people’s feelings’. Cronbach’s $\alpha$ in this study was 0.86. The second dimension was Open-mindedness (18 items), which measured the openness of the respondent’s attitude towards different cultures, for example: ‘I am the sort of person who is fascinated by other people’s opinions’. It had a Cronbach $\alpha$ in this
study of 0.83. A high score on the Social Initiative dimension indicated a tendency to take an active approach in social situations, for example: ‘I am the sort of person who makes contacts easily’. This subscale contained 17 items and had an $\alpha$ in this study of 0.87. The Flexibility scale (18 items) referred to an ability to adjust one’s behaviour in foreign situations and cultures. Cronbach’s alpha in the current study was 0.83. An example of an item in this scale was ‘I am the sort of person who changes easily from one activity to another’. The final scale of Emotional Stability (Cronbach $\alpha$ in this study of 0.83) was comprised of 20 items. It measured an individual’s tendency to remain calm when in stressful situations, for example: ‘I am the sort of person who takes it for granted that things will turn out right’.

The second section of the questionnaire examined respondents’ social self-efficacy in co- and cross-ethnic interactions (Fan & Mak, 1998). The 12-item social self-efficacy scale (SSES) was taken from Barker, Troth and Mak (2002). Cronbach’s alpha in the current study was 0.88. The scale included questions such as ‘I am confident in my language skills’ and ‘It is difficult for me to express a different opinion’. Items were measured using a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 7 = Strongly Agree. Responses to negatively-worded items were reverse-scored (e.g. ‘It is difficult for me to express a different opinion’). For each item, respondents’ were asked to indicate their self-efficacy twice. First, students had to report their social self-efficacy when interacting with people from both the same and secondly, when they were interacting with people from different ethnic backgrounds.

The next section of the questionnaire differed between the two groups. In Section Three, the exchange students were asked to rate the extent to which various factors influenced their decision to participate in the exchange program (e.g. ‘Intend to work overseas’; ‘Assist with educational success’) and the choice of their host country.
and institution (e.g. ‘Knowledge of language of host country’; ‘Social costs’). Items were based upon the literature reviewed in Chapter Two (e.g. (Carlson et al., 1990; Chieffo, 2000; Clyne & Rizvi, 1998; Mazzarol & Soutar, 2002; Van Hoof & Verbeeten, 2005). Questions focused on factors such as recommendations of others, desires for international travel, belief of enhancing career opportunities, knowledge of country and language; cost, location and climate. Students responded to the 18 items using a five-point Likert scale (1 = No influence; 5 = Extreme Influence).

In contrast, the 13 questions in Section Three of the non-exchange students’ survey examined the extent to which various factors influenced his/her decision to not participate in the exchange program using a five-point Likert scale (1 = No influence; 5 = Extreme influence). Many questions reflected those asked of the exchange students; e.g. ‘Knowledge of another language’ and ‘living costs’. Additionally, participants were asked about conflicting obligations such as course restrictions and work and family commitments, which could have impacted on their decision to study abroad. Responses to negatively-worded items were reverse-scored (e.g. ‘My chosen course was not available).

Questions in the final section of the survey gathered demographic and descriptive data such as gender, age, country of birth, number of languages spoken, course of study, and household income bracket. Household income bracket was in the student’s own currency.
Results

*Personal characteristics of exchange students and non-exchange students*

The first research question of Study Two (RQ3) focused on understanding the demographic characteristics of Australian and New Zealand exchange students and comparing these to non-exchange students. Some students did provide responses to all questions relating to the demographic characteristics. As such, the valid percent of responses will be discussed. Five chi-square tests for independence were conducted to examine group differences on gender, ethnicity (analysed by region of birth), previous mobility (mobile vs non-mobile), household income and employment.

There were significantly more female exchange students than non-exchange students, $\chi^2 (1, N = 479) = 4.85, p = .03$. Females made up a significant proportion of the exchange student sample (70.9%, N=178) with only 73 male participants. Females also comprised a greater proportion (61.4%) of the non-exchange student group (N=140) with 88 males completing the survey.

Non-exchange students reported greater ethnic diversity. The difference in proportions of students from the nine regions was significant, $\chi^2 (8, N = 477) = 22.13, p = .005$. In both groups of students, most respondents were born in Australia or New Zealand. In the exchange student sample there were 168 Australian and 35 New Zealand respondents while the non-exchange group was comprised of 110 Australian-born and 37 New Zealand-born students. As seen in Table 7.1, of the students who were born overseas, a high proportion originated from Asia which reflects the composition of the general university population (Department of Education Science & Training, 2005). However, it is important to note that the non-exchange cohort was diverse with more students born overseas. Table A4 (in Appendix) details exchange and non-exchange students’ countries of birth.
Table 7.1 Geographic regions of birth for Australian and New Zealand overseas-born students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Exchange students</th>
<th>Non-exchange students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Valid Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continental Europe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania/Pacific</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean length of time in which overseas-born exchange students had lived in Australia or New Zealand was 11.4 years, with a range from one to 24 years. In contrast, the non-exchange students reported a shorter mean time period of living in Australia or New Zealand (X = 9.88 years), although the reported range was from one to 27 years.

Approximately half of the respondents in both groups spoke one language; 120 (52.2%) monolingual exchange students and 122 (54.2%) monolingual non-exchange students. Sixty-six exchange students (28.7%) spoke two languages and 44 exchange student respondents reported that they were multilingual, speaking three (N = 30, 13.0%) or four (N = 14, 6.1%) languages. One third of non-exchange participants (N = 76, 34%) spoke two languages and 27 respondents were multilingual, speaking three (N = 21, 9.3%) or four (N=6, 2.6%) languages.

In terms of previous mobility, no significant difference between the two groups was found. Over three quarters of exchange student participants (N=188) had travelled
in the last five years with most students sojourning to less than three countries. Like the exchange student participants, most non-exchange students (N=192) had travelled in the last five years and commonly, students had sojourned to 1-3 countries. A slightly lower proportion of non-exchange students (14.6%, N= 28) than exchange students (N= 41, 16.9%) had not travelled overseas in the last five years.

The median reported household income of exchange students ($40,000 - $60,000) was significantly higher than that of non-exchange students ($20,000 - $40,000), \( \chi^2 (4, N = 439) = 10.69, p = .03 \). It is interesting to note that the distribution of household income for exchange students was bimodal with almost one third of respondents indicating that their gross household income was less than $20,000, and the household income of more than a quarter of participants was more than $80,000 (refer to Table A3 in Appendix). Over one-third of non-exchange students reported that their household income is less than $20,000. Previously Daly (2002) found that household income was related to residence with those students who do not live at home being significantly more likely to have an income of less than $20,000. Significantly more exchange students (N = 168) were employed than non-exchange students (N = 141), \( \chi^2 (1, N = 466) = 3.99, p = .046 \).

Students’ areas of study were coded by two independent raters with 100% agreement. Initially, the disciplines of enrolment of exchange students were separated into seven areas: Arts, Business, Technology, Law, Science, Education and Health. The Arts discipline area was coded to include Humanities, Psychology, Communication, Media and Languages. Business incorporated all commerce related fields such as Accounting, Management, Marketing, Economics and Finance, Human Resource Management and Industrial Relations. Medicine, Nursing and Allied Health were incorporated into the Health discipline. The Technology discipline area comprised
courses such as Engineering and Information Technology. However, since only three students reported that they were enrolled in Education courses, this discipline was incorporated into the Arts category. Similarly, the Commerce discipline was extended to include the two students reported to be studying Law. Another category of ‘Dual’ was coded to include all studies drawn from two separate discipline areas, e.g. a Bachelor of Education/ Bachelor of Science. This category was necessary as it was unclear under which of the two disciplines students were enrolled while participating in the exchange program.

Table 7.2: The distribution across disciplines of Australian and New Zealand university students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Exchange students</th>
<th>Non-exchange students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>% of total enrolled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.2 details student enrolments in each field of study. The most common enrolment by exchange students was in dual degrees. Most exchange students were enrolled in dual degrees (33.5%) or in the Arts discipline (28.9%). There was a high concentration of Commerce students in the non-exchange group. This reflected the lectures in which the surveys were distributed. Thus, further statistical comparison of
the disciplines of study of exchange students and non-exchange students was not possible.

To consider the differences in age of the two cohorts, an independent samples t-test was conducted. No significant difference was found between reported age of participants in the two groups. This result was expected since attempts were made to match the control group to the exchange students in terms of age based upon year of enrolment. The mean age of exchange students was 21.7 years (S.D = 3.7), with ages ranging from 18 to 51 years while for the control group the mean age was 22.2 years (S.D = 5.2), with ages ranging from 17 to 55 years.

Next Study Two compared exchange students and non-exchange students in terms of their intercultural competencies as measured by the Multicultural Personality Questionnaire (MPQ) and Social-self efficacy scale (SSES). Data screening for respondent errors and omissions was conducted prior to analysis. Missing values analysis for the MPQ and SSES revealed that the missing data ranged between 0.6% - 3.1%. To retain as many cases as possible, missing values were replaced with the linear trend for that point.

Table 7.3 details the scale means and inter-correlations computed for the MPQ and SSES scores for the total group of exchange and non-exchange students. As van Oudenhoven and Van der Zee (2002) found, all MPQ scale means were above the midpoint, and in particular, the means for cultural empathy and open-mindedness were quite high. Indeed, van Oudenhoven and Van der Zee (2002, p.686) pointed out that such results indicate “a possible susceptibility of the two scales to social desirability bias”. All subscales of the MPQ were positively correlated which reflects the overlap of concepts. There was a strong correlation between Social Initiative and the SSES. This
was anticipated since these scales measure similar constructs (Barker et al., 2002; Van Oudenhoven & Van der Zee, 2002).

Table 7.3 Means, standard deviations and inter-correlations of scales\(^{1,2}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cultural Empathy</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Open-mindedness</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Social Initiative</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Flexibility</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Emotional Stability</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. SSES(^{2})</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{1}\) All correlations are significant at \(p < .001\)

\(^{2}\) SSES is a 7-point Likert scale

A one-way (MANOVA) was conducted to test H4: *Before departing on the exchange program, exchange students would report higher levels of intercultural competencies than non-exchange students.* The analysis examined the five dimensions of the MPQ (cultural empathy, open-mindedness, flexibility, social initiative and emotional stability). Table 7.4 shows that overall exchange students reported significantly higher levels of intercultural competencies than non-exchange students, \(F(5, 485) = 23.92, p = .000, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .20\). Analysis of univariate results revealed that exchange students presented with higher levels of cultural empathy, \(F(1, 491) = 18.50, p = .000, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .04\), open-mindedness, \(F(1, 491) = 80.64, p = .000, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .14\), social initiative, \(F(1, 491) = 40.94, p = .000, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .08\), emotional stability, \(F(1, 491) = 18.50, p = .000, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .04\) and flexibility, \(F(1, 491) = 79.08, p = .000, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .14\).

Exchange students also reported significantly higher social self-efficacy than non-exchange students regardless of the ethnic group of others, \(F(2, 488) = 25.27, p = .000, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .20\)
Social self-efficacy scores for exchange students also were significantly higher than for non-exchange students when interacting with others from the same culture, $F(1, 490) = 36.05, p = .000$, partial $\eta^2 = .07$; and when interacting with others from different cultures, $F(1, 490) = 48.15, p = .000$, partial $\eta^2 = .09$.

Table 7.4 Means and standard deviations of MPQ and social self-efficacy scores for exchange and non-exchange students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exchange students</th>
<th>Non-exchange students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N = 257)</td>
<td>(N = 234)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural empathy</td>
<td>Mean 3.86 S.D .43</td>
<td>Mean 3.7 S.D .44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-mindedness</td>
<td>3.84 .38</td>
<td>3.5 .46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social initiative</td>
<td>3.63 .49</td>
<td>3.33 .51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional stability</td>
<td>3.23 .45</td>
<td>3.06 .46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>3.50 .41</td>
<td>3.15 .45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Self-efficacy scale (SSES)</td>
<td>5.06 .65</td>
<td>4.61 .78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSES Same cultural group</td>
<td>5.23 .67</td>
<td>4.81 .86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSES Different cultural group</td>
<td>4.89 .73</td>
<td>4.40 .84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 All between-subject effects were significant at the $p<.001$ level

Thus, these results supported Hypothesis 4 confirming that at the pre-departure stage exchange students reported higher levels of intercultural competencies than non-exchange students. That is, before departing their home country, exchange students were more open towards different cultures, more able to adjust their behaviour in foreign situations and cultures, tended to take an active approach in social situations, more able to empathize with people from different cultural backgrounds and tended to remain calm when in stressful situations than non-exchange students. Additionally, exchange students reported high levels of social self-efficacy when interacting with people from both the same and different ethnic backgrounds.
A MANOVA was conducted to compare male and female exchange and non-exchange students on the MPQ and SSES. While a main effect for gender was found, F(7, 469) = 10.25, p = .000, partial η² = .13, there was no significant interaction between student group (exchange vs. non-exchange) and gender. Analysis of the univariate results revealed that overall females (X = 3.86, S.D. = .42) reported significantly higher levels of cultural empathy than males (X = 3.66, S.D. = .44), F(1, 479) = 20.19, p = .000, partial η² = .04. In contrast, males (X = 3.27, S.D. = .47) reported significantly higher levels of emotional stability than females (X = 3.09, S.D. = .45), F(1, 479) = 20.04, p = .000, partial η² = .04.

**Factors influencing the student mobility decision**

The second research question of Study Two (RQ4) aimed to investigate the extent to which six factors may influence a student’s decision to participate in the exchange program or remain at the home campus. The factors examined included career development, culture and travel, language, relationships, financial constraints and education. Descriptive statistics provided an understanding of the frequency and relevance of these factors. Comparison between exchange students and non-exchange students was not possible because different factors were examined for the two cohorts. Exchange students were asked about the factors which influenced their decision to participate in the exchange program. In contrast, non-exchange students were asked about factors which influenced their decision to not participate in the exchange program.

Table 7.5 details the scale means and standard deviations for each of the factors which may have influenced an exchange student’s decision to participate in an exchange program. Exchange students acknowledged that participating in the exchange
program was part of their travel plans; 99 students stated this had a great-extreme influence. Almost two-thirds of respondents reported that their decision to study overseas was greatly influenced by an intention to work (N=160) and to live overseas (N=145). They also believed that the experience would assist both their educational success (N=159) and with gaining employment overseas (N=158). Almost half of the respondents (N=118) reported that their decision to participate in the exchange program was influenced to a great-extreme extent by the belief that the experience would assist them with gaining employment in Australia or New Zealand.

Table 7.5 Means and standard deviations of factors that influenced an exchange student’s decision to participate in an exchange program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Assist with educational success</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Intend to work overseas</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Assist with gaining employment overseas</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Intend to live overseas</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Assist with gaining employment in Australia or NZ</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Part of travel plans</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Friends recommended</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Family members recommended</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Lecturer recommended</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations from family and lecturers did not strongly affect a student’s decision to participate in an exchange program. Indeed, 45% (N=109) of exchange students reported that their family did not have any influence on their decision to study overseas. Lecturers appear to have played an even weaker role with 140 students (57.6%) stating that their lecturers had no influence on the decision. While one quarter of students (N= 63) reported that their friends were not influential, similar proportions
stated that their friends’ recommendations exerted either a moderate influence (N=54) or a great influence (N=61).

Table 7.6 Means and standard deviations of factors that influenced a non-exchange student’s decision to not participate in an exchange program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cost of travel</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Living costs</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Family commitments</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Knowledge of exchange programs</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Never thought about participating</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Knowledge of another language</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Social costs</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Work commitments</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Availability of chosen course</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Subjects matching course requirements</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Knowledge of another culture</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.6 details the scale means and standard deviations for the factors which influenced the decision-making of non-exchange students regarding participating in an exchange program. Living and travel costs both had great-extreme influences affecting over half of the non-exchange respondents’ decisions to study abroad; N=116 and N=123 respectively. Somewhat surprisingly, one-third of non-exchange students reported that social costs had no influence on their decision but 41.9% of students (N=89) reported that social costs had a slight-moderate influence on their decision to participate in an exchange program.

Almost half of the non-exchange students (N=94) revealed that family commitments had a great-extreme influence on their decision to go on exchange. Work commitments were reported to have a minimal influence in the decision making process.
with 85 students (39.7%) stating work had no influence. Another third of students (N=74) indicated that work commitments had a slight-moderate influence affecting their decision to study overseas.

The extent to which student knowledge of the exchange program affected the decision to participate in an exchange program was quite spread: 65 students (30.2%) reported this had no effect; 81 students (37.6%) revealed it had a slight-moderate effect; and, 69 students (32.1%) indicated it had a great-extreme influence. This also reflected the extent to which students had thought of participating in an exchange program. Approximately two thirds of students (134) had not thought of studying overseas on an exchange.

Half of the respondents (N=112) stated that knowledge of another culture had no influence but for 55 students this factor was slightly-moderately important. The extent of influence of knowledge of another language was more spread. Sixty nine students (32.1%) stated it had no effect on their decision. Eighty students (37.2%) reported it had a slight-moderate effect. Approximately one third of respondents (N=66) indicated language knowledge had a great-extreme importance.

Almost half of the non-exchange students (N=104) reported that the matching of subjects to meet course requirements in the home institution had no influence on their decision to participate in the exchange program. A similar proportion of respondents (N=96) stated that the availability of their chosen course did affect their decision to study abroad, with 14 students indicating this had an extreme effect.

Factors influencing an exchange student’s decision regarding their host destination

Table 7.7 details the scale means and standard deviations for the factors which influenced an exchange student’s decision regarding their host destination. Almost half
(N=105) of the exchange students stated that the knowledge of the host culture had a great-extreme influence. The knowledge of the language of the host country was also extremely relevant for almost two-thirds of students (N=152). Interestingly, for 79 students the similarity of the host culture did not affect their decision of studying abroad. In contrast, almost half of the students (N=109) stated this had a slight-moderate influence.

Table 7.7 Means and standard deviations of factors influencing an exchange student regarding their host destination and institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Knowledge of language of host culture</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Knowledge of host culture</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Reputation of chosen institution</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Similarity of host culture</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Living cost</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Availability of chosen course</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Social cost</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Geographic proximity to Australia or NZ</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the availability of a student’s chosen course did not influence the decision regarding the host institution for almost half of the participants (N=113), the reputation of the host university was a much stronger persuasive factor. Over one-third of students (N=88) reported that the university’s reputation had a slight-moderate influence on their decision regarding where to study overseas. One hundred and three students stated this had a great-extreme influence.

The living and social costs had slight-moderate influences affecting an exchange student’s decision to study abroad. Somewhat surprisingly, over one-third of respondents reported that these factors had no influence on their decision: 39.3% of
students (N=95) reported that living cost had no influence on their decision, and 37.1% of students (N=89) reported that social costs had no influence. Moreover, most exchange students (N=190) indicated that the geographic proximity of the host country did not influence their decision regarding participating in the exchange program.

Discussion

The objective of Study Two was to analyse the seven factors proposed in Figure 2.1, which influence the decision of Australian and New Zealand students to participate in an exchange program. This involved comparing the intercultural competencies of both exchange students and non-exchange students and the demographic characteristics of both student groups. The results show that overall exchange students and non-exchange students are two very distinct cohorts. Students differed in terms of gender representation, socio-economic background (as reflected by household income) and ethnicity. Interestingly there was no notable difference on previous mobility.

In support of hypothesis 4, exchange students presented with higher levels of cultural empathy, open-mindedness, flexibility, emotional stability, social initiative and self-efficacy than non-exchange students. Thus, exchange students appear to possess the necessary intercultural competencies for multicultural effectiveness and satisfaction. This raises the question as to whether exchange students gain any benefit from their experience abroad. Study Four measured changes in students’ intercultural competencies and investigated personal outcomes of the sojourn.

Study Two also analysed the extent to which six factors (career development, foreign language competence, education, financial constraints, personal relationships and culture and travel) influenced a student’s decision to participate in a student
exchange program or remain at the home campus. Factors that motivated exchange students to study overseas included enhancing their educational and future employment opportunities in both the home country and overseas, and a desire to travel and experience a new culture. Financial constraints and a lack of knowledge of mobility opportunities were reasons non-exchange students did not participate in the exchange program.

**Personal characteristics of exchange students**

Before undertaking the overseas study period, exchange students are a different cohort from their non-mobile peers (Carlson et al., 1990; Clyne & Rizvi, 1998; Dolby, 2004; Lincoln Fellowship Commission, 2004; Sussex Centre for Migration Research & Centre for Applied Population Research, 2004). The data from Study Two confirms research from other countries, in which female students from middle-upper socio-economic backgrounds who are academically high achievers participate in exchange programs. In this current study, the typical exchange student was female, studying a dual degree, born in Australia or New Zealand, monolingual and, had travelled overseas in the last five years. The average household income bracket of exchange students was higher than the national average for Australia and New Zealand. Additionally, exchange students reported higher levels of intercultural competencies and social self-efficacy than the non-exchange students.

As found by other researchers (Carlson et al., 1990; Clyne & Rizvi, 1998; Olsen, 2006; Van Hoof & Verbeeten, 2005), almost three-quarters of exchange program participants in the current study were female. While more females than males are enrolled in tertiary education in Australia and New Zealand (Krause et al., 2005; Ministry of Education, 2005a) the gender bias in the current study did not reflect the
gender representation in the university population. In Australia, 54.3% of university students are female and in New Zealand this proportion is 55.7% (Department of Education Science & Training, 2005; Ministry of Education, 2006b). Golstein and Kim (2006) speculated that certain fields of study such as humanities and social sciences are more suited to study abroad programs and these are dominated by females. Krause and her colleagues (2005) found that females “tended to have stronger academic orientation and application towards their studies” (p.2). Kling and his colleagues (1999) proposed that females students are recognising that participating in student exchange programs will better prepare them for challenging the ‘glass-ceiling’ within organisations. As outlined in Figure 2.1, career development is one of the drivers of mobility. However, these findings for exchange students contradict those studies of expatriates (e.g. Palthe, 2004; Waxin, 2004). While Forster (1997) noted that females are seeking international assignments, the typical expatriate manager is male. However, the proportion of female expatriates is growing. In 1994, Westwood and Leung concluded that only three percent of the expatriate population is female. Ten years later this had grown to approximately eight percent (Palthe, 2004; Waxin, 2004).

It is interesting to note that there was a significant difference between male and female respondents in Study Two. However in light of Kling et al’s (1999) position, it was surprising to find that there was no interaction between gender and group (exchange student vs. non-exchange student). In accordance with findings from Van der Zee et al (2003), females reported higher levels of cultural empathy than males. An ability to empathise with host nationals is one of the key competencies for intercultural effectiveness (Van der Zee & Van Oudenhoven, 2000). Confirming findings in previous studies (Van der Zee & Van Oudenhoven, 2000; van der Zee et al., 2003), male participants reported higher levels of emotional stability. Thus, it may be speculated
that females who study abroad would experience greater feelings of stress in a novel environment (O'Sullivan, 1999; Van der Zee & Van Oudenhoven, 2000). Further research is warranted to gain an understanding of how these differences affect the decision to participate in an exchange program and a student’s cross-cultural success.

Carlson (1990) and Orahood (2004) noted that American exchange students were enrolled in the disciplines of social sciences, business and education. While Australian and New Zealand exchange students tend to be engaged in the faculties of humanities/ social science and business, very few education students go abroad. Business and social science degrees are quite flexible, although some business specialisations have subject requirements established by professional bodies which may affect the ability of a student to study abroad and receive credit for that work undertaken overseas. It is worthwhile noting that the availability of their chosen course was not a strong factor influencing an exchange student’s choice of destination. This may add further weight to the prospect that those students enrolled in degrees with greater flexibility are more likely to participate in the exchange program. Further work in this area would be beneficial.

Although it was anticipated that more exchange students would be enrolled in the business and humanities disciplines, the findings suggest that exchange participants are studying dual degrees. Over the last decade in Australian universities enrolment in dual degrees has increased dramatically (Krause et al., 2005). In Study Two, one third of exchange student respondents were enrolled in dual degrees. This finding may suggest that exchange students were higher achievers as indicated by the program selection criteria or perhaps these students were seeking to maximise their employment opportunities through studying two disciplines as well as gaining intercultural
experience (Furnham, 1988; Krause et al., 2005; Mazzarol & Soutar, 2002; Van Hoof & Verbeeten, 2005; Wiers-Jenssen, 2003).

Clyne and Rizvi (1998) found that on average $10,000 was needed for one semester abroad. Although scholarships may be available (Australian Vice Chancellors' Committee, 2005c), these are often limited to a small number of students. Moreover, the value of available scholarships may not be sufficient to meet the expenses of studying abroad. In turn, this could exclude those students from low-income households from participating in the exchange program. In this study, the average household incomes of non-exchange students were lower than that of exchange students. However, it is worthwhile noting that while 60% of non-exchange students were engaged in part-time employment, significantly more exchange students were also employed. This finding may simply confirm that increasing numbers of university students work to support themselves while studying (Krause et al., 2005). Further research examining the impact of income on participation in the exchange program is warranted.

The results show that before their overseas experience, exchange students presented with higher levels of open-mindedness and cultural empathy than non-exchange students. These findings reflect the strong interest that exchange students have in learning about other cultures. Similar to students in Van Hoof and Verbeeten’s (2005) study, Australian and New Zealand exchange students reported that a key factor motivating their decision to participate in the program was because this was part of their travel plans. The importance of travel and experiencing other cultures is further seen in the high proportion of exchange students who reported having travelled overseas within the last five years. Clyne and Rizvi (1998) also found that exchange students were well-travelled. However, non-exchange students also reported similar travel experiences
suggesting that other factors such as financial constraints and awareness of the program may play a greater role in the decision-making process for non-mobile students.

Exchange students in Study Two possessed the skills to be able to adjust their behaviour in a foreign environment and tend to remain calm in stressful situations. These are key skills to manage in novel situations (Van der Zee & Van Oudenhoven, 2000). Certainly, flexibility is essential for the global employee (Kealey, 1990; Moro Bueno & Tubbs, 2004; Adler & Bartholomew, 1992 cited in Townsend & Cairns, 2003). Furthermore when living and working in a new culture, sojourners need to remain calm, even tempered and relaxed when dealing with uncertainty and unexpected situations. Several authors have found that those individuals who do remain calm will be more adjusted and experience greater satisfaction in their host culture (Aycan, 1997; Caliguiri, 2000; Van Oudenhoven et al., 2003).

It is firmly established that the better sojourners are able to integrate into the host culture, the better their adaptation and satisfaction (Barker et al., 2002; Brown & Daly, 2005; Palthe, 2004; Ward, 2005). Such integration is possible through taking an active approach in interacting with locals and forming friendships. As with other intercultural competencies previously discussed, exchange students reported significantly higher social initiative skills than non-exchange students. Furthermore, exchange students’ social self-efficacy scores were higher than their non-mobile peers, regardless of the ethnicity of the other person with whom they were interacting. So it seems that before departing on their overseas study, exchange students are more confident in interacting with others and more willing to initiate such interactions and form friendships than non-exchange students. These are key skills that will enhance their adjustment to and satisfaction with, their experience overseas.
It is acknowledged that these competencies are essential for multicultural effectiveness (Arthur & Bennett, 1995; Brislin et al., 1986; Cushner & Karim, 2004; Furnham, 1988; Volet, 2004). Thus, exchange students appear to be more skilled to function in the global environment than non-exchange students. It is interesting to note that the desire to live and work overseas were amongst the strongest factors influencing an exchange student’s decision to study abroad. So it seems students who want to live and work abroad may possess the relevant competencies to do so successfully.

Factors surrounding the decision to participate in the exchange program

In the current study, the chance to enhance their educational success was cited as a key reason for Australian and New Zealand exchange students to study overseas. Yet, Malicki (2003) and Van Hoof and Verbeeten (2005) found that exchange students do not participate in the exchange program for academic reasons such as improving their academic success or because lecturers recommended they do so. One of the strongest reasons reported by participants in Study Two as to why they studied abroad was the chance to maximise their employment opportunities in the home country or overseas. Students assume employers value the experience they gain overseas (Carlson et al., 1990; Clyne & Rizvi, 1998; Van Hoof & Verbeeten, 2005; Wiers-Jenssen, 2002). Furthermore, this may reflect the fact that the university's reputation was an important factor driving where the Australian and New Zealand exchange students chose to study. Exchange students select prestigious institutions with the view that their academic success will be augmented and in turn provide them with an advantage when seeking employment over their non-mobile peers (Clyne & Rizvi, 1998).

Both exchange and non-exchange students reported being well travelled. This suggests that Australian and New Zealand students are indeed interested in learning
about other cultures, unlike their US counterparts (Surridge 2000 cited in Cushner &
Karim, 2004; Kecht, 1999 cited in Sakuragi, 2006). However, it may be speculated that
the non-exchange students in the current study simply did not know about the
opportunities to study abroad. Almost three-quarters of non-mobile respondents
confirmed that a lack of knowledge of the program impacted upon their non-
participation in the exchange program. Many non-exchange students stated that they
simply had not thought about participating in an exchange program. The Sussex Centre
that the availability of good promotional information and support acts as both a
mitigating and a reinforcing factor when deciding study abroad. Additional research
should be conducted to specifically examine tertiary student awareness of student
exchange programs. As identified in Chapter Six, this finding has great implications for
the implementation of student exchange as a strategic goal and may reflect the
organisational culture and leadership.

It is worthwhile considering that for approximately half of the exchange
students surveyed the availability of their course at the host institution did not greatly
influence their choice of host destination. This finding might reflect the potential
flexibility available to students enrolled in dual degrees. Moreover, almost half of non-
exchange students reported that the ability to match subjects at the host university to
meet course requirements at the home institution had no influence on their decision to
not participate in an exchange program. While these results might suggest that a
student's discipline of study does not directly influence their decision to participate in
an exchange program, the field of study may indirectly affect who can study overseas
during their degree. As discussed in Chapter Two, when deciding to exchange students
must consider the relevance of the exchange opportunity to their degree, the availability
of an appropriate credit transfer system and the possible effect the time abroad may have on prolonging their degree. Additional research should be conducted in this area including examining the flexibility of study programs for accommodating periods of overseas study. Once again, this has implications for the management of exchange programs by the home institution and will reflect how student mobility is incorporated as a strategic goal.

An ability to communicate in the host language can enhance a newcomer's adjustment in the foreign setting (Barker et al., 2002; Mendenhall & Oddou, 1985; Waxin, 2004). For non-exchange groups, a familiarity with the culture and language of another country was an extremely important issue when considering whether to study overseas. Certainly a lack of a second language is acknowledged as one of the top reasons students do not participate in exchange programs (Clyne & Rizvi, 1998; Holdaway et al., 1988; Lakshmana Rao, 1979; Mazzarol & Soutar, 2002). Yet, similar proportions of non-exchange students and exchange students were monolingual. Foreign language proficiency will influence the destinations of those who do study abroad (Wiers-Jenssen, 2002). Exchange students in Study Two reported that their choice of the host destination was influenced by knowledge of the host culture and its language. While Study One showed that Australian and New Zealand exchange students have a preference for Anglophone countries, the current study did not examine the host destinations of participating exchange students. Further research is warranted to examine (a) the relationship between LOTE learning in secondary schools and universities and student participation in exchange programs, and (b) the relationship between foreign language proficiency and the countries in which Australian and New Zealand exchange students study.
In support of previous studies (e.g. Maiworm, 2001; New Zealand Vice Chancellors' Committee, 2002; Wiers-Jenssen, 2003), the non-exchange students reported that cost was one of the most prominent barriers preventing them from participating in the exchange program. Work commitments also had a minimal influence on students’ decision making. The non-exchange students recognised that travel and living costs greatly impacted on their ability to study abroad. Exchange students also acknowledged that the cost of living in the host culture was an issue that influenced their decision regarding their study destination.

With the changing geopolitical environment there is greater concern for personal safety (IDP Australia, 2003b). However, social cost did not rate highly as a key factor influencing neither the decision to study abroad nor the choice of host destination. One third of non-exchange students reported that social cost was not an issue at all when deciding to study overseas. These results confirmed the findings of Wang and Bu (2004). Although students may be somewhat hesitant regarding a period of work or study overseas in certain countries, overall they do not seem to be greatly affected by the geopolitical climate.

Numerous authors acknowledged that students are more likely to participate in an exchange program if significant others recommend they do so (Cushner & Karim, 2004; Malicki, 2003; Wiers-Jenssen, 2003). Interestingly, Clyne and Rizvi (1998) proposed that the exchange experience also impacts upon family and friends. In contrast to the literature (e.g. Sussex Centre for Migration Research & Centre for Applied Population Research, 2004; Wiers-Jenssen, 2003), it appears that when deciding to study abroad Australian and New Zealand exchange students were not greatly influenced by their family. Yet, family commitments presented as a key barrier to non-exchange students. Similar to the findings of Van Hoof and Verbeeten (2005),
exchange respondents stated that they were their decision to participate in the exchange program was influenced slightly if their friends made the recommendation. At one Australian University, Malicki (2003) found that there was a high referral rate between friends.

A limitation of this study was the inability to make statistical comparisons between exchange and non-exchange students in terms of the factors influencing the sojourn decision. Thus comparison was not possible as the two student groups were asked different questions, although some of the topics (e.g. language, culture, cost) were similar (see Appendix B). The focus for the non-exchange students was on how these factors acted as barriers to participating in the student exchange program. On the other hand, exchange students were asked to what extent such factors influenced their decision regarding their host destination. So, these factors came into effect after the students had decided to participate in the exchange program.

Conclusion

Study Two has examined what factors influence students to participate in an exchange program. This involved comparing and contrasting the personal characteristics of exchange and non-exchange students, and evaluating the importance of variables in the decision-making process.

The first research question of this study (RQ3) aimed to examine the demographic differences between exchange and non-exchange students and it was confirmed that these are indeed two distinct cohorts. In consideration of the student’s profile characteristics which are proposed to influence the decision to study abroad, the findings of Study Two show that exchange students differed significantly from their
non-mobile peers in terms of gender, socio-economic background (as reflected by household income) and ethnicity. A typical Australian or New Zealand exchange student was female, from a middle-upper class family, born in Australia or New Zealand and monolingual. Interestingly there was no notable difference on previous mobility. While further investigation of the effect of discipline of study is warranted, it was also found that Australian and New Zealand exchange students studied dual degrees which may be speculated is done so as to further enhance their career opportunities.

Exchange students and non-exchange students also differed in terms of intercultural competencies. The findings supported hypothesis 4 which stated that exchange students would present with higher levels of intercultural competencies than non-exchange students. Thus, it appears that exchange students possessed the necessary intercultural competencies to aid their adjustment in the host culture, and enhance their educational success and satisfaction with their sojourn experience. This raises the question as to whether exchange students gain any benefit from their experience abroad. To date, there is a paucity of research examining the outcomes of participating in an exchange program for Australian and New Zealand students. Study Four, presented in Chapter Nine, comprised a pre-and post-study to empirically measure changes in the students’ intercultural competencies and to determine their international orientation.

The second research question of Study Two (RQ4) focused on what factors influenced a student’s decision to participate in the exchange program or remain at home. Exchange students reported that the key factors which influenced their decision to study overseas included the belief that the experience would enhance their educational success and maximise employment opportunities in both the home country and overseas. Respondents also reported a desire to travel and experience a new culture.
In contrast, non-exchange students indicated that financial constraints and a lack of knowledge of mobility opportunities were reasons they had not participated in the exchange program.

The final research question (RQ5) examined what factors influenced an exchange student’s decision regarding their host destination. Knowledge of the host country’s language and culture were the top two factors cited by participants. Thus, it seems exchange students are choosing countries in which they may experience fewer difficulties. The cultural and linguistic similarity of host destinations was analysed in Study One and will be discussed further in Chapter Ten.

Both home and host institutions should have an understanding of exchange students’ experiences while abroad. The next study investigated the experiences of Australian and New Zealand students in Canada. Study Three included an examination of pre-departure training and on-arrival orientation, students’ experiences with studying and living in a new environment and interactions with locals.
CHAPTER 8 – STUDY THREE: AUSTRALIAN AND NEW ZEALAND EXCHANGE STUDENTS’ EXPERIENCES IN CANADA

Introduction

Study Two reported that exchange students were motivated to study abroad because they wanted to experience a new culture. However, few studies have examined exchange students’ experiences of a new culture while in the host country. Study Three responds to this gap in the literature. The primary objective of Study Three was to examine the in-country experiences of Australian and New Zealand exchange students in Canada. Four aspects of the students’ experiences in Canada were considered: (1) cultural differences between the home and host countries such as communication, customs and values; (2) general living including accommodation, food, public transport and the weather/ environmental differences; (3) study and educational differences; and, (4) relationships with host nationals. Study Three also investigated how support from the home and host university may have influenced the student exchange experience.

In a novel environment, a sojourner may experience culture shock which is a series of emotional reactions stemming from a lack of understanding of the country’s values, customs and communication. It was established in Chapter Three that there is a need to understand culture shock for short-term sojourners. An understanding of culture shock experienced by exchange students would allow it to be managed effectively and thus ensure students experienced success while in the host country (Ting-Toomey, 1999). Thus, the first research question asked,

How did Australian and New Zealand exchange students experience cultural differences when studying in Canada? (RQ6)
RQ6 aimed to understand if exchange students experienced culture shock in Canada, and if they did, what factors presented as stressors and what were the coping mechanisms used by students? Interview questions included examining communication difficulties and students’ perceptions of general cultural differences. Additionally, comparison of students’ pre-departure expectations and experiences provided further insight into culture shock and adjustment (Black et al., 1991; Brislin et al., 1986; Roskams & Dallo, 1990).

Previous studies have indicated that differences in general living conditions and lifestyle can impact upon a sojourner’s adjustment (e.g. Aycan, 1997; Black, 1988; Kealey, 1978; Torbijn, 1982). However, it is unclear as to whether Australian and New Zealand exchange students studying in Canada perceived differences of, and experienced difficulties related to, general living conditions such as accommodation, shopping and food, using public transport and the weather. Thus, the second research question in Study Three was,

*Did Australian and New Zealand exchange students experience differences in terms of general living conditions when studying in Canada? (RQ7)*

Ryan and Twibell (2000) commented that the in-country experiences of exchange students are unique because they must adjust to function in an academic setting. Study Three aimed to understand the study experiences of Australian and New Zealand exchange students in Canada. So, the third research question asked,

*What were the experiences of Australian and New Zealand exchange students in terms of teaching and learning styles and expectations when studying in Canada? (RQ8)*
The exchange experience is influenced by the type and amount of contact with host nationals (Cushner & Karim, 2004; Fish, 2005; Masgoret, 2006; Tomich et al., 2003). Opper et al (1990) noted that exchange students studied abroad as they wanted to establish friendships with host nationals. However, in her review of the literature Ward (2005) noted that the interaction between full-fee paying (FFP) international students and domestic students is low. It is uncertain as to the amount and type of interaction between exchange students and local students. Thus, Study Three examined the friendships of Australian and New Zealand exchange students with local students at the host universities. The fourth research question of Study Three was,

*What was the nature of the friendships experienced by Australian and New Zealand exchange students in Canada? (RQ9)*

Since domestic students are not likely to seek contact with their overseas-born classmates (Beaver & Tuck, 1998), it was expected that the participants in Study Three would have greater interaction with other Australians and New Zealanders and other exchange students than with locals.

As discussed in Chapter Three, pre-departure training and orientation upon arrival in the host country are two effective methods for students to develop appropriate expectations of their sojourn and thus facilitate in-country adjustment (Black et al., 1991; Brislin et al., 1986; Roskams & Dallo, 1990). Yet, it is unclear as to what pre-departure training or on-arrival orientation exchange students receive. This led to the final research question in Study Three,

*In what pre-departure training and orientation programs did exchange students engage? (RQ10)*
Method

Study Three utilised a qualitative approach to address the five research questions described above. The study was comprised of semi-structured interviews with 17 Australian and New Zealand exchange students studying at two Canadian universities. Interviews were conducted face-to-face at the host institutions during the ‘Fall’ semester.

Procedure

There were several reasons justifying the choice of Canada as the host culture under review in the current study. First, it was identified in Study One that Canada was one of the most popular destinations for Australian and New Zealand university students. Second, focusing on the Anglophone regions of Canada reduced the possibility of linguistic difficulties further impacting on students’ adjustment. Finally, this study was made possible because I was awarded a Graduate Student Scholarship from the International Council for Canadian Studies Graduate Studies Scholarship. This grant provided for travel to Canada for up to six weeks to examine the experiences of Australian and New Zealand students.

While abroad, all participants were approached by their respective home institutions. The two host Canadian Institutions (UC1 and UC2) were chosen as many Australian and New Zealand universities have exchange agreements with these universities. Indeed of the 11 Australian and New Zealand universities who supported Studies Two, Three and Four, seven had exchange agreements with University C1 and, five had exchange programs with University C2.

The students participated in a semi-structured one hour interview. The face-to-face interview was conducted in a neutral setting at the host institution. The interviews
were conducted in late November and early December, which corresponded with the ‘Fall semester’. This was done for two reasons. First, this semester is the time when more Australian and New Zealand students choose to study abroad. Second, it was necessary to allow students time to experience the new culture and learning environment (Waxin, 2004).

Participants

The sample used in this study was a subgroup of the exchange students who participated in Studies Two and Four. Sixteen undergraduate students and one postgraduate student who were studying at two Canadian universities through an exchange program with their home university in Australia or New Zealand, were interviewed while they were in Canada. As seen in Table 8.1, the gender and age distribution reflected that of the exchange student cohort in Study Two.

As described in Chapter Seven, students’ areas of study were coded into six discipline fields by two independent raters. Unlike the exchange cohort in Study Two, almost half (N=7) of the participants reported that they were enrolled in dual degrees and six students revealed that they were enrolled in Arts degrees. Other students indicated studies in the areas of Engineering (N=1), Commerce (N=1) and Science (N=1).

While most students were participating in a semester-long exchange program, it was interesting to note that five participants reported that they were studying in Canada for one year. This high proportion of year-long study did not reflect the findings of Dwyer (2004). Rather Dwyer (2004) found that more exchange students studied abroad for only one semester.
Table 8.1: Profiles of participants in Study Four

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Country of birth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alicia</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher (Chris)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belinda</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas (Nick)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivia</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Pseudonyms have been created to maintain anonymity

**Interview**

A semi-structured interview procedure was followed with probing questions used when necessary. Questions focused on three topic areas: (1) students’ expectations of life in Canada and experiences of culture shock (e.g. *What did you expect life to be like here in Canada? Did you experience culture shock?*); (2) students’ experiences in Canada including adjusting to general living conditions and lifestyle and study, and interactions with others (e.g. *What things have you liked best? What have you found difficult? Tell me about your friends here*), and (3) pre-departure training and orientation (e.g. *What training was offered before leaving Australia/New Zealand*?). See Appendix B2 for the interview questions.
Data Analysis

All interviews were audio-taped and later transcribed with the participants’ permission. The transcription and subsequent analysis focused only on the words spoken and did not consider non-verbal communication. The data was analysed using N-Vivo 7. The analysis involved four stages. First, the topics or themes upon which the analysis was conducted were based upon the six research questions outlined earlier. These were (1) cultural differences and culture shock, (2) general living conditions and lifestyle, (3) educational styles identified, (4) relationships with others, (5) pre-departure training and (6) in-country orientation programs.

Next, topic coding was completed. Analysis was based upon responses to all questions as students may have discussed various issues in response to different questions. This stage of the data analysis required the allocation of participants’ responses to topics using Free Nodes such as ‘adjustment’, ‘positive experiences’, ‘relationships’.

Since Richards (2005) noted that this stage of analysis involves little interpretation, the third step was analytical coding. Analytical coding involved coding on from the previous free node coding. Analytical coding comes from interpreting and reflecting on the meaning of responses. Tree nodes were developed to integrate the topics identified earlier and the common themes emerging from reflecting upon the coding process and students’ responses. Passages of interviews could be coded to more than one theme; for example, the comment “I was frustrated with them not being able to understand me and being able to use words that they use” was coded under the nodes of Adjustment/ Culture shock examples; Evaluations of experience/ Negative; Experiences/ Daily Living Skills/ Socialising; and Experiences/ Relationships.
Once coding was complete, a matrix search was conducted to discover patterns within the participants’ responses. Krippendorf (2004) referred to this as ‘clustering’. The following matrices were analysed:

1. Evaluations of experiences (positive vs. negative) AND Experiences (culture; daily living skills- accommodation, food, socializing, tax, transport, weather; orientation; relationships; study; orientation groups)
2. Evaluations of experiences (positive vs. negative) AND Adjustment (culture shock, culture shock examples, health, pre-departure training)
3. Evaluations of experiences (positive vs. negative) AND expectations (in-country)

Findings and Discussion

Culture shock and cultural differences

In the current study, culture shock was not defined for the participants. Rather the goal was to understand students’ perceptions of culture shock in terms of their feelings such as anxiety, uncertainty and disorientation and responses to the host environment. Only four respondents acknowledged that they experienced culture shock. Similarly in Kealey’s (1990) study of the effectiveness of Canadian technical advisors, 65% of respondents initially denied experiencing culture shock. Traditionally culture shock was defined negatively and seen as a problem with adjustment (P. S. Adler, 1975). Thus, it is not seen as an important aspect of “cultural learning, self development and personal growth” (P. S. Adler, 1975, p.14; Furnham, 1988; Kim, 2001).
Interestingly, Max commented that he did not know if he had experienced culture shock (I am worried cos they say if you don’t experience it you don’t experience the culture). So it seems that the exchange students may have been unsure of what culture shock entails. Nick stated that it was not how it was described in the book; and Emily indicated that her experience was not so much shock but more so noticing that Australians and Canadians are not the same.

Seven students felt that Canada would be the same as Australia or New Zealand, as reflected by comments from Alicia and Matthew:

I have been told that Vancouver was quite like New Zealand, but just bigger (Alicia)

I have always thought of Canada as being pretty similar to Australia in a lot of ways. I expected the university to be like [my university], and I expected living in Vancouver to be like living in Melbourne (Matthew)

Such low expectations of differences may reflect the cultural and linguistic similarity of Australia, New Zealand and Canada. This issue was considered further in relation to the cultural differences experienced by students, which is discussed below. Furthermore, student pre-departure expectations and in-country experiences were analysed in Study Four.

In the context of the reported expectations of the Canadian sojourn being like the home culture, Michelle stated

When you come from somewhere radically different like Europe or Asia you expect culture shock, but I think for us we think we speak the same language, have the same kind of history and same kind of land mass, you
don’t expect to have culture shock. It’s harder for us than some of the
other kids sometimes.

Certainly, Grace did not expect difficulties and acknowledged that this affected
her adjustment in Canada:

Just little things that you don’t expect to be. Cos you are not expecting
there to be so many changes so you are not aware of them and they
strike you unawares. Probably if you were expecting lots of changes you
would be a little bit more on the ball and a bit more flexible.

Students were asked about what things they had found difficult and how they had
coped being in Canada. Frustration with just the little things (Olivia) such as
accommodation and changing vocabulary were identified. Difficulties experienced by
students are often categorised into three areas: (1) cultural adjustment, which involves
adjusting to the new culture, climate, food and establishing friendships; (2) educational
adjustment to become accustomed to differing attitudes of learning, and styles of
thinking and writing; and, (3) language use (Eischenlas & Trevaskes, 2003; Jones,
1994; Stephens, 1997).

Bureaucracy and rules were the most common themes students noted in relation to
difficulties they experienced with the Canadian culture. For example:

Canada seems to be a very rule-governed society. That has been difficult
as there are so many rules about so many things which don’t seem
totally necessary. Even opening a bank account was quite difficult;
sorting out a telephone. And normally that can be challenging as banks
and telephone companies are not known for being cooperative anywhere in the world but the Canadians were worse (Tina).

Communication differences were also observed:
In Australia we get a lot of Canadian and American accents and over here you feel like you are speaking a whole different language, just because they aren’t used to the accent (Olivia).

It seems that students do not recognise their experiences as part of culture shock. Participants reported feeling frustrated and homesick which are symptoms of culture shock (P. S. Adler, 1975; Church, 1982; Oberg, 1970). Yet, there seemed to be a reluctance to acknowledge these feelings as culture shock. For example Olivia reflected:

I don’t think I have experienced a great deal of culture shock here. It’s just the little things, and when you’ve got a lot of little things it adds up. Normally it’s just fine. But occasionally you just have a day when all the little things seem too much. And you get frustrated. (RESEARCHER: Any down days, when you have a cry?) Yeah, plenty of those.

Indeed, several students reported feeling sadness and overwhelmed at times, especially upon arrival:

You get frustrated. You get down... You get your good days and your bad days. Initially there were a lot more bad days especially associated with the accommodation and that posed problems with getting to meet people... You didn’t have someone else to turn to (Diana).
It was bewilderment and trying to adjust took about a month or more (Jennifer).

While Michelle and Paul reported changes in sleeping patterns, five other participants noted increased poor health:

*I’ve got a doctor’s appointment after this actually. It hasn’t been brilliant. I got sick with a flu which dragged on the first two months I was here. It hasn’t been the best* (Sarah).

Overall when asked to reflect on their time in Canada, students reported enjoying their time abroad and would recommend the experience to others. For example, Tina noted:

*I’ve liked the different experience; the fact that things are different here. I’m able to do different things than I do at home. You also have more freedom than you do at home; a certain level of anonymity. I like the idea that all anyone knows about you here is what you tell them so you can do things you wouldn’t necessarily do at home, for whatever reason and you have more opportunities than you would do at home.*

Yet, the matrix analysis of students’ experiences revealed that their comments were more skewed to negative evaluations. This may reflect students using the interview as an opportunity to debrief with a co-national.

**General Living Conditions and Lifestyle**

As introduced earlier, students often experience difficulties with general cultural adjustment. In response to the second research question (RQ7, *Do Australian and New*
Zealand exchange students experience differences in terms of general living conditions when studying in Canada), five topics were examined in the context of student exchange: accommodation, food, transport, weather and shopping.

Accommodation

For some students housing was the biggest difficulty (Tina). This was observed more with students who were living off-campus compared to those in residence:

*I haven’t liked living off campus cos I don’t get to see anyone, like all the people I met at orientation (Alicia).*

*This is a little bit of a bone of contention. I am living off-campus, I found out after I left Australia and there wasn’t a lot I could do from Cuba [where I was traveling] about organizing accommodation…. It’s horrible. It has really detracted from my whole exchange experience (Emily).*

In contrast, Sarah has enjoyed living on-campus:

*I find that living on campus is fun; it’s great and you are surrounded by a lot of international students but there are very few Canadians that live here.*

Nick, Grace and Diana all noted that accommodation was quite expensive, especially when compared to costs at home.
Food

Cost was also frequently mentioned in relation to food. This included groceries and eating out. Belinda commented that *at home it seemed cheaper. I think they cater more to student budgets*. Although respondents did not note problems with finding food they liked or to which they were accustomed, Diana mentioned that she *miss[ed] the great restaurant culture of Melbourne*.

Transport

Three participants commented on the public transport in Canada. While Max, who attended UC2, reported that *public transport is so easy to use and get around on*, Belinda at UC1 commented that the *campus is so far from town that without cars, to do anything is an entire day out*. Grace identified that the subway cost was an issue for her as it was an unexpected expense.

Weather

Of the four students who discussed the weather, all found it a negative aspect of their time in Canada. Interestingly all of these respondents attended UC1. Tina reported *I had to buy clothes when I got here cos I don’t own the right clothes cos I am from the wrong climate*.

Shopping

Only Olivia and Scott discussed shopping in Canada. Both found the tax frustrating:

*Tax is annoying when it’s not included in the price. Even though it’s not an extra cost, it feels like it is cos it’s not included in the price.*
Study

The third research question in the current study focused on the differences in teaching and learning between Australia and New Zealand, and Canada (RQ8). Participants reported varied experiences in the classroom. For some, such as Alicia and Tina, classes were large lectures with minimal interactions between students and with the lecturer. Sarah noted that [UC1] is a big campus with a lot of students. There is not much lecturer time per student. Yet, Jennifer found that despite the large classes, you can always put your hand up and interact with the professor and other students will comment.

Nick reported on the differences between his classes with some offering little opportunity for interaction and another comprising of student presentations so that allows for more interaction cos people ask questions. Several students commented that classes are lot smaller and more discussion-oriented (Belinda). For example, the subjects studied by Emily and Grace employed seminar style classes and Olivia noted that her class sizes are between 15-20 people and really interactive.

Reflecting the discussion above, overall it seems that the teaching methods are varied. Jennifer and Tina identified that they had to undergo some adjustment in this area: Trying to understand the academic system has been a little bit hard (Tina). While most students relished the different opportunities, a few students were dissatisfied with the teaching style. For example, Belinda missed the tutorial system employed in New Zealand; Sarah found the standard of material to be at a lower level than that she was studying at home (The courses I am taking here are third year level and a lot of what I am studying now, I have already studied in first year); and, Michelle reported her studies have not been fun. It’s much more rote learning. It’s less applied and creative application learning.
In contrast, other students expressed a high level of satisfaction with the courses at the host institution, particularly as many were not available at home. Emily commented that she was studying more than she had expected because she was really enjoying the courses. Both Matthew and Alicia experienced many field trips: I did a couple of subjects with field trips, like one up on a glacier- I have never seen a glacier before let alone walked on one and do tests on it. We stayed overnight so I slept in my sleeping bag under the stars, which I have never done before. That was phenomenal (Alicia). Olivia also found her classes very practical and hands on.

The theme of workload was raised by several respondents. Matthew and Chris wished they were doing fewer subjects than they had enrolled in as this would have allowed them to do some of the culture things (Chris). Similarly, Emily expressed a desire that her home university

be aware that there is no break and study week and I am doing more subjects than I would be doing back home so that detracts from the experience cos you are doing all this work. And exchange is not all about Uni.

Sarah reported that she did undertake a reduced study load and was satisfied with this:

I am extremely active in getting out to see as much of Canada and BC as I can. That was my expectation of coming here that I was going to have fun. I was going to study a bit- 50% study; 50% recreation and social.
Relationships

The fourth research question in Study Three asked about the nature of friendships experienced by Australian and New Zealand exchange students in Canada (RQ9). Friendships and socialising were common themes when analysing student’s expectations. Specifically, students reported that they thought they would mix with the Canadians (Belinda). Thirteen participants (76%) stated that they had expected to form friendships with more locals than they did. Numerous studies have shown that international students expect and desire more contact with locals (Brown & Daly, 2004; Ward, 2002; Ward, Berno, & Kennedy, 2000). The results from the current study suggest the same may be true for exchange students. Greater interaction between international and local students is associated with psychological, sociocultural and academic adjustment (Ward, 2005).

However, cross-cultural interaction is not likely to occur spontaneously. Orientation influenced early relationships. Scott noted that orientation

‘was gearing us to be friend with those people, which I didn’t like because in coming to university in Canada I expected that they would want to mingle you with Canadians. That was a bit frustrating’.

Similarly, Sarah found this frustrating: the one drawback was we didn’t get to meet any Canadians for the first few weeks we were in Canada and we didn’t know any Canadians.

Interestingly, half of the students indicated that they socialised only with other exchange students. The high incidence of co-national friendships is consistent with past research undertaken in Britain, Japan, France, USA and Canada (e.g. Bochner, Hutnik,
Findings of previous studies have indicated a trend for international students to interact with co-nationals but yet desire greater contact with local students. While the work of Brown and Daly (2005) and Pitts (2006) suggests that the low level of interaction between domestic and international students is related to social self-efficacy in a cross-cultural context and the relative ease of communicating in the home language, it was proposed that in the current study the cultural and linguistic similarities of New Zealand, Australia and Canada would have reduced the possible impact of these factors.

Paul also commented on other factors influencing interactions with host nationals:

>You really have to have the motivation. It’s hard because you’re busy with work, and you’re trying to do all this socialising to meet people… and you don’t have much money.

Many students acknowledged that it was hard to establish relationships in the classroom. William observed that the Canadian students were much more reserved with strangers. Interestingly, Emily and Michelle proposed that it was because of the number of exchange students in class and the short-term nature of the sojourn. So, locals may be disinterested in establishing friendships which would cease after a semester and overwhelmed by the large numbers of incoming exchange students. Certainly, Koskinen and Tossavainen (2003) found that there was limited interaction between the British exchange students and local students in Finland because British students arrived in large groups.

>Having so many Australians has been really frustrating cos its really hard to meet Canadians and there are so many Australian people that
the people in my class are like “oh a whole lot of exchange students so
don’t bother talking to them.”... They are quite interested in Australia
and talking to you, it’s just when you are en masse, it’s like, “how
awful”, which is quite understandable. I am sure we would be the same
way at home (Emily).

Maybe people do it at home as well. “She is only going to be here for a
year so it’s not worth making her a friend” (Michelle).

Michelle’s comments are supported by the studies of Mills (1997) and Smart et al
(2000), which have shown that Australian and New Zealand domestic students are
disinterested in intercultural relations. Rather local students are focused on gaining their
qualifications and are less likely to seek contact with their overseas-born classmates
(Beaver & Tuck, 1998).

Students also identified that they had different agendas from local students. In
particular, participants perceived that because university entry is harder for Canadian
students, they tend to be more studious than the exchange participants. Belinda argued
that the difference lay with the fact that exchange students want to socialise and
experience Canadian life. Several students reported that they joined clubs at the
university, but through this met more exchange students and particularly those from
Australia. Olivia was able to summarise the different expectations between local and
exchange students, explaining why she tended to interact more with fellow exchange
students:

...they are in a similar situation and they want to see these things as
well. I have a friend whose flatmates sat him down and said “you’ve
gotta go to an ice hockey game, you’ve gotta go to a football game;
you’ve gotta go here and see this” and when he asked if they wanted to 
come with him, they said no. So you find that cos exchange students are 
in a similar situation, you do stuff with them.

**Pre-departure Training & Orientation**

The final research question of Study Three was seeking to understand the pre-
departure training and in-country orientation programs undertaken by Australian and 
New Zealand exchange students (RQ10). Fourteen respondents reported that a pre-
departure session was conducted at the home institution. Pre-departure training sessions 
tended to be half a day in length and included administrative information and 
discussions regarding adjustment in a new culture.

*They covered the basics. There are certain aspects of exchange that you 
will be able to prepare people for. Like there are things about culture 
shock, but you can’t just say that in a lecture theatre and expect people 
to be prepared* (Scott).

*.. a month before I left there was a half day session on what to do, what 
not to do. It wasn’t particularly profound. It was all pretty much basic 
commonsense* (Olivia).

Brislin and his colleagues (1986; Cushner & Brislin, 1996) described this 
approach as cognitive training. The sojourners are provided with facts about the host 
country and the adjustment process. This is most commonly used for expatriate training 
(Gudykunst et al., 1996), relying on “lectures, group discussions, presentation of 
written materials, and question-answer sessions with returned sojourners who have been
in the host country for several years” (Brislin et al., 1986, p. 21-22). Universities adopt the cognitive approach because it is easy to staff and matches students’ previous educational experiences (Bennett, 1986; Cushner & Brislin, 1996; Pitts, 2006).

However it is argued that cognitive training alone is not effective, but rather the best method is a multidimensional approach (Black & Mendenhall, 1990). Bennett (1986) proposed that the training program should incorporate “a balance of culture specific with culture general knowledge” (p. 130). Moreover to be most effective, pre-departure training should be experiential as well as including lectures (Gudykunst et al., 1977 cited in Black & Mendenhall, 1990) so that students may possess both the necessary knowledge about their host culture and the adjustment processes and the cross-cultural skills to function within the new environment (M. J. Westwood, Mak, Barker, & Ishiyama, 2000). Indeed, Westwood et al (2000) put forward that training should utilise role-based learning in groups. This style of training would be possible within universities, however additional funding and resources may be required.

Despite most universities offering pre-departure workshops, only five respondents attended such training. Reasons for non-attendance included being busy, clash of timing with exams, work commitments and travel:

I chose to travel beforehand. Because of the difference in timing, we finish in June and they don’t start til September so I used those 2 or 3 months to travel which meant that all those pre-departure sessions I missed out on (William).

An additional issue identified by two students was the late notice of acceptance into the program given by the host university:
The students who had applied to ‘UC1’ didn’t know whether they had been accepted or not to ‘UC1’. The pre-departure session was in May; we didn’t get our acceptances til 13 June (Tina).

Therefore as Pitts (2006) concluded, “students are being sent abroad with little or no training on how to make a positive experience”. Since pre-departure training and on-arrival orientation are essential to familiarise the sojourner to both the country and institution (D. L. Goldstein & Smith, 1999; Gudykunst et al., 1996; Robertson & Andrew, 1990; Roskams & Dallo, 1990), universities should re-consider the timing of sessions to improve attendance and review the content of the training program. Studies have shown that training programs offered to overseas students studying in Australia and New Zealand result in improvements in adjustment and academic success (Barker et al., 2002; Daly & Brown, 2004).

Both of the host institutions provided orientation programs which were three to five days in length. The program focused on promoting socialisation between students, providing university tours and faculty-specific orientation, and presenting information sessions on the city, life in Canada, Canadian culture and culture shock. Respondents acknowledged that orientation was good because of the social aspect:

*It was nice to meet other exchange students. They organised social activities with other exchange students (Matthew)*

*They put on a big concert and we had lots of activities, and we had a boat cruise in the harbour- that was pretty cool actually (Christopher).*
However, some students reported that the program was lacking in more practical aspects like opening a bank account (William) and

…where are the computer labs on campus, how do you go about getting your meal cards if you live on residence, how you get your laundry cards, where are the libraries, what are the borrowing rights at the libraries. We didn’t do a lot of the basic day to day stuff which was more likely to initially be a challenge here. How to open a bank account, like if you went to a bank downtown you wouldn’t be able to open one, but if you went to one near the university you would have a better chance cos they are used to dealing with international students cos we don’t have the right documentation. Very basic stuff wasn’t covered, which might have been more use to more people (Tina).

Logistic support and training provided by the host organisation on arrival is critical in assisting sojourner adjustment (Aycan, 1997; D. L. Goldstein & Smith, 1999; Robertson & Andrew, 1990).

While much of the program was designed for all incoming international students (i.e. full-fee paying students and exchange students), overwhelmingly respondents reported that the best aspect of the orientation program were those events run only for exchange students. The exchange students felt that they needed a different program from those students who were new to university and Canada.

Perhaps it would have been better if they had separated international and exchange students in that program, cos a lot of the program was
irrelevant to the exchange students and the exchange student part of the program was irrelevant to the international students (Tina).

They grouped us together with international students so we had a lot of people in the group who were first time students and were in a new country to boot. So it was pretty basic stuff (Christopher).

We went to a lecture on how to study which was such a simple thing (Belinda).

I didn’t enjoy it cos it felt more like a first year orientation which it was for the international students (Scott).

Conclusion

Study Three was comprised of interviews with 17 exchange students while in their host country, Canada. The objective of Study Three was to understand the experiences of Australian and New Zealand exchange students in a host country, Canada. Four aspects of the students’ experiences in Canada were considered: (1) cultural differences between the home and host countries; (2) general living conditions and lifestyle; (3) academic styles; and, (4) relationships with host nationals. Study Three also investigated how support from the home and host university may have influenced the student exchange experience.

It was surprising to find that respondents reported that they expected life in Canada to be the same as at home. If students are not expecting difficulties or novel
experiences they would not perceive a need for training to prepare them for their time abroad. In turn, such expectations may explain why few students attended the pre-departure training conducted by their home university. It may be speculated that pre-departure training is not valued by outgoing exchange students. In contrast, orientation by the host institution was found to be beneficial in terms of socialisation with other exchange students but needed to be expanded to focus more on practical issues (RQ10).

Overall respondents indicated satisfaction with their in-country experiences. Although students did not perceive that experienced culture shock (RQ6), they reported problems with dealing with general living conditions (RQ7) such as accommodation and the weather, the different approaches to study (RQ8) and relationships (RQ9). Students reported that had expected greater interaction with host nationals but instead they tended to establish friendships with other exchange students. It was proposed that relationships with Canadians were influenced by orientation activities, which included only exchange and international students. Moreover, it seemed that the Canadian students may have been more focused on studying rather than establishing what may have been perceived as short-term friendships, and local students were not as interested in sight-seeing and travel as the exchange students. This finding suggests that the host university may need to establish greater opportunities for interaction with incoming exchange students and local students.

The next chapter will present the final study which examined the outcomes of the exchange sojourn in terms of intercultural competencies and international orientation. Study Four also investigated the relationship between student’s pre-departure expectations of their time abroad and their experiences in the host country.
CHAPTER 9 – STUDY FOUR: THE OUTCOMES OF THE EXCHANGE EXPERIENCE

Introduction

Study Two revealed that before their overseas study exchange students differed significantly from their peers who remain at home. Specifically, before an international experience exchange students reported higher levels of intercultural competencies than non-exchange students did. Although it appears that members of this self-selecting group already possess such skills before their sojourn, numerous authors (e.g. Akande & Slawson, 2000; Hashimoto, 2003; Mahon & Cushner, 2002; Milstein, 2005; Van Hoof & Verbeeten, 2005) have contended that a student exchange experience provides many opportunities for growth and development.

Study Two also showed that Australian and New Zealand university students participate in exchange programs for four main reasons: (1) to enhance their educational success; (2) to maximise employment opportunities both locally and globally; (3) to learn about other cultures; and (4) to travel. An underlying premise of Study Four was that there are numerous benefits for students who engage in student exchange programs. It is believed that upon return exchange students achieve greater educational success, desire graduate study, continue to be more mobile than their peers who did not study abroad (Abrams, 1979; Teichler & Gordon, 2001), and report experiencing growth and skill development as a result of their sojourn (for a review see Milstein, 2005). Despite these assumptions, several authors have noted that there is a paucity of empirical research to confirm these outcomes of student exchange experiences, especially non-linguistic effects (Hashimoto, 2003; Milstein, 2005).
The first objective of Study Four was to compare students’ expectations of their experiences in the host country with their actual experiences. That is, Study Four compared pre-departure predictions of difficulties which may have been experienced in the host country with experiences recalled once the student had returned to home. The first research question was,

*To what extent did students’ expectations in terms of the extent of difficulty they would experience in the host country differ from their actual experience? (RQ11)*

Since the cultural and linguistic similarity of the host and home countries affect sojourner adjustment (Black et al., 1991; Fish, 2005; Gudykunst & Hammer, 1988; Masgoret, 2006; Palthe, 2004; Searle & Ward, 1990; Selmer, 2006; Shaffer et al., 1999; Tomich et al., 2003; Ward & Kennedy, 1999; Waxin, 2004), it was hypothesised that,

*Students who studied in countries which were culturally and linguistically similar to Australia and New Zealand would have expected at the pre-departure stage to experience fewer difficulties while in the host country than those students who studied in countries which were culturally and linguistically distant. (H5)*

The second objective of Study Four was to examine the outcomes of the student exchange experience. Outcomes were considered in three areas: intercultural competencies, career and travel. It was anticipated that after participating in the exchange program, the intercultural competencies of students would have developed because of their experiences. Specifically, it was hypothesised that:

*Students would report higher levels of intercultural competencies at the return stage than at the pre-departure stage. (H6)*
The remaining two research questions in Study Four were aimed at understanding students’ plans for international and domestic work and travel as a consequence of their exchange experience. The research questions were,

*After participating in an exchange program, what were a student’s goals in terms of domestic and international work? (RQ12)*

*After participating in an exchange program, what were a student’s goals in terms of travel? (RQ13)*

**Method**

Study Four used a pre-test post-test design to determine whether a student’s intercultural competencies changed as a result of the exchange experience. Students completed questionnaires at two time periods - before departing on the sojourn and 12 months after completing the pre-departure survey. Participants’ intercultural competencies at the pre- and post- sojourn stages were compared. The two questionnaires permitted comparison of students’ expectations of their experiences in the host country and their recalled experiences. The second survey also examined outcomes of international orientation in terms of career, education and travel plans.

**Procedure**

As described in Chapter Six, at the pre-departure stage participants were approached by their respective institutions. Upon completing the pre-departure survey, one third of students (N = 82) interested in being involved with future research
provided their e-mail address. These participants were then surveyed via e-mail 12 months after completing the pre-departure survey.

In this current study, participants completed the survey in their own time and returned it through a website where, in turn, the document was forwarded to the e-mail account of the researcher. This ensured that responses remained anonymous. Two techniques were used to increase the response rate (Bordens & Abbott, 2005; Kypri & Gallagher, 2003). Firstly, two follow-up e-mails reminding returned exchange students to complete the survey were sent; two weeks and six weeks after the initial message. Secondly, an incentive was offered in the form of movie tickets.

Participants

The sample used in this study was a subgroup of the exchange students who participated in Study Two. Participants in Study Two were invited to be involved in future studies after their exchange experience. Eighty-two exchange students agreed to be surveyed before and after their sojourn. Surveys were sent to all of these students, but a total of only 71 valid questionnaires were received. This represented a response rate of 86.6%, supporting the view of Edwards et al (2002) that surveys of interest to participants are more likely to be returned.

The age and gender representation of participants in the current study was similar to the larger cohort of exchange students in Study Two. Females made up a significant proportion of the sample in this study (N = 50, 71.4%) with 20 male students participating. The mean age was 20.8 years (S.D. = 2.1), with ages ranging from 18 to 31 years. Most students (N = 40, 71.4%) were engaged in part-time employment. The median reported household income was $60,000 - $80,000, which was higher than that of the larger group of exchange students who participated in Study Two. It appears the
financial position of the current group of students was much stronger, with thirty students reporting an income greater than $60,000.

There was less ethnic diversity in this sample of exchange students as almost all of the respondents were born in Australia or New Zealand (N = 60). Three students were born in the United Kingdom and there was one student from each of Iraq, Finland, South Africa, Brazil, China and Taiwan. The mean length of time in which the current group of exchange students had lived in Australia or New Zealand was 14.6 years, with a range from 5 to 21 years. Half of the exchange student respondents (N=29) spoke one language, with a quarter of participants (N =14) speaking two languages. Interestingly, 13 respondents reported that they were multilingual, speaking three (N = 9) or four (N = 4) languages.

Table 9.1 details student enrolments in each field of study. Compared to participants in Study Two, a greater proportion of students in the current study were enrolled in dual degrees with fewer in business-related courses.

Table 9.1: The disciplines of study Australian and New Zealand exchange students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of total enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dual</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most students (N=59) had participated in the exchange program for one semester only. As seen in Table 9.2, Canada, the USA and UK were the most popular destinations. The mean length of time for which the exchange students had returned to their home country was four months (S.D= 3.3). Anecdotal reports suggest that students travel abroad upon completing their period of study at the host institution and before returning home.

Table 9.2: The host destinations of Australian and New Zealand exchange students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of total enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey Instrument

The pre-departure and post-return questionnaires were similar and consisted of four sections (see Appendix B2). Both surveys utilised the Multicultural Personality
Questionnaire (MPQ) (Van der Zee & Van Oudenhoven, 2000) as described in Chapter Six. The 91-item instrument measured self-reported cross-cultural competencies across five dimensions: Cultural Empathy, Open-mindedness, Social Initiative, Flexibility and, Emotional Stability.

The second section examined expected experiences and actual experiences. Items were taken from the Sociocultural Adaptation Scale (SCAS) (Ward & Kennedy, 1999). The SCAS can be readily modified according to the characteristics of the sojourning sample (Ward & Kennedy, 1999). Participants responded to the 29 items using a five-point Likert scale (1 = No difficulty; 5 = Extreme difficulty). At the pre-departure stage, students indicated the extent of difficulty they expected to experience in the host country and after their overseas sojourn participants reported the extent of difficulty they did experience in the host nation. Questions were based on issues such as relationships with host nationals (‘making friends’; ‘communicating with people of a different ethnic group’); daily living skills (‘finding food that you enjoy’; ‘the standard of accommodation’; ‘dealing with the climate’); and, global culture (‘understanding the host country’s value system’; ‘dealing with bureaucracy’). Cronbach’s alpha for the SCAS was .93.

Additionally at the post-return stage, students were asked about the likelihood of engaging in international travel and work in the next two years using a five-point Likert scale (1 = Not likely; 5 = Extremely likely). Based upon the findings of numerous researchers (N. J. Adler, 1991; Clyne & Rizvi, 1998; Van Hoof & Verbeeten, 2005; Van Oudenhoven & Van der Zee, 2002), the questions included activities such as ‘travelling back to the host country’ and ‘applying for work overseas in countries other than the host country’.
Questions in the final section of the pre-departure survey gathered demographic and descriptive data such as gender, age, country of birth, number of languages spoken, course of study, and household income bracket. In the post-return survey students were asked about their host country and the length of time on exchange.

**Results**

Data screening for respondent errors and omissions was conducted prior to analysis. Missing values analysis revealed that the missing data ranged between 0.6% - 6.9%. Missing values were replaced with the linear trend for that point.

*Students’ pre-departure expectations and in-country experiences*

Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was used to reduce the 29 items of Ward and Kennedy’s (1999) expectation scale “to a smaller set of underlying factors that summarized the essential information contained in the variable” (Coakes & Steed, 2003, p.147). Principal components extraction with oblique rotation was performed. In line with Tabachnick and Fidell (2001), only variables with loadings >.32 were interpreted. Comrey and Lee (1992, cited in Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001) recommended that factor analysis should be conducted on 300 cases. Thus, this analysis was performed using the responses of all 257 exchange students in Study Two.

In their factor analysis of the SCAS, based upon a sample of 108 Singaporean students abroad, Ward and Kennedy (1999) identified two factors. The first factor included items which related to “cognition (e.g. understanding local perspectives, values and world views) and communication (intercultural communication, making friends, making oneself understood)” (p.670). The second factor reflected items which
concerned “the management of impersonal interactions (e.g. bureaucracy, authority) and/or awkward situations (e.g. unsatisfactory service, unpleasant people)” (p.670). When the EFA was restricted to creating two factors, Ward and Kennedy’s two factors could not be replicated.

Table 9.3 Factor analysis of Ward and Kennedy’s (1999) expectations scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Going to social gatherings</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making friends</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with people staring at you</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating with people of a different ethnic group</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relating to members of the opposite sex</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with unsatisfactory service</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with someone who is unpleasant</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding jokes and humour</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The standard of accommodation</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making yourself understood</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with people in authority</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going shopping</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding the host country’s value system</td>
<td></td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing things from the host national’s point of view</td>
<td></td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding the host country’s world view</td>
<td></td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking the host country’s perspective on the culture</td>
<td></td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being able to see two sides of an intercultural issue</td>
<td></td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding the host country’s political system</td>
<td></td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding ethnic or cultural differences</td>
<td></td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following rules and regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking about yourself with others</td>
<td></td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with bureaucracy</td>
<td></td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with the climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding your way around</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the transport system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Study Four, three factors were extracted with oblique rotation converging on a solution in 14 iterations. The solution explaining 48.6% of the variance in the data set. The factors and loadings (rotated) are shown in Table 9.3. Factor 1, termed ‘Relationships’, was the main factor in the SCAS accounting for 34.47% of variance. Factor 1 included items examining interpersonal relationships such as making friends, communicating with people of a different ethnic group and understanding jokes and humour. Cronbach’s α in this study was 0.86. Factor 2 reflected general cultural issues such as following rules and regulations, understanding the host culture’s perspective and understanding cultural differences. Cronbach’s α was 0.84. This factor was named ‘Culture’ and accounted for 6.0% of variance. Accounting for 5.42% of variance, the third factor was labeled ‘Daily Living Skills’. It contained only three items: dealing with the climate; finding your way around; and using the transport system, and had an α of 0.75. Four items (finding foods that you enjoy, worshipping, family relationships and pace of life) did not load on to any factors. These were removed from further analysis.

Table 9.4 details the scale means and intercorrelations computed for the three factors of the SCAS for the exchange students who participated in Study Four (N = 71). All subscales of the SCAS were positively correlated (p < .01), which reflects the overlap of concepts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Daily Living Skills</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Culture</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Relationships</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Paired-sample t-tests were conducted to compare students’ pre-departure expectations of difficulties with the difficulties they recalled experiencing post sojourn. The results of the paired sample t-tests were significant. Upon returning home from their sojourn, students reported experiencing significantly less difficulties than they expected in terms of their Daily Living Skills, \( t(70) = 4.47, p = .000 \); Relationships, \( t(70) = 3.86, p = .000 \); and, Culture, \( t(70) = 3.22, p = .002 \). That is, students over-estimated the problems they would experience in the host country. Seventeen students over-estimated their difficulties with daily living skills; 19 students overestimated their difficulties with culture; and 22 students overestimated their difficulties with relationships.

A MANOVA was conducted to consider whether this expectation-experience gap was related to the host country’s language spoken (English vs non-English speaking) and the region of the host country in which the student studied (H5). No significant differences were found.

*Students’ pre- and post-sojourn intercultural competencies*

Pre-departure and post-return scale means were computed for the MPQ subscales. Overall there was no significant change in students’ intercultural competencies. However, as detailed in Table 9.5, there was a trend for an increase in flexibility after studying abroad on the exchange program, \( t(57) = -1.89, p = .06 \). Thus, these findings partially supported hypothesis H2. Students tended to become more flexible as a result of the exchange experience.
Table 9.5 Pre-and post-measures of intercultural competencies (MPQ)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean T1</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean T2</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Partial $\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural empathy</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openmindedness</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social initiative</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional stability</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>3.51*</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .10$

Exchange students’ international orientation

Table 9.6 shows that after their exchange period students reported that they were very likely to continue to travel. Eighty-four percent of students (N=48) indicated a high desire to travel to other countries overseas and two-thirds of students (N=37) also indicated that it was highly likely that they would return to their host country. Participants’ desire to work abroad was not as strong as their desire to travel. While 23 students reported that they were highly likely to seek work in their host country, over half of respondents (N=31) stated that they were likely to seek employment in other countries.

Table 9.6 Means, standard deviations and inter-correlations of factors reflecting students’ international orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Travel to other countries</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Travel to host country</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work in other countries</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Work in host country</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$
A Pearson’s correlation test was conducted to analyse the relationship between the four items related to a student’s international orientation (travel to other countries, travel to host country, work in other countries and work in host country). Table 9.6 shows the correlations between the four items of international orientation. Students who expressed plans to travel to the host destination were significantly likely to report desires to work in the host country. Plans to travel to other countries and the host country were moderately associated, as were students’ goals of travelling and working in other countries.

A second Pearson’s correlation test was conducted to analyse the association between the four items of international orientation listed above and student’s intercultural competencies after the exchange sojourn. Students’ intercultural competencies were related to their plans regarding international travel and work. Specifically, students with higher social initiative scores were more likely to express goals of travelling back to the host country, \( r(67) = .37, p = .002 \), travelling to other countries, \( r(67) = .30, p = .013 \) and working in the host country, \( r(67) = .33, p = .006 \). Students plans to travel to other countries was also related to higher levels of open-mindedness, \( r(67) = .40, p = .001 \) and flexibility, \( r(67) = .39, p = .001 \). Cultural empathy was associated with students’ plans to travel back to the host country, \( r(67) = .27, p = .028 \).

Discussion

The first research question of Study Four sought to compare students’ expectations and experiences of difficulties in the host country (RQ11). The results show that overall exchange students predicted at the pre-departure stage that they
would experience greater difficulty while on exchange than the difficulties they recalled experiencing in the host country. Hypothesis Five was rejected as the cultural and linguistic similarity did not affect students’ pre-departure expectations.

Study Four also investigated the outcomes of the sojourn in terms of students’ intercultural competencies and career and travel (RQ12 & 13). It was hypothesised that participants would report higher levels of intercultural competencies at the post-sojourn stage rather than the pre-departure stage. Hypothesis Six was partially supported. Overall there was no significant difference between students’ pre-departure and post-sojourn intercultural competencies. However, there was a trend for students to become more flexible as a result of the exchange experience. The final two research questions focused on students’ career and travel plans both overseas and at the home country. The results indicated that post-sojourn, exchange students were internationally oriented. Participants expressed that they wanted to keep travelling abroad and were interested in working overseas.

*Expectations and experiences*

In response to the first research question, the results of Study Four showed that exchange students overestimated the difficulties they would experience in the host culture. At the pre-departure stage, students reported higher levels of expected difficulties in the host country compared to the extent of difficulty they recalled experiencing. However, it is important to note that this is a limitation of the study, as the level of difficulty reported is based on recall rather than considering the student’s experiences on the sojourn (Carlson et al., 1990). Ideally, students’ experiences of difficulties should have been measured while in the host country to be more accurate regarding their actual experiences.
The linguistic and cultural similarity of the host destination to the home country did not affect the gap between students’ expectations and experiences. Although most students studied in Anglophone countries (e.g. Canada, UK and USA), they still overestimated the difficulties in the host culture. However, it is important to note that the level of expected difficulty across the three dimensions was quite low. Moreover, although the mean response was significantly different, students reported they expected to experience, and did indeed experience, few difficulties. Study Three aimed to gain a better understanding of students’ expectations and experiences within the host country of Canada. Similar to the research presented in Study Three, further detailed qualitative research should examine how students’ develop their expectations of the host culture and the relationship of these expectations with their experiences in the host culture. Thus, additional investigation at the pre-departure and in-country phases of the exchange experience would be beneficial.

Outcomes of students exchange

Intercultural Competencies

Study Four revealed that overall there were no significant changes in Australian and New Zealand students’ intercultural competencies as a result of studying abroad on a student exchange program. Several reasons for this finding will be discussed. These include: (a) the possibility that the competencies measured were stable rather than dynamic (O'Sullivan, 1999); (b) the length of time in the host culture was insufficient to result in changes (Kauffman, Martin, & Weaver, 1992); (c) other areas of students’ intercultural skills are enhanced as a result of the sojourn (Anderson et al., 2006; Medina-Lopez-Portillo, 2004; Milstein, 2005; Paige et al., 2004; Van Hoof &
Verbeeten, 2005); and (d) the sample size of Study Four was too small and thus power was limited.

Although this thesis proposed that the competencies examined were dynamic, O’Sullivan (1999) contended that social initiative, cultural empathy, open-mindedness and emotional stability are stable competencies. That is, these four dimensions assessed using the MPQ are personality traits. Funder, Kolar and Blackman (1995) noted that when researchers measure personality they are often analysing behaviours. Thus, the intercultural competencies measured in this thesis may change because individual’s behaviours can change as a result of their experiences.

As suggested above, there is ongoing debate in the literature as to whether personality traits are stable or can change (Caspi, Roberts, & Shiner, 2005; P. T. Costa, Jr & McCrae, 1994; P. T. Costa, Jr & McCrae, 1989; Duggan, 2004; McCrae, 1993; Roberts, Caspi, & Moffitt, 2001). In examining the development of personality between adolescence and adulthood, Roberts et al (2001) argued for both consistency and growth. Certainly, it seems that personality is less stable in adolescents than adults. While Costa and McCrae (2002) maintain that there is little change in personality traits after 30 years of age, Duggan (2004) reported personality changes in individual between the ages of 20 – 40. Similarly, Caspi et al (2005) proposed that personality traits continue to change through adulthood. Since Study Two showed that the typical exchange student is 20 years of age, it would be expected that the experience abroad would result in changes in a student’s personality. This is further supported by the argument that personality traits change in response to environmental influences (McCrae, 1993; Roberts et al., 2001). Environmental influences can include change in residence, such as a sojourn to another country (McCrae, 1993).
Personality change can also be considered in terms of maturity. That is growth and development will occur until the trait reaches a “desirable endpoint” (Roberts et al., 2001, p.672). The maturity principle refers to the development of personality until an individual is effective in that area (Caspi et al., 2005). Study Two showed that before departing on their sojourn, exchange students reported higher levels of intercultural competencies than non-exchange students did. Exchange students were multiculturally effective, particularly in terms of cultural empathy and emotional stability, and so they were better equipped to deal with challenges and thus less likely to present with changes in personality (Roberts et al., 2001). Thus, in line with the maturity principle, exchange students’ intercultural competencies examined in Study Four will not increase further as a result of the exchange experience.

The length of time studying abroad is significantly associated with the long term impact (Zorn, 1996). Kauffman, Martin and Weaver (1992) argued that six months is the minimum time a sojourner should live in a different culture in order to produce real changes. In Australia and New Zealand universities, exchange programs involve students studying overseas for one or two semesters. However in the current study, most students participated in the program for only one semester. In the academic calendar, a semester is only four months in length and while anecdotally students report traveling before and/or after their study at the host university, it may be speculated that the semester abroad is insufficient time to consolidate any changes in intercultural competencies (Kauffman et al., 1992). Further research is warranted to compare the outcomes for students who study abroad for two semesters with those students who are on a one-semester exchange program. However, obtaining an adequate sample size might be a challenge with Dwyer (2004) noting that over the past 16 years, the duration of study abroad programs has decreased significantly. Considering that financial
reasons are frequently cited as disincentives for study abroad (Maiworm, 2001; New Zealand Vice Chancellors' Committee, 2002; Wiers-Jenssen, 2003), it may be conjectured that exchange students do not study abroad for two semesters due to the cost.

Although the results of Study Four revealed that the intercultural skills of exchange students do not change as a result of the sojourn, students in other studies have perceived that they have undergone personal change as a result of the exchange experience (Carlson et al., 1990; Teichler & Jahr, 2001; Van Hoof & Verbeeten, 2005). This may reflect the methodology of those studies where students were asked to describe what they gained through the exchange experience, rather than comparing pre- and post-sojourn skills. Finn (1986) argued that self perception of change does not offer a useful approach to identify true changes. Instead he proposed that ratings by others of exchange students’ personalities and competencies would provide better insight into changes.

Examples of areas of personal change cited by students include open-mindedness, flexibility and maturity (Milstein, 2005; Van Hoof & Verbeeten, 2005). Study Two revealed that before their sojourn, exchange students already presented with higher levels of intercultural competencies than non-exchange students. Thus, based upon the results of Study Four it may be speculated that the intercultural competencies of exchange students do not change but rather students experience an increase in their awareness of pre-existing skills. Alternatively, the perceived transformation may reflect changes in intercultural sensitivity (Anderson et al., 2006; Medina-Lopez-Portillo, 2004; Paige et al., 2004) or communication self-efficacy (Milstein, 2005). There is a need for further research to determine the outcomes of student exchange programs in relation to student perceptions.
Although overall no significant difference was noted in students’ intercultural competencies at the pre-departure and post-sojourn stages, a trend was noted for exchange participants to become more flexible as a consequence of their time abroad. This finding was similar to the results of Stitsworth (1989). When in a host environment, sojourners need to be able to adjust their behaviours as a consequence of learning from their mistakes (Van der Zee & Van Oudenhoven, 2000). After being in a novel situation which has not met with their existing knowledge, students learn to be more ready to adapt and thus more flexible (Kim & Ruben, 1988; Mezirow, 1991). Further to the earlier discussion regarding stable and dynamic competencies, flexibility was not seen as being a stable competency (O'Sullivan, 1999).

The results of Study Four indicated that the cultural and linguistic similarity of the host country did not affect the exchange students’ intercultural competencies. It was predicted that if students sojourned to culturally distant regions where English is not the primary language of the country, Australian and New Zealand exchange students would experience more stress (Fish, 2005; Gudykunst & Hammer, 1988; Kim, 2001; Searle & Ward, 1990; Selmer, 2006; Waxin, 2004). This would result in greater intercultural transformations (Kim & Ruben, 1988, p.315). However, a limitation of Study Four was the low number of students who studied in non-English speaking and culturally distant countries. Over 65% of participants studied in Canada, the USA and UK, which are linguistically and culturally similar to Australia and New Zealand. Further research is warranted comparing experiences of students in linguistically and culturally distant nations with those who travel to countries whose culture and language are the same as the home nation.
International orientation and educational goals

After their exchange experience, Australian and New Zealand students reported that there was a greater likelihood they would travel overseas again, especially to countries other than their host destination. Participants also indicated a moderate possibility they would seek work abroad. These findings support Akande and Slawson’s (2000) study, which showed that US exchange students had a greater likelihood to continue having an international component in their lives. Interestingly, van der Zee and van Oudenhoven (2000) found that flexibility was a significant predictor of ‘inspiration for an international career’ and ‘international orientation’. The results of Study Four suggest that social initiative, open-mindedness, flexibility and cultural empathy were significant predictors of plans for international employment and travel.

Employers’ perceptions of exchange programs are unclear (Zadeh, 1999 cited in Van Hoof, 1999; Wiers-Jenssen, 2003). Swedish employers' prefer to hire people who are partly trained abroad rather than those who have their entire education from abroad or those who are entirely trained domestically (Zadeh 1999 cited in Wiers-Jenssen, 2003, p.404). Contrastingly, recruiters in the US did not value a graduate’s international study experience very highly (Van Hoof, 1999). It may be speculated that this contrast in employers’ perspectives on study abroad relates to the desired attributes in graduates. For example, the employers interviewed in Zadeh’s (1999 cited in Wiers-Jenssen, 2003) study emphasised the importance of the effects of studying abroad such as language skills and cultural competence rather than the educational course. These linguistic and cultural outcomes may have greater economic benefit to European organisations than American companies due to the geographic location and focus on trade within the European Union.
Queensland Education and Training International and the International Education Association of Australia (QETI & IEAA, 2006) analysed the attitudes and perceptions of Australian employers towards an overseas study experience. The results indicated that employers saw an overseas exchange experience as valuable in the graduate portfolio. An overseas experience was highly prized by employers in multinational corporations. Interestingly, the report did not specifically consider how employers perceived an exchange experience but the length of time abroad was seen as relevant. Almost one third of employers stated that the overseas experience should be at least six months in length, and another third of respondents indicated that this time should be at least one year. It was argued that “anything less than six months was irrelevant in terms of the extra skills the student could offer an employer” (QETI & IEAA, 2006).

Unfortunately, there are few studies investigating the actual career outcomes of exchange students. Teichler and Jahr (2001) examined the relationship between the exchange experience and career and personal development. Former ERASMUS exchange students were surveyed at three points in time- (1) a few months after returning to the home country; (2) three years after the exchange period; and, (3) five years after studying abroad. Few students believed that the exchange experience was worthwhile in relation to their income levels (Maiworm & Teichler, 1996 cited in Teichler & Jahr, 2001). In contrast, after analysing the careers of Norwegian graduates, Wiers-Jenssen and Try (2005) noted that individuals who had been mobile during their studies had higher incomes in their current job than non-mobile students. Certainly respondents in Teichler and Jahr’s (2001) survey indicated that upon graduation, their study abroad experience stood out as something interesting to interviewers. It would be beneficial for future research to examine the careers of Australian and New Zealand
graduates who participated in exchange programs to consider whether the experience assists their job-seeking, income levels and professional progress.

A limitation of this research was that the measures of international orientation were obtained after the students had studied abroad. Ideally, these measures should have been taken pre- and post-sojourn in order to see whether the exchange experience made respondents more likely to be internationally oriented or whether they would have reported such desire to work and live abroad without participating in an exchange program. In consideration of the reasons given by students for participating in an exchange program such as a desire to travel and increasing overseas employment opportunities, it may be speculated that they were already internationally oriented. However, further research is warranted.

Conclusion

Study Four was comprised of pre-departure and post-sojourn surveys examining students’ expectations, experiences and the outcomes of participating in an exchange program. Overall the results showed that students overestimated the difficulties they would experience in the host country. While it is argued that this would better prepare them for their sojourn (Aycan, 1997; Black et al., 1991; Furnham, 1988; Rogers & Ward, 1993; Searle & Ward, 1990), Study Four did not investigate how students formed these beliefs. Further research examining how students form their expectations and the relationship between expectations and pre-departure training would be beneficial.

Study Four also compared exchange students’ intercultural competencies before and after their sojourn and considered these changes in the context of the cultural and
linguistic similarity of the host destination. Overall exchange students did not undergo significant development of their intercultural competencies as a result of their sojourn. This may reflect the findings of Study Two which showed that exchange students already possessed the necessary intercultural competencies for multicultural effectiveness. However, it is worth noting that there was a trend for students to become more flexible as a result of the sojourn. In consideration of the ongoing debate regarding personality development, further research in this area would be worthwhile.

Although Study Four did not consider students’ international orientation at the pre-departure stage, Study Two identified that Australian and New Zealand exchange students were motivated to study abroad because of a desire to travel and experience other cultures. Thus as expected, students continued to be internationally orientated after the sojourn. Participants reported that they wanted to keep travelling and they were interested in working overseas. Additional research should be conducted to consider how Australian and New Zealand students plan to continue to have an international component in their lives. Certainly, it is worthwhile investigating whether, like their European counterparts, Australian and New Zealand exchange students continue as graduates to be mobile and engage in graduate education more than non-exchange students (Teichler & Gordon, 2001; Teichler & Jahr, 2001).

This section of the thesis has presented the research program including the methodology used in this thesis and the four studies, which examined the three phases of an international sojourn - pre-departure, in-country and post-return. Studies One and Two considered the national, institutional and individual factors that may influence a student’s decision to participate in an exchange program or remain at home. Study Three investigated the experiences of Australian and New Zealand exchange students in
Canada. While, Study Four analysed students’ expectations and experience in the host country, the changes in intercultural competencies which occurred as a result of the exchange experience, and students’ international orientation. In the next section of the thesis, Chapter 10 will integrate the findings from all of the four studies. The discussion will also consider the theoretical and practical implications of the current research.
CHAPTER 10 – GENERAL DISCUSSION

Introduction

The research program reported in this thesis has extended previous research on student mobility to consider the determinants, processes and outcomes of the student exchange experience. The primary research question proposed in Chapter One was: ‘what is the process of the student exchange experience?’ Theoretical and empirical gaps in the cross-cultural psychology and international education literature led to the development of this research question. Using a mixed-methods approach, the four studies in the current research program addressed the major aims of the thesis, which were to: (a) explore the complex processes of the student exchange experience at the three stages of the sojourn, including understanding the process of deciding to study abroad or remain at home as well as students’ experiences within the host country; and, (b) examine the outcomes of the exchange sojourn in terms of intercultural competencies and international orientation.

This chapter will review the primary research problem introduced in Chapter One. Further, it summarises the aims and findings of the research program and integrates the results from the four studies to consider the complex processes of the exchange experience. The theoretical and practical implications of the findings are also discussed along with the limitations of the research program and directions for future research are presented.
Chapter One identified the growing demand for graduates to be interculturally competent (Australian International Education Foundation, 1998; Finger & Kathoefer, 2005; Industry Task Force on Leadership and Management Skills, 1995; Webb et al., 1999) and, in turn, for universities to prepare students for the global marketplace (Back et al., 1998; Beazley, 1992; Fantini et al., 2001; Higher Education Council, 1990; Knight & de Wit, 1995; Slee, 1989). Several authors (e.g. Gochenour, 1993; Knight & de Wit, 1995; Lawson, 1969; Wallace, 1993) have argued that student exchange programs are one of the most effective ways domestic students can become interculturally competent. Yet, few studies have examined the exchange experience to measure empirically the outcomes (Carlson et al., 1990; Clyne & Rizvi, 1998; Knight & de Wit, 1995). Despite increasing global student mobility (Bohm et al., 2002; OECD, 2004a) and changing government focus on the various aspects of international education (Department for Education and Skills, 2004; Ministry of Education, 2003, 2004c, 2007; Nelson, 2003), Australian and New Zealand universities tend to be receivers of incoming international students rather than sending domestic students to study abroad.

Although Australian and New Zealand graduates do not possess adequate intercultural competencies and have limited knowledge about international issues (Fitzgerald, 1997; Industry Task Force on Leadership and Management Skills, 1995), it is not clear as to whether universities are able to develop student’s international knowledge and skills through exchange programs. Thus, Chapter One established the need to understand the role of exchange programs in the development of graduates’ intercultural competencies through examining: (a) who participates in exchange programs and the reasons why they participate; (b) their experiences in the host country; and, (c) the outcomes of the sojourn.
As outlined in Chapter One, there are several gaps in the existing research examining short-term student mobility programs. First, previous studies have examined only one aspect of the sojourn such as the factors surrounding the decision to study abroad (Chieffo, 2000; S. B. Goldstein & Kim, 2006), students’ experiences in the host country (Pitts, 2006) or the outcomes of the time abroad (Armstrong, 1984; Carlson & Widaman, 1988; Orahood et al., 2004). Second, the outcomes of the exchange experience were based on students’ recall and perceived benefits and changes (Church, 1982; Milstein, 2005; Van Hoof & Verbeeten, 2005). Third, research examining the pre- and post-sojourn exchange experiences have been based upon small samples at one university or a few universities within a small region or state (Anderson et al., 2006; Clyne & Rizvi, 1998; Engle & Engle, 2004; Ingraham & Peterson, 2004; Medina-Lopez-Portillo, 2004). Fourth, much of the work examining the student exchange experience has adopted a quantitative approach (Anderson et al., 2006; Engle & Engle, 2004; Olsen, 2006). Finally, although there is a growing body of work examining student exchange experiences of North American, European and British students (Carlson et al., 1990; Dolby, 2004; S. B. Goldstein & Kim, 2006; Hart et al., 1994; Maiworm, 2001; Pitts, 2006; Sell, 1983; Sussex Centre for Migration Research & Centre for Applied Population Research, 2004; Teichler, 1999; Wiers-Jenssen, 2003), there is limited research of outbound student exchange in New Zealand and Australia.

As will be shown in the next section of this chapter, this thesis has responded to the gaps in the literature. Studies One and Two analysed the factors surrounding a student’s decision to participate in university exchange programs including changing government international education policies and programs, university strategic goals of student exchange and individual factors such as students’ personal characteristics. Study Two also compared the personal characteristics of exchange students and non-exchange
students to identify some individual-level predictors of the exchange decision. In order to provide further insight into exchange students' experiences while in the host country, Study Three examined the experiences of Australian and New Zealand exchange students in Canada. Finally, Study Four compared students’ expectations and experiences of difficulties in the host country. Study Four also investigated the outcomes of the exchange sojourn in terms of changes in students’ intercultural competencies and their international orientation. The next section of this chapter reviews the methodology of the research program, and the aims and key findings of each of the four studies before discussing and integrating the results from the whole research program.

Summary of the current research program

Methodology

This thesis employed a longitudinal mixed-methods research design within the post-positivist paradigm. This design was most effective to understand the complex processes of the exchange experience across the three phases of the sojourn- pre-departure, in-country and post-return (Creswell, 2003; Paige et al., 2004). Unlike previous research, large samples were used here to understand the phenomenon of exchange students within the Australian-New Zealand context. All Australian and New Zealand public universities were invited to participate, with 81% of universities participating in Study One. Thus, Study One provided the first national longitudinal record of participation in exchange programs for both Australia and New Zealand. Student participants in the remaining three studies were sampled from eleven universities across the two countries.
The current research program extended the predominantly quantitative research on student exchange in the literature by utilising mixed-methods to gain a deeper understanding of the phenomenon. Studies One and Two used quantitative surveys to investigate the factors affecting a student’s decision to participate in the exchange program. To consider why some students choose to study abroad and others remain at home, a quasi-experimental approach was adopted in Study Two. Exchange program participants formed the ‘experimental’ group and were matched with a control group of non-exchange students. Study Four also comprised quantitative research to analyse the outcomes of the exchange experience. A pre-test post-test design was employed in Study Four to empirically measure changes in students’ intercultural competencies as a result of the exchange sojourn. In contrast, Study Three utilised a qualitative approach of interviewing exchange students in Canada to obtain a detailed understanding of students’ experiences while on exchange.

The method and key findings of each of the studies will be elaborated further below. This will be followed in the next section by a general discussion integrating the results of all four studies.

**Study One**

The primary aim of Study One was to consider the relationships between participation rates in Australian and New Zealand university exchange programs and the host destinations of exchange students, and government international education policies, LOTE policies and universities’ strategic goals of student exchange. The first step was to survey the universities to examine the participation rates in their exchange programs from 1996-2005 and students’ host destinations in 2001. Second, the strategic
plans of participating universities were analysed to determine the presence or absence of a goal of student exchange.

The findings showed that although there was growth from 1996-2005, overall few Australian and New Zealand students participate in university exchange programs. The rate in 2005 was less than 0.5% for both countries. Student participation may have been temporarily affected by ‘9/11’ in the USA, as there was no significant growth from 2001-2003 but the participation rate significantly increased from 2000-2005.

It was hypothesised that: *Universities that have a specific goal of student mobility would have proportionately more students participating in the exchange program.* However, the results of Study One found that there was no significant relationship between the presence (or absence) of a goal of student exchange with the university strategic plan and the participation rate in the student exchange program. The second hypothesis proposed that: *New universities would have proportionately less students participating in the exchange program than the other types of universities.* In support of this, participation rates differed for the type of Australian universities. New universities had proportionately fewer students participating in the exchange program than Sandstone universities. Finally, North America was the most common destination for Australian and New Zealand students in 2001. Yet in contrast to Hypothesis 3 (*More Australian and New Zealand exchange students would study in English-speaking countries than non-English speaking countries*), there was no significant difference between the proportion of exchange students in English speaking countries and those in non-English speaking countries.
Study Two

The primary goal of Study Two was to investigate the individual factors which influence the student exchange decision by surveying 257 exchange students and 238 non-exchange students from Australian and New Zealand universities. First, students’ personal characteristics such as intercultural competencies, gender, socio-economic background, previous mobility and discipline were analysed. The results suggested that exchange students and non-exchange students are very distinct groups. Student groups differed significantly in terms of gender representation, socio-economic background and ethnicity. It was hypothesised that: Before departing on the exchange program, exchange students would report higher levels of intercultural competencies than non-exchange students will. Hypothesis 4 supported this as exchange students presented with significantly higher levels of cultural empathy, open-mindedness, social initiative, emotional stability, flexibility and social self-efficacy than non-exchange students did.

Study Two also examined the factors which influenced exchange students’ in their decision to study abroad and non-exchange students to remain at home. Finally, Study Two considered what factors influenced exchange students’ choice of host destination. Exchange students reported they participated in the exchange program because they wanted to increase their employability within the domestic and international market and increase their educational success. The choice of host destination was driven by students’ knowledge of the host language and culture. In contrast, the key reason non-exchange students did not study abroad was because of travel and living costs. An awareness of the exchange program also impacted on these students’ decision to remain at home.
Study Three

Study Three presented an insight into the experiences of 17 Australian and New Zealand exchange students studying at two Canadian universities, through face-to-face interviews. Study Three had three focus areas: (1) the expectations of life in Canada; (2) students’ experiences adjusting to general living conditions, study and their interactions with others; and (3) pre-departure training and orientation undertaken by students.

Interestingly, the students reported that they had expected life in Canada to be the same as life at home. This may have reflected the low number of students who had attended pre-departure training. Contrastingly, all students attended the host institution’s orientation program and were positive about the experience. While students did not perceive that they experienced culture shock they admitted they had experienced difficulties with general living conditions such as the accommodation and weather, differences in approaches to study, and relationships. The participants reported that they interacted more with other exchange students than with host nationals, which was not what they had expected. They had hoped that they would have more friendships with locals.

Study Four

The main objective of Study Four was to examine the outcomes of the exchange sojourn. Specifically, this study examined 71 students’ pre- and post-sojourn intercultural competencies, and also considered students’ career and travel plans. It was hypothesised that: Students would report higher levels of intercultural competencies at the return stage than at the pre-departure stage (H6). This hypothesis was partially supported. While there was no significant change in students’ intercultural competencies, there was a trend for students to become more flexible after their time
abroad. After participating in the exchange program, students were internationally oriented with further plans to work and travel overseas.

Study Four also compared students’ pre-departure expectations of difficulties in the host country with the difficulties they recalled experiencing. Interestingly, students overestimated the difficulties they would experience while on exchange. It was hypothesised that: *Students who studied in countries which were culturally and linguistically similar to Australia and New Zealand would have expected at the pre-departure stage to experience fewer difficulties while in the host country than those students who studied in countries which were culturally and linguistically distant (H5)*. Hypothesis 5 was rejected as there was no relationship between the language of the host country or region in which the student studies and whether students’ predictions of their experiences.

Integration of findings and discussion

As will be discussed below, this thesis has shown that the role universities play in developing students’ intercultural competencies through outbound student exchange programs is complex. First, it seems that students who choose to become exchange students and study abroad are a different cohort from their peers who remain at home. Second, it may be contended that the implementation of government and university policies influences how the exchange program is managed rather than the mere presence of a policy. The impact of these factors will now be discussed in more detail.

The findings of this thesis revealed that exchange students studied abroad to improve their future employment opportunities. Yet it may be speculated that, from the perspective of future employers, exchange students already possess advantages over
their non-exchange peers. For example, rather than developing the intercultural competencies sought by employers through the exchange experience, exchange students possessed these skills at the outset when compared with their non-exchange peers (Australian International Education Foundation, 1998; Finger & Kathoefer, 2005; Industry Task Force on Leadership and Management Skills, 1995; Webb et al., 1999). Study Four showed that while there was a trend towards increased flexibility, there was no great change in intercultural competencies for these students from pre- to post-exchange. Also, it might be that these students may be positioned better academically, as reflected by the high academic criteria necessary to participate in the program and the bias towards enrolment in dual degrees. Students enrolled in dual degrees tend to be academic achievers (McInnis, 2002), and the entry requirements and study demands of dual degrees may be greater than single degrees. Furthermore, the field of study bias suggests that exchange students are seeking several ways to enhance their career prospects (Duke & Victorova, 1998).

Thus, while exchange students may be better prepared to function effectively within the global market, there is a large proportion of students who remain at the home campus and do not possess the same level of international knowledge and intercultural competencies. It is for this reason that some authors may contend that universities are failing to meet the needs of business in preparing graduates for the workforce (Fantini et al., 2001; K. Wilson, 1989). While there are two possible solutions to this situation, they should not be seen as mutually exclusive because both reflect a culture of internationalisation within the university. First, universities may be able to develop students’ knowledge and skills to a rudimentary level through internationalising the curriculum. In particular, Leask (2005) contended that academic staff “need the skills, knowledge and personal characteristics to be able to... develop international
perspectives in students”. Moreover, intercultural learning is enhanced through engagement (Cushner & Karim, 2004). Thus secondly, mobility programs for both staff and students may play a vital role in intercultural learning. Staff may develop intercultural awareness and competencies through their experiences abroad. In turn, staff mobility programs may assist with internationalising the curriculum and encourage greater student involvement in exchange programs.

Although the findings of this thesis did not demonstrate significant growth in students’ intercultural competencies, exchange students already presented at the pre-departure stage as significantly more interculturally competent than non-exchange students. So it may be speculated that non-exchange students with less developed knowledge and skills may experience growth as a result of the sojourn. This is yet to be examined. However, first it is important to consider the individual and organisational factors which may inhibit non-exchange students from participating in the exchange program.

Study One found that less than half of the participating universities included a specific goal of student exchange in their strategic plan. Yet, the implementation process appears to play a greater role in student participation in exchange programs than the presence of a specific policy or strategic goal of student exchange. This was demonstrated in Study One when it was shown that there was no significant relationship between a specific strategic goal of student exchange and participation rates in the exchange program. Instead, it was suggested in Chapter Six that the way the exchange program is managed and perceived by all university staff would influence which students are able to participate and their experiences at home and abroad. Furthermore, the content of government international education policies affect how university senior
management implement the policies and prioritise the importance of student exchange (Brunetto & Farr-Wharton, 2005a).

More specifically, the implementation of international education policy is affected by the level of resourcing and accountability of the university to the government (Brunetto, 1999, 2000; Brunetto & Farr-Wharton, 2005a; van Meter & van Horn, 1975; C. A. Wilson, 2000; Yanow, 1993). As discussed earlier, the Australian government has provided limited resources through UMAP, while this program is not funded within New Zealand. Without financial support from the government, universities will not prioritise student exchange programs (Davies, 1992 Knight & de Wit, 1995; Yanow, 1993). Moreover, there is a lack of accountability for universities in terms of student mobility as there is an absence of performance indicators or reporting requirements within the recent international education policies in Australia and New Zealand. Rather, government policy statements regarding student exchange are quite generic. In contrast if the government policy was specific, clearly stated tangible performance indicators and was linked to adequate levels of funding it is more likely that the universities would adopt the goals of the policy (Brunetto, 1999, 2000, 2006; Brunetto & Farr-Wharton, 2005a, 2005b; Johnston & Moore, 1990). The work of Brunetto and her colleagues further suggests that successful implementation of specific government international education policies would be reflected in increased participation rates in student exchange programs.

When student exchange is valued by the institution, it will be expressed through the responses of employees and the availability of resources such as staffing in the exchange office to promote and manage the program and financial support for scholarships for students (Malicki, 2003). In the context of the findings of Study Two, scholarships may assist to promote participation amongst those non-exchange students.
from low socio-economic backgrounds and for whom financial constraints prevent overseas study. Supporting studies from the US and UK (Chieffo, 2000; Washington 1998 cited in Cushner & Karim, 2004; Sussex Centre for Migration Research & Centre for Applied Population Research, 2004), as well as the results of Study Two suggest that few non-exchange students were aware of their university’s exchange program. This may reflect lower levels of resourcing within the university, with fewer staff to manage and promote the program. Moreover, exchange students were not highly influenced to study abroad by recommendations from academic staff. This finding may reflect a lack of awareness of the program on the behalf of lecturers, or it may be posited that as Malicki (2003) found, few academic staff perceive the exchange program to be highly beneficial for students.

As a response to the absence of performance indicators in the Australian government’s policy, the Australian Vice-Chancellors’ Committee (AVCC, 2004a) proposed a target of 20% of Australian students including international study in their degree by 2020. However, this goal is quite ambitious considering Olsen’s (2006) finding that only 4.8% of undergraduates had an overseas study experience in 2005. It is also important to note that the proposed participation rate would include cultural tours, internships and study visits. Moreover, these types of mobility programs may not produce the desire results in students’ knowledge and skills (Kauffman et al., 1992; Zorn, 1996).

The resourcing and staffing of exchange programs further reflect the type and amount of training offered to students before they depart on their sojourn (Bennett, 1986; Cushner & Brislin, 1996; Pitts, 2006). Although Mak (2000) suggested that cross-cultural training is not offered to students, it seems that Australian and New Zealand universities do provide training to outbound exchange students. This training
employed a cognitive approach providing general information about adjustment. Some institutions also presented general facts about the host country, which is an essential part of pre-sojourn preparation (D. L. Goldstein & Smith, 1999; Gudykunst et al., 1996; Robertson & Andrew, 1990). Numerous authors (e.g. Barker et al., 2002; Bennett, 1986; Mak, 2000; Mak & Barker, 2000; Mak, Westwood, & Ishiyama, 1994; Mak, Westwood, Ishiyama, & Barker, 1999; West, 1991) have stated that a cognitive approach to training is ineffective. Indeed, Bennett (1986) noted that there is a lack of congruence between the students’ lived experience and the classroom environment. So, the style of training may provide an explanation for low participation by participants in Study Three. Additionally, perhaps the timing of training did not suggest to students that it was of importance. In some instances, respondents indicated that there was a clash with assessments and training or the training was offered too late, when they had already departed. Since anecdotal evidence has suggested that exchange students choose to travel before the start of their semester abroad, home institutions may need to re-consider when training is offered.

It was also speculated that the participants in Study Three did not attend the pre-departure training because they had expected life in Canada would be the same as at home. More importantly, it is interesting to consider why these participants expected no difference between Australia or New Zealand and Canada when the results from Study Two revealed that one of the key reasons Australian and New Zealand exchange students participated in the exchange program was because they wanted to experience a new culture. Yet, exchange students reported that they chose their host destination because the language and culture were familiar. Certainly in 2001, half of the Australian and New Zealand exchange participants studied in either North America or the United Kingdom. This finding may have been influenced by the relative ease an
exchange experience in these regions may have offered as the cultural and linguistic similarity would have assisted adjustment (Black et al., 1991; Fish, 2005; Gudykunst & Hammer, 1988; Masgoret, 2006; Palthe, 2004; Searle & Ward, 1990; Selmer, 2006; Shaffer et al., 1999; Tomich et al., 2003; Ward & Kennedy, 1999; Waxin, 2004). It may be proposed that Australian and New Zealand students want to experience a new culture, but perhaps they do not want to undergo unnecessary problems by having to adjust to a new environment, which in turn may negatively affect their academic progress (Sussex Centre for Migration Research & Centre for Applied Population Research, 2004). Nonetheless it is important to note that there was no significant difference in the proportion of exchange students in English speaking/ culturally similar countries and non-English speaking/ culturally distant countries.

In contrast to the findings of Study Three which examined the expectations of only 17 students studying in Canada, Study Four showed that overall Australian and New Zealand exchange students overestimated the difficulties they would experience in the host country. This strategy may indeed have assisted students to cope in the novel environment, since students had low expectations regarding their ease of adjustment. When expectations are overmet, the sojourner experiences better adjustment (Krupinski cited in Furnham & Bochner, 1986). Conversely, if experiences are more difficult than expected, this leads to greater psychological distress and adjustment problems (N. J. Adler, 1981). By overestimating the difficulties they would experience in the host culture, students may have inadvertently improved their in-country experience. On the other hand if students attended the cross-cultural training, perhaps they would have developed more accurate expectations of the host culture (Black et al., 1991; Tomich et al., 2003).
It was suggested earlier that how student exchange is positioned by the university may influence student participation in the program. For example, the institution could incorporate exchange opportunities within their programs, or shorter international mobility opportunities. Although these suggestions do not result in increased levels of intercultural competencies, they may have the benefits of increasing awareness and interest in study abroad and also creating a stronger link between the student exchange program and core goals of academic study (Anderson et al., 2006; Hart et al., 1994; Stitsworth, 1989).

Certainly, the results of Study Two showing the bias towards exchange students being enrolled in dual degrees suggests that the flexibility of the degree may play a role in whether a student decides to study abroad. Nonetheless it is acknowledged that market demand including requirements of professional bodies and expectations of the community may influence the structure of courses and whether students may receive credit for study undertaken overseas. While Australia and New Zealand lack a strong tradition of study abroad, there has been limited investigation of community attitude towards student mobility programs. In their survey of the general community, the American Council on Education (ACE, 2000) found that almost three quarters of respondents agreed that higher education students should have an overseas experience while studying at college or university. This is not reflected in high participation rates in US outbound exchange programs. Yet as the findings relate to ‘an overseas experience’ it is unclear as to what this term encompasses. For example as discussed in Chapter One, an overseas experience may include short-term programs such as cultural tours or internships and indeed even general travel. The ACE findings further indicate the complexity of the student exchange decision-making process.
Moreover, employers’ perceptions of exchange programs are unclear (Zadeh, 1999 cited in Van Hoof, 1999; Wiers-Jenssen, 2003). Once again, there is a paucity of research examining Australian and New Zealand employers’ attitudes towards student exchange. While exchange students put forward that they were engaging in the exchange program to improve their employment opportunities, it is troubling to note that organisations do not value expatriates when they return from overseas assignments (Coyle, 1993; R. I. Westwood & Leung, 1994). So, it is difficult to determine if exchange students do gain an advantage over their non-exchange peers.

**Major Contributions**

After integrating the findings of the four studies in the current research program above, the next section of this chapter will describe the theoretical and practical contributions of the research presented in this thesis.

*Theoretical contributions*

While there is a growing body of researchers examining short-term student mobility programs (e.g. Anderson et al., 2006; Chieffo, 2000; Dolby, 2004; Engle & Engle, 2004; S. B. Goldstein & Kim, 2006; Ingraham & Peterson, 2004; Maiworm, 2001; Medina-Lopez-Portillo, 2004; Milstein, 2005; Olsen, 2006; Orahood et al., 2004; Pitts, 2006; Van Hoof & Verbeeten, 2005; Wiers-Jenssen, 2003), few have conceptualised theoretically the exchange experience or empirically measured the changes which may occur as the result of the sojourn. Furthermore, there has been a predominance of US and European samples. This thesis adds to the theoretical body of knowledge surrounding tertiary student exchange, especially in the Pacific region. Three
conceptual models were proposed to explain: (a) the student exchange decision-making process; (b) the student’s in-country experience and, (c) the process of developing intercultural competencies as a result of the exchange sojourn. Each of these will now be elaborated further.

The student exchange decision-making process

Studies examining the decision-making processes of business expatriates and international students (N. J. Adler, 1991; Gatfield, 1997; Kwok, 1972; Lim, 1992; Mazzarol & Soutar, 2002; Torbiorn, 1982; Wang & Bu, 2004) were combined with the Sussex Centres’ (2004) previously untested model of student mobility decision-making.

As suggested in the revised model (Fig. 10.1), it appears the decision to participate in an exchange program is not directly influenced by a student’s personal characteristics (i.e. demographic characteristics and intercultural competencies). Rather, the results of Study Two suggest that the demographic profile and student’s intercultural competencies establish the individual context in which the decision is made; that is personal characteristics moderate other variables. For example, an individual’s gender did not influence his/her choice to study abroad but the literature suggests that this will affect the importance of issues such as career development (Kling et al., 1999) and enhancing educational outcomes (S. B. Goldstein & Kim, 2006; Krause et al., 2005) which ultimately impact on the student exchange decision. Similarly, cultural empathy and open-mindedness influence a student’s international orientation (Van der Zee & Van Oudenhoven, 2000; van der Zee et al., 2003; Van Oudenhoven & Van der Zee, 2002), which in turn impacts upon the decision to participate in the exchange program.
The factor of education directly influences a student’s decision to study abroad on exchange and also is affected by the factor career development. Education is a driver of mobility— an exchange student will study abroad because of a desire to enhance his/her educational success. In Chapter Two it was proposed that a student’s awareness of the exchange program also was incorporated within the factor of Education but as a result of Studies One and Two, it may be argued that this is associated more with the institutional context. The implementation of national international education policies at the organisational level will affect a student’s awareness of the exchange program.

In Figure 2.1, Culture and Travel were included as factors influencing the exchange decision. However, this factor has been defined in two different ways. First, since exchange students reported that they had a desire to work and live overseas, these aspirations were seen as the international orientation of the individual. Next, cultural knowledge and language competence appear to be barriers to the decision to participate
in the exchange program. If students perceived themselves to be competent in intercultural settings, they may be more likely to engage in student exchange.

While it is acknowledged that further examination is necessary, this revised model leads to more insight into the complex nature of the student exchange decision, extending the model presented in Chapter Two and the Sussex Centres’ model of the decision-making process, which had not been previously tested empirically. The findings of Study Two suggest that not all of the components are directly linked to the decision to participate in an exchange program or remain at home but that some factors such as education might be moderated by career development.

_The student’s in-country experience_

There is an extensive range of literature reporting on cross-cultural adjustment of sojourners (e.g. Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005; Fish, 2005; Selmer, 2006; Selmer & Leung, 2003a; Shaffer et al., 1999; Van Oudenhoven et al., 2003; Ward et al., 2001; Ying & Han, 2006). Thus, instead of focusing on adjustment, this thesis examined the specific experiences of exchange students. Also, the process did not emphasise the labelling of negative or positive experiences based on students’ reflections to confirm successful or problematic adjustment. Rather, students’ perspectives of their time in the host country were analysed in situ. Interviews with exchange students while at their host institution permitted greater exploration and identification of issues that may affect their in-country experiences than would have been possible through a quantitative approach.

These findings could be expanded to relate an exchange student’s in-country experience with those factors that influenced his/her original decision to study abroad. For example, in-country experiences would be affected at: (a) the international level (e.g. changing geopolitical instability, changing perceptions and affections of cultural
others towards the home country); (b) national level (e.g. community and business attitude towards the exchange experience); and, (c) university level (e.g. the pre-departure training provided before the time abroad, support from academic staff). Thus, this thesis has introduced the relationship between the pre-departure and in-country phases of a student exchange sojourn. The exchange experience should be considered from different levels of analysis (e.g. individual, university and nation) as different levels yield different results. This suggests the importance to understand the student exchange experience from various levels to adequately understand its complex nature.

*Developing intercultural competencies through student exchange*

As mentioned earlier, while the benefits of an exchange experience are commonly espoused there have been limited empirical studies to prove these claims (Carlson et al., 1990; Clyne & Rizvi, 1998; Sussex Centre for Migration Research & Centre for Applied Population Research, 2004; Van Hoof & Verbeeten, 2005). While the results of this current research did not demonstrate that students’ become more interculturally component after their study abroad, the findings are significant for international education researchers. In accordance with existing studies (Anderson et al., 2006; Carlson et al., 1990; Medina-Lopez-Portillo, 2004; Paige et al., 2004; Teichler & Jahr, 2001; Van Hoof & Verbeeten, 2005), the findings of Study Four suggest that while exchange students do not increase their intercultural skills abroad, they may show an increase in awareness of their intercultural competence as a result of their experience in a novel culture. Interestingly, this finding has implications for the student exchange decision-making process because as suggested above, the student’s personal characteristics (e.g. intercultural competencies) influence the individual context in which the decision to study abroad is made. It seems that students who are more
interculturally competent before studying abroad are more likely to participate in the exchange program than those who present with lower levels of intercultural competence. However, then it seems due to issues such as the maturity principle (Caspi et al., 2005), exchange students will not experience a significant increase in intercultural competencies. Therefore, this thesis implies that there is a relationship between each stage of the exchange sojourn; i.e. the characteristics of the exchange student will influence the observed outcomes in terms of intercultural competencies.

**Practical contributions**

The results of the series of studies presented in this thesis have practical implications for Australian and New Zealand universities and government policy makers. First, this thesis is unique because it provides the first longitudinal national record of participation in Australian and New Zealand university exchange programs. In addition to providing an accurate understanding of the changes in student exchange in response to national and international events, this data also provides participating universities with a benchmark for participation rates. The findings of Study One also indicated the need for more specific national policies on student exchange and LOTE education. Policies should be detailed and specific in their objectives, accountability, and resourcing and funding. Through enhancing student mobility policies and programs and encouraging LOTE study, governments may reap the reported benefits of international exchange.

This research has identified the demographic characteristics of exchange students (i.e. gender, ethnicity, previous mobility, socio-economic background and discipline of study). Understanding these characteristics will assist universities to better understand their target audience for exchange programs and also how and where to
market exchange opportunities to students who otherwise may not have participated in the exchange program. These results have important implications for institutions in terms of the marketing and management of exchange programs. There is a need for good promotional material, supportive staff and scholarships to assist students with extra-curricular costs (Sussex Centre for Migration Research & Centre for Applied Population Research, 2004).

The investigation of students’ experiences in-country provided both the home and host institutions with information regarding the management of the exchange program, and in particular pre-departure training and in-country orientation. Based on the findings of Study Three, feedback and recommendations were provided to the participating Canadian universities. This included topics such as: students’ attitudes towards, and experiences of orientation programs; accommodation; information on the host destination and study options. The recommendations were implemented immediately and the two institutions have reported that students have welcomed the new orientation programs and support provided before they arrive in Canada.

Strengths and Limitations

As outlined in Chapter One, there are several gaps in the existing research examining short-term student mobility programs. This thesis has attempted to address some of these gaps theoretically and empirically. This next section will consider the strengths and limitations of the four studies presented in this thesis.

First, as mentioned above, the research program reported in this thesis represents the first national study examining student exchange in both Australia and New Zealand. In Study One, 40 out of 45 possible universities participated. While only one quarter of
these institutions supported Studies Two - Four, the sample represented both countries and included each of the different types of Australian universities. However, it is important to note that the exchange student sample was skewed towards Sandstone universities which may have influenced the nature of the personal characteristics of the exchange cohort.

In contrast to many of the existing studies (Armstrong, 1984; Carlson & Widaman, 1988; Chieffo, 2000; S. B. Goldstein & Kim, 2006; Orahood et al., 2004; Pitts, 2006), this thesis has examined all three phases of the sojourn from pre-departure to in-country and then post-sojourn return home rather than just one phase. As suggested by Van Hoof and Verbeeten (2005), a pre-test post-test design permitted empirical measurement of the changes in intercultural competencies as a result of the exchange experience instead of relying on students’ perceptions of changes. Longitudinal research was essential to understand the complex process of the exchange experience. It is acknowledged that it was difficult to maintain a sample over time (Barry, 2005), with only 32% of exchange students in Study Two agreeing to participate in Study Four. However it was encouraging that 86.6% of these students completed the post-sojourn survey.

Whereas much of the work examining the student exchange experience has adopted a quantitative approach (Anderson et al., 2006; Engle & Engle, 2004; Olsen, 2006), mixed methods were employed in the current research program to gain a deeper understanding of the complex processes in the exchange experience. Studies One, Two and Four utilised quantitative approaches to facilitate the generalisation of the findings. Study Three was a qualitative study comprising a face-to-face interview to understand the lived experiences of exchange students in the host country.
A quasi-experimental approach was adopted in Study Two. This involved having a control group matched to the exchange student cohort. While this approach aimed to consider the differences between students who would be subject to the ‘treatment’ (i.e studying abroad) with those who would not, there were difficulties obtaining a perfectly matched control group. Arceneaux, Gerber and Green (2006, p. 38) commented that “matching on observed characteristics leaves the possibility of unobserved differences between groups”. Certainly there were many possible differences between the exchange students and non-exchange students; for example students differ by age, socio-economic background, discipline of enrolment, previous mobility, career aspirations and attitude towards international education and student exchange. The control group was used to represent the popular fields of study and matched to the exchange students by year of study, with the anticipation this would reflect the age distribution of the exchange cohort. This was done through targeting lectures which corresponded with second year subjects. However, this method posed potential problems because students may not follow the recommended study schedule, or they may be studying the chosen subject as an elective. In addition, students’ ages may range significantly.

Another limitation of the current research program relates to the use of MPQ as an instrument to measure students’ intercultural competencies. First, Hogan and Holland (2003) argued that when measures of personality rely on self ratings, the result is respondents’ identity but in the context of ratings by others, the result is a summary of the individual’s behaviour. Personality is expressed in different ways in different contexts (Funder et al., 1995; Hunthausen, Truxillo, Bauer, & Hammer, 2003). Finn (1986) proposed that ratings by others of exchange students’ personalities and competencies would provide better insight into changes. Thus, using both self and other
ratings would have improved the reliability of the results. Indeed, it may be speculated that since behaviour may change as a result of a cross-cultural experience, judgments by others would have more accurately identified any changes in students’ intercultural competencies (Hunthausen et al., 2003).

Directions for Future Research

The role of the university in developing students’ to be interculturally competent needs further investigation. More specifically, future research should examine the implementation of government international education policies within the university. Similar to the work of Brunetto (1999; 2000; Brunetto & Farr-Wharton, 2005a), it would be worthwhile examining the responses of university staff including awareness of and attitudes towards the student exchange program and the resourcing. Analysis of the relationship between the university’s culture and leadership would also be worthwhile as these factors are thought to affect successful policy implementation (Brunetto & Farr-Wharton, 2005a) and in turn, the success of the exchange program (Davis et al., 1999).

The selection mechanisms and criteria are aspects of the exchange program not considered in this thesis. Several authors (e.g. Aycan, 1997; Black et al., 1991; Waxin, 2004) proposed that this construct affects anticipatory adjustment. However, there is limited discussion of the selection methods used in study exchange programs. It is likely that this is because exchange students are self-selected. Furthermore, Cushner and Karim (2004) concluded that it is difficult to prescribe specific selection criteria. Thus, it would be beneficial for research to investigate the criteria used by Australian
and New Zealand universities when accepting student applications for the exchange program to further consider the factors influencing the outcomes of the sojourn.

Since the relationship between previous cross-cultural experience and adjustment is moderated by the time between the previous and the present international sojourn, and the nature of the previous experience (Black, Gregersen, & Mendenhall, 1992), future studies of exchange students should investigate these variables. It is proposed that this would be best achieved through qualitative research to examine the type of previous experiences exchange students have undergone.

Future research examining changes in students’ intercultural competencies as determined by personality measures should utilise self- and other- ratings so that a more sound understanding of the individuals’ behaviour is obtained (Funder et al., 1995; Hunthausen et al., 2003). Furthermore, providing students with a frame of reference (FOR) such as ‘in the classroom’ or ‘at university’ would improve the validity of the instrument (Hunthausen et al., 2003).

As mentioned earlier, it is unclear whether employers value the student exchange experience. There is contradictory evidence from Europe and the US (Zadeh, 1999 cited in Van Hoof, 1999; Wiers-Jessen, 2003). Recently a joint study by Queensland Education and Training International and the International Education Association of Australia (QETI & IEAA, 2006) indicated that Australian employers see that students have enhanced skills as a result of an overseas experience. However, respondents preferred an internship or work experience rather than study. With a lack of research from New Zealand, there is a need to examine further how Australian and New Zealand employers and recruiters perceive an exchange experience as part of a student’s university qualifications. Moreover, future research should consider the long-term
impact of the exchange experience, particularly in terms of former exchange students’ career progress, international orientation and intercultural competencies.

Conclusion

In the context of growing expectations for Australian and New Zealand graduates to be interculturally competent, the research presented in this thesis has extended previous work on cross-cultural adjustment and student mobility to consider the processes and outcomes of a student exchange experience. The inaugural national study of student exchange programs at Australian and New Zealand universities may aid government and university policy makers in their understanding of the international and national issues influencing the student mobility decision. Empirical investigation of the student exchange experience was long overdue. The conclusions of this research program suggest that the acclaimed benefits of an exchange experience in terms of development of students’ intercultural competence may not apply to program participants. Rather, the findings indicate the potential to develop interculturally competent graduates through internationally-oriented universities.
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Table A1: Details of the participating Australian and New Zealand universities and their exchange programs in 2001 (Study One)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Enrolments (by range)</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>1. Sandstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>2. Wannabee sandstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>3. U-tech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>4. New university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NN</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QQ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENROLMENTS

| I.   | 0 - 4999 |
| II.  | 5000 - 9999 |
| III. | 10000 - 14999 |
| IV.  | 15000 - 19999 |
| V.   | 20000 - 24999 |
| VI.  | 25000 - 29999 |
| VII. | 30000 - 34999 |
| VIII.| 35000 - 39999 |
| IX.  | 40000 - 44999 |
Table A2: The number of Australian and New Zealand exchange students studying in other countries in 2001 (Study One)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>No. Australian students</th>
<th>Percent of valid responses</th>
<th>No. of NZ students</th>
<th>Percent of valid responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Philippines</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A3: Gross annual household income of exchange students and non-exchange students (Study Two)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Bracket</th>
<th>Exchange students</th>
<th>Non-exchange students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Valid Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $20,000</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 - $60,000</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000 - $80,000</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $80,000</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A4: Countries of birth of Australian and New Zealand exchange students and non-exchange students (Study Two)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Exchange students</th>
<th>Non-exchange students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>% of total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>66.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Philippines</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oman</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>251</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear International Exchange Officer/Coordinator,

My name is Amanda Daly and I am a PhD candidate at Griffith University. As part of my research I am conducting a study of the student exchange programs offered at Australian and New Zealand Universities.

The following survey consists of 19 questions, which are based upon gathering non-identifying statistical data on the types of exchange programs for students and the types of students who participate in exchange programs. Although, I understand that not all centres compile this data, please provide as much information as possible for each question. If your centre does not have any data please indicate this by writing “NA” which represents that the 'Information is Not Available'.

At the end of the survey, you will be asked whether your organisation would be willing to be involved in future research examining the experiences of Australian and New Zealand exchange students. If you would be willing to be involved in further studies, could you please provide your organisation’s details. Please note, that when additional studies are designed, you will be contacted again, and as such your acceptance at this point in time, for participation in later studies, does not obligate you to participate in future research.

All information provided through this survey is strictly confidential. Upon receiving your completed survey, any identifying information will be removed prior to data entry and analysis. A separate list of those parties interested in being involved with further research in this area will be kept.

The survey should take approximately 30 minutes to complete. If you could please complete it, by simply typing your answers in the spaces provided, and then return the completed survey to me at the e-mail address below.

If you are interested in receiving a summary of the results of this survey, please indicate this in your return e-mail.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me on (07) 3875 7671 or e-mail: a.daly@mailbox.gu.edu.au.

Thank you for your support with this project.

Amanda Daly
PhD candidate
School of Management
Griffith University
EXCHANGE PROGRAMS IN 2001

Thinking only of exchange programs/ study abroad opportunities for students for 2001, please answer the following questions.

1. How many participants have gone/ will be going to another country as part of the exchange?

2. What is the average length of time for an exchange placement?

   Months
   Years

3. What is the minimum length of time for an exchange placement?

   Months
   Years

4. What is the maximum length of time for an exchange placement for a student?

   Months
   Years
5. How many students are studying or will be studying in the following countries?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Philippines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Are there any other countries in which students are studying?  
(Please indicate YES or NO)

If yes, please list the countries and the number of participants in each country.

7. What is the average age of students who are participating in an exchange program?  
Years

8. What is the age of the youngest student who is participating in an exchange program?  
Years

9. What is the age of the oldest student who is participating in an exchange program?  
Years

10. How many students participating in an exchange program are male?  

11. How many students participating in an exchange program are female?  

12. How many undergraduate students are participating in an exchange program?
13. How many postgraduate students are participating in an exchange program?

14. How many undergraduate students are in the following year levels of study:

1st year:
2nd year:
3rd year:
4th year:
5th year:

15. How many students who are on exchange, are enrolled in the following disciplines in their home University?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allied Health</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism &amp; Hospitality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. Are there any other disciplines in which students, who are currently on exchange, are enrolled in at their home University?  
(Please indicate YES or NO)

If yes, please list the disciplines and the number of participants in each discipline.

17. How many students who are participating in an exchange program, are from Non-English speaking countries?

18. How many students who are participating in an exchange program, are from English speaking countries, other than Australia or New Zealand?

EXCHANGE PROGRAMS IN PREVIOUS YEARS
Only complete this question if your centre has recorded this information over the last 5 years.

19. How many students have participated in the student exchange program in these years:

2000:
1999:
1998:
1997:
1996:
THANKYOU FOR TAKING TIME TO COMPLETE THIS SURVEY.

Future research examining participants’ experiences with exchange programs will arise from this study. Appropriate practices would be implemented to ensure that participants’ privacy and confidentiality is maintained.

Please note, that if you choose now to agree to be involved with future research, you are under no obligation to participate in future and as such you may withdraw your interest at any time.

**Would you be willing to be involved in further research relating to international exchange programs?**

Please indicate YES or NO

If yes, please provide your contact details:

**NAME:**

**ORGANISATION:**

**EMAIL ADDRESS:**

**PHONE:**
University Name:

**EXCHANGE PROGRAM IN 2005**
1. How many students are participating in the program this year?

**EXCHANGE PROGRAMS IN PREVIOUS YEARS**
2. How many students participated in the exchange program in the following years?

2004:

2003:

2002:
APPENDIX B3: STUDY TWO SURVEY OF AUSTRALIAN AND NEW ZEALAND EXCHANGE STUDENTS

Chief Investigator: Associate Professor Michelle Barker
Assistant Investigator: Ms Amanda Daly

Address: School of Management
Griffith University
Nathan QLD 4111

Telephone: 07 3875 7779
Facsimile: 07 3875 3887
Email: M.Barker@mailbox.gu.edu.au

The survey of international exchange experiences for Australian and New Zealand university students is distributed to all Australian and New Zealand students departing on exchange programs in 2003. The study is part of Doctor of Philosophy research. The aim of the survey is to find out about their reasons for going on exchange, expectations and experiences of the exchange program.

The survey is confidential and only the research team will see any completed questionnaires. Participation is voluntary. Refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which participants might otherwise be entitled, and participants may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or without providing an explanation. You cannot be identified unless you volunteer to be involved in further studies.

The results of the survey will provide essential information for the development and evaluation of university student exchange programs, including educational policies, training and marketing. Therefore it is requested that participants respond to the relevant sections of the survey. It will take about 20-25 minutes to complete.

Please fill out the questionnaire in your own time and return it ASAP through uploading it the following website: http://www.cce.ac.nz/misc/survey.php
PART A: PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS (MPQ)
(van Oudenhoven & van der Zee)

To what extent do the following statements apply to you?
(Please tick the box that is most applicable to you)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Likes low-comfort holidays</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Takes initiatives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is nervous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Makes contacts easily</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is not easily hurt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Suffers from conflicts with others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Finds it difficult to make contacts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Understands other people's feelings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Keeps to the background</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Is interested in other cultures</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Avoids adventure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Changes easily from one activity to another</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Is fascinated by other people's opinions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Tries to understand other people's behavior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Is afraid to fail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Avoids surprises</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Takes other people's habits into consideration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Is inclined to speak out</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Likes to work on his/her own</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Is looking for new ways to attain his/her goal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Dislikes travelling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Wants to know exactly what will happen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Keeps calm at ill-luck</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Leaves the initiative to others to make contacts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Takes the lead</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Is a slow starter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Is curious</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Takes it for granted that things will turn out right</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Is always busy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Is easy-going among groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Finds it hard to empathize with others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Functions best in a familiar setting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Radiates calm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Easily approaches other people</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Finds other religions interesting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Considers problems solvable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Works mostly according to a strict scheme</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Is timid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Knows how to act in social settings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Likes to speak in public</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Tends to wait and see</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Feels uncomfortable in a different culture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Works according to plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Is under pressure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Sympathizes with others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Has problems assessing relationships</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Likes action</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Is often the driving force behind things</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Leaves things as they are</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Likes routine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
51. Is attentive to facial expressions 1 2 3 4 5
52. Can put setbacks into perspective 1 2 3 4 5
53. Is sensitive to criticism 1 2 3 4 5
54. Tries out various approaches 1 2 3 4 5
55. Has ups and downs 1 2 3 4 5
56. Has fixed habits 1 2 3 4 5
57. Forgets setbacks easily 1 2 3 4 5
58. Is intrigued by differences 1 2 3 4 5
59. Starts a new life easily 1 2 3 4 5
60. Asks personal questions 1 2 3 4 5
61. Enjoys other people's stories 1 2 3 4 5
62. Gets involved in other cultures 1 2 3 4 5
63. Remembers what other people have told me 1 2 3 4 5
64. Is able to voice other people's thoughts 1 2 3 4 5
65. Is self-confident 1 2 3 4 5
66. Has a feeling for what is appropriate in a specific culture 1 2 3 4 5
67. Gets upset easily 1 2 3 4 5
68. Is a good listener 1 2 3 4 5
69. Worries 1 2 3 4 5
70. Notices when someone is in trouble 1 2 3 4 5
71. Has an insight into human nature 1 2 3 4 5
72. Is apt to feel lonely 1 2 3 4 5
73. Seeks contact with people from a different background 1 2 3 4 5
74. Has a broad range of interests 1 2 3 4 5
75. Is insecure 1 2 3 4 5
76. Has a solution for every problem 1 2 3 4 5
77. Puts his or her own culture in a perspective 1 2 3 4 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>Is open to new ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>Is fascinated by new technological developments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>Senses when others get irritated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>Likes to imagine solutions for problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>Sets others at ease</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>Works according to strict rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>Is a trendsetter in societal developments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>Has a need for change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>Pays attention to the emotions of others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>Reads a lot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.</td>
<td>Seeks challenges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td>Enjoys getting to know others profoundly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.</td>
<td>Enjoys unfamiliar experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.</td>
<td>Looks for regularity in life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PART B: CO-ETHNIC AND CROSS-ETHNIC INTERACTIONS

In relation to your interactions with people from the same ethnic group, and those from different ethnic groups, please indicate your degree of agreement with the following statements by ticking the appropriate number. “1” means you strongly disagree with the statement and “7” means you strongly agree with the statement. Tick “4” if you are uncertain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>With People from the Same Ethnic Group as me</th>
<th>With People from Different Ethnic Groups from me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. If I see someone I would like to meet, I go to that person instead of waiting for him or her to come to me.</td>
<td>5 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When I’m trying to become friends with someone who seems uninterested at first, I don’t give up easily.</td>
<td>5 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It is difficult for me to make new friends.</td>
<td>5 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I do not handle myself well in social gatherings.</td>
<td>5 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I find it difficult to hold a conversation with most people.</td>
<td>5 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I am confident of my language skills.</td>
<td>5 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am usually quiet and passive in social situations.</td>
<td>5 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I have common topics for conversation with people.</td>
<td>5 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I have common interests with people.</td>
<td>5 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I enjoy activities that most people enjoy.</td>
<td>5 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. It is difficult for me to express a different opinion.</td>
<td>5 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART C: FACTORS INFLUENCING STUDENT EXCHANGE PARTICIPATION

1. Please rate how much each of the following items influenced your decision to participate in the student exchange program.

Please tick the appropriate box for your response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>No Influence</th>
<th>Slight Influence</th>
<th>Moderate Influence</th>
<th>Great Influence</th>
<th>Extreme Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Part of travel plans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Family members recommended going on exchange</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lecturer recommended going on exchange</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Friends recommended going on exchange</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Intend to work overseas in the future</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Intend to live overseas in the future</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Assist with educational success</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Assist with gaining employment in Australia/New Zealand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Assist with gaining employment overseas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Please rate how much each of the following items influenced your decision to go to your host country and institution.

Please tick the appropriate box for your response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Influence</th>
<th>Slight Influence</th>
<th>Moderate Influence</th>
<th>Great Influence</th>
<th>Extreme Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Knowledge of host culture</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Similarity of host culture to</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia/ New Zealand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Knowledge of language of host</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Chosen course not available in</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Reputation of chosen institution</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Living cost in host country</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Social costs (eg crime, personal</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>safety, racial discrimination) in**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>host country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Climate</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. Geographic proximity of host</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>country to Australia/ New Zealand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART D: EXPECTATIONS (Ward & Kennedy, 1999)

Please indicate how much difficulty you expect to experience in your host country in each of the following areas. Please tick the appropriate box for your response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>No Difficulty</th>
<th>Slight Difficulty</th>
<th>Moderate Difficulty</th>
<th>Great Difficulty</th>
<th>Extreme Difficulty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Making friends</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Finding food that you enjoy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Following rules and regulations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dealing with people in authority</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Taking the host country’s perspective on the culture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Using the transport system</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Dealing with bureaucracy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Understanding the host country’s value system</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Making yourself understood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Seeing things from a host national’s point of view</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Going shopping</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Dealing with someone who is unpleasant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Understanding jokes and humour</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The standard of the accommodation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Going to social gatherings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Dealing with people staring at you</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Communicating with people of a different ethnic group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Understanding ethnic or cultural differences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Slight</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Great</td>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Dealing with unsatisfactory service

20. Worshipping

21. Relating to members of the opposite sex

22. Finding your way around

23. Understanding the host country’s political system

24. Talking about yourself with others

25. Dealing with the climate

26. Understanding the host country’s world view

27. Family relationships

28. The pace of life

29. Being able to see two sides of an intercultural issue
PART E: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The following information will only be used to describe, in general terms, the group of people who complete this survey.

1. What is your gender? Male ☐ Female ☐

2. What is your age?

3. Are you currently employed? No ☐ Yes ☐
If yes, what occupation?

4. What is your country of birth? (e.g. Hong Kong):

5. If you were born overseas, how long have you been in this country? Years

6. How many languages do you speak?

7. How many different countries have you spent your holidays in during the last five years?

8. In which Australian state are you studying?

9. What course are you enrolled in? (e.g. Bachelor of Arts/Bachelor of Law):

10. Do you live at home? No ☐ Yes ☐

11. What is your gross household income per year?
Less than $20,000 ☐ $20,000 - $40,000 ☐ $40,000 - $60,000 ☐
$60,000 - $80,000 ☐ Over $80,000 ☐
When you return to Australia or New Zealand, we are interested in asking you about your experiences as an exchange student. If you would like to be involved in this follow-up study, please provide your email address so that we may contact you.

Please note, that after returning to Australia, you may choose to withdraw from any future studies. Providing us with your email address now does not commit you to be involved in future research.

As we would like to match up your responses on this survey with those you may be asked to provide in the future, a unique personal code will be used instead of your name. Please create an anonymous code using the following information:

- The day (in the month) of your birthday
- The last two digits of the year you were born
- Your favourite colour

For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/11/69</td>
<td>CODE = 0269RED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLEASE PRINT YOUR CODE HERE:

Thank you for your cooperation.

Associate Professor Michelle Barker
Amanda Daly
This survey is being distributed to Australian and New Zealand undergraduate students. The study is part of Doctor of Philosophy research. The aim of the survey is to find out about internationalisation in universities.

The survey is confidential and only the research team will see any completed questionnaires. Participation is voluntary. Refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which you might otherwise be entitled, and you may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or without providing an explanation.

It is requested that you respond to the relevant sections of the survey. It will take about 15 minutes to complete.

Please feel free to contact Associate Professor Michelle Barker on +61 (07) 3875 7779 should you have any questions about the research.

Please fill out the questionnaire in your own time and return it ASAP through uploading it the following website: http://www.cce.ac.nz/misc/survey.php
PART A: MPQ (van Oudenhoven & van der Zee)

To what extent do the following statements apply to you?  
(Please click on the answer that is most applicable to you)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Totally not applicable</th>
<th>Hardly applicable</th>
<th>Moderately applicable</th>
<th>Largely applicable</th>
<th>Completely applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Likes low-comfort holidays</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
<td>[ ] 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Takes initiatives</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
<td>[ ] 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is nervous</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
<td>[ ] 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Makes contacts easily</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
<td>[ ] 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is not easily hurt</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
<td>[ ] 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Suffers from conflicts with others</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
<td>[ ] 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Finds it difficult to make contacts</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
<td>[ ] 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Understands other people’s feelings</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
<td>[ ] 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Keeps to the background</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
<td>[ ] 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Is interested in other cultures</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
<td>[ ] 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Avoids adventure</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
<td>[ ] 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Changes easily from one activity to another</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
<td>[ ] 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Is fascinated by other people’s opinions</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
<td>[ ] 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Tries to understand other people’s behaviour</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
<td>[ ] 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Is afraid to fail</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
<td>[ ] 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Avoids surprises</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
<td>[ ] 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Takes other people’s habits into consideration</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
<td>[ ] 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Is inclined to speak out</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
<td>[ ] 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Likes to work on his/her own</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
<td>[ ] 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Is looking for new ways to attain his/her goal</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
<td>[ ] 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Dislikes travelling</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
<td>[ ] 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Wants to know exactly what will happen</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
<td>[ ] 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totally not applicable</td>
<td>Hardly applicable</td>
<td>Moderately applicable</td>
<td>Largely applicable</td>
<td>Completely applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Keeps calm in bad times</td>
<td>[ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Leaves the initiative to others to make contacts</td>
<td>[ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Takes the lead</td>
<td>[ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Is a slow starter</td>
<td>[ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Is curious</td>
<td>[ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Takes it for granted that things will turn out right</td>
<td>[ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Is always busy</td>
<td>[ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Is easy-going among groups</td>
<td>[ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Finds it hard to empathise with others</td>
<td>[ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Functions best in a familiar setting</td>
<td>[ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Radiates calm</td>
<td>[ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Easily approaches other people</td>
<td>[ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Finds other religions easily</td>
<td>[ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Considers problems solvable</td>
<td>[ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Works most according to a strict scheme</td>
<td>[ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Is timid</td>
<td>[ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Knows how to act in social settings</td>
<td>[ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Likes to speak in public</td>
<td>[ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Tends to wait and see</td>
<td>[ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Feels uncomfortable in a different culture</td>
<td>[ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Works according to plan</td>
<td>[ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Is under pressure</td>
<td>[ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Sympathises with others</td>
<td>[ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Has problems assessing relationships</td>
<td>[ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Likes action</td>
<td>[ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Is often the driving force behind things</td>
<td>[ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Leaves things as they are</td>
<td>[ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Likes routine</td>
<td>[ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totally not applicable</td>
<td>Hardly applicable</td>
<td>Moderately applicable</td>
<td>Largely applicable</td>
<td>Completely applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

51. Is attentive to facial expressions
52. Can put setbacks into perspective
53. Is sensitive to criticism
54. Tries out various approaches
55. Has ups and downs
56. Has fixed habits
57. Forgets setbacks easily
58. Is intrigued by differences
59. Starts a new life easily
60. Asks personal questions
61. Enjoys other people’s stories
62. Gets involved in other cultures
63. Remembers what other people have said
64. Is able to voice other people’s thoughts
65. Is self-confident
66. Has a feeling for what is appropriate in a specific culture
67. Gets upset easily
68. Is a good listener
69. Worries
70. Notices when someone is in trouble
71. Has an insight into human nature
72. Is apt to feel lonely
73. Seeks contact with people from a different background
74. Has a broad range of interests
75. Is insecure
76. Has a solution for every problem
77. Puts his/ her own culture into perspective
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totally not applicable</th>
<th>Hardly applicable</th>
<th>Moderately applicable</th>
<th>Largely applicable</th>
<th>Completely applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

78. Is open to new ideas
79. Is fascinated by new technological developments
80. Senses when others get irritated
81. Likes to imagine solutions for problems
82. Sets others at ease
83. Works according to strict rules
84. Is a trendsetter in societal developments
85. Has a need for change
86. Pays attention to the emotions of others
87. Reads a lot
88. Seeks challenges
89. Enjoys getting to know others profoundly
90. Enjoys unfamiliar experiences
91. Looks for regularity in life
PART B: INTERPERSONAL INTERACTIONS

In relation to your interactions with people from the same cultural group, and those from different cultural groups, please indicate your degree of agreement with the following statements by ticking an appropriate number. “1” means you strongly disagree with the statement and “7” means you strongly agree with the statement. Tick “4” if you are uncertain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>With People from the Same Cultural Group as me</th>
<th>With People from Different Cultural Groups from me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. If I see someone I would like to meet, I go to that person instead of waiting for him or her to come to me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When I’m trying to become friends with someone who seems uninterested at first, I don’t give up easily.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It is difficult for me to make new friends.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I do not handle myself well in social gatherings.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I find it difficult to hold a conversation with most people.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I am confident of my language skills.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am usually quiet and passive in social situations.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I have common topics for conversation with people.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I have common interests with people.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. I enjoy activities that most people enjoy.  
11. It is difficult for me to express a different opinion.  
12. I feel comfortable requesting information.  
13. I have difficulties getting a date when I want one.

PART C: INTERNATIONALISATION PROGRAMS

1. What international programs does your university offers?

2. How did you discover such information?

3. What do you know about the University student exchange program?

4. Have you participated in the university’s exchange program? (Please tick)
   Yes ☐ No ☐

5. Have you applied for the university’s exchange program? (Please tick)
   Yes ☐ No ☐

6. Have you participated in any other exchange programs? (Please tick)
   Yes ☐ No ☐
If yes, in which program have you participated? 
If yes, go to Part D.

7. Please rate how much each of the following items influenced your decision NOT to participate in the university’s exchange program.

Please tick the box which is most appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>No Influence</th>
<th>Slight Influence</th>
<th>Moderate Influence</th>
<th>Great Influence</th>
<th>Extreme Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Knowledge of another culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Knowledge of another language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Chosen course not available in other countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Costs of travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Living costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Social costs (e.g. crime, personal safety, racial discrimination)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Family commitments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Sporting commitments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Work commitments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Subjects in other countries did not match course requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Knowledge of the exchange program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Never thought about participating in the exchange program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART D: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The following information will only be used to describe, in general terms, the group of people who complete this survey.

1. What is your gender? □ Male  □ Female

2. What is your age?

3. Are you currently employed? □ No  □ Yes
   If yes, what is your occupation?

4. What is your country of birth? (eg Japan)

5. If you were born overseas, how long have you been in this country?     years

6. How many languages do you speak?

7. How many different countries have you spent your holidays in during the last five years?

8. What course are you enrolled in? (Eg Bachelor of Arts/ Bachelor of Law):

9. What is your gross household income per year? (please tick)
   □ Less than $20,000  □ $20,000 - $40,000  □ $40,000 - $60,000
   □ $60,000 - $80,000  □ $Over $80,000

Thank you for your cooperation.

Associate Professor Michelle Barker          Amanda Daly
APPENDIX B5: STUDY THREE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. How long have you been in Canada

2. What prompted you to come on the exchange program? To Canada in particular?

3. What happened upon arrival?
   - Orientation program (university wide or discipline specific)
   - Linking with other exchange students/ international students

4. Where are you living- on/off campus?

5. Is it as expected?

6. Things you like best

7. Things that have been difficult/ not liked

8. Travelling- where, how long?

9. Friends- Australians/Nzers, other exchange students, host nationals

10. Talk about experiences (based on Ward & Kennedy’s scale)
    - making friends
    - finding foods that you enjoy
    - following rules and regulations
    - dealing with people in authority
    - using the transport system
    - dealing with bureaucracy
    - making yourself understood
    - going shopping
    - dealing with someone unpleasant
    - understanding jokes and humour
    - the standard of accommodation
    - going to social gatherings
    - dealing with people staring at you
    - communicating with people of a different ethnic group
    - relating to members of the opposite sex
    - finding your way around
    - talking about yourself with others
    - dealing with the climate
    - family relationships
    - pace of life
    - teaching styles/ study patterns

11. Contact with people back home- how much/ what method?
APPENDIX B6: STUDY FOUR SURVEY OF RETURNED EXCHANGE STUDENTS

Chief Investigator: Associate Professor Michelle Barker
Assistant Investigator: Ms Amanda Daly
Address: School of Management
          Griffith University
          Nathan QLD 4111
Telephone: 07 3875 7779
Facsimile: 07 3875 3887
Email: M.Barker@griffith.edu.au

The survey of international exchange experiences for Australian and New Zealand university students was distributed to all Australian and New Zealand students who departed on exchange programs in 2002 and 2003. The study is part of Doctor of Philosophy research conducted through and supported by Griffith University.

The study aims to examine the experiences of Australian and New Zealand students participating in university educational exchange programs. This survey will gather information about your experiences on the exchange program, and your expectations about the effects of participating in the exchange program.

The survey is confidential and only the research team will see any completed questionnaires. Any information disclosed, reported or published will be kept strictly confidential, with your anonymity protected at all times. The research process will be conducted in a way that will ensure that you do not incur any personal or financial loss, or damage to your reputation.

Participation is voluntary. You have been contacted as you previously indicated an interest to be involved in further studies examining student experiences in exchange programs. Although you indicated in the previous survey that you wanted to be involved in future studies, you are not committed to complete this survey. Refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which you might otherwise be entitled, and you may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or without providing an explanation. Your participation in this study does not relate to your eligibility to participate in any other university programs.

The results of the survey will provide essential information for the development and evaluation of university student exchange programs, including educational policies, training and marketing. Therefore it is requested that participants respond to the relevant sections of the survey. It will take about 20-25 minutes to complete.

Please fill out the questionnaire in your own time and return it ASAP by posting it through the following website:

www.cce.ac.nz/misc/survey.php
PART A: PERSONAL INFORMATION & EXPERIENCES

As we would like to match your responses on this survey with those you provided in 2002, we require your unique personal code. You created this code using the following information:

- The day (in the month) of your birthday
- The last two digits of the year you were born
- Your favourite colour

For example:

02/11/69
CODE = 0269RED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>For example:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02/11/69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CODE = 0269RED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please print your code here:


1. What was your host country?

2. How long have you been back in Australia/New Zealand?

  Months
  Weeks
3. Please indicate the likelihood of you engaging in the following activities in the next two years:
(Note: host country refers to the country you stayed in while on your exchange program)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>No Influence</th>
<th>Slight Influence</th>
<th>Moderate Influence</th>
<th>Great Influence</th>
<th>Extreme Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel back to host country</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel overseas to countries other than host country</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel around Australia or New Zealand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply for work in host country</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply for work overseas in countries other than host country</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To what extent do the following statements apply to you?  
(*Please click on the answer that is most applicable to you*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totally not applicable</th>
<th>Hardly applicable</th>
<th>Moderately applicable</th>
<th>Largely applicable</th>
<th>Completely applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Likes low-comfort holidays
2. Takes initiatives
3. Is nervous
4. Makes contacts easily
5. Is not easily hurt
6. Suffers from conflicts with others
7. Finds it difficult to make contacts
8. Understands other people’s feelings
9. Keeps to the background
10. Is interested in other cultures
11. Avoids adventure
12. Changes easily from one activity to another
13. Is fascinated by other people’s opinions
14. Tries to understand other people’s behaviour
15. Is afraid to fail
16. Avoids surprises
17. Takes other people’s habits into consideration
18. Is inclined to speak out
19. Likes to work on his/her own
20. Is looking for new ways to attain his/her goal
21. Dislikes travelling
22. Wants to know exactly what will happen
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Totally not applicable</th>
<th>Hardly applicable</th>
<th>Moderately applicable</th>
<th>Largely applicable</th>
<th>Completely applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23. Keeps calm in bad times</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Leaves the initiative to others to make contacts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Takes the lead</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Is a slow starter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Is curious</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Takes it for granted that things will turn out right</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Is always busy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Is easy-going among groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Finds it hard to empathise with others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Functions best in a familiar setting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Radiates calm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Easily approaches other people</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Finds other religions easily</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Considers problems solvable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Works most according to a strict scheme</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Is timid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Knows how to act in social settings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Likes to speak in public</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Tends to wait and see</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Feels uncomfortable in a different culture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Works according to plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Is under pressure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Sympathises with others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Has problems assessing relationships</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Likes action</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Is often the driving force behind things</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Leaves things as they are</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Likes routine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totally not applicable</td>
<td>Hardly applicable</td>
<td>Moderately applicable</td>
<td>Largely applicable</td>
<td>Completely applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

51. Is attentive to facial expressions
52. Can put setbacks into perspective
53. Is sensitive to criticism
54. Tries out various approaches
55. Has ups and downs
56. Has fixed habits
57. Forgets setbacks easily
58. Is intrigued by differences
59. Starts a new life easily
60. Asks personal questions
61. Enjoys other people’s stories
62. Gets involved in other cultures
63. Remembers what other people have said
64. Is able to voice other people’s thoughts
65. Is self-confident
66. Has a feeling for what is appropriate in a specific culture
67. Gets upset easily
68. Is a good listener
69. Worries
70. Notices when someone is in trouble
71. Has an insight into human nature
72. Is apt to feel lonely
73. Seeks contact with people from a different background
74. Has a broad range of interests
75. Is insecure
76. Has a solution for every problem
77. Puts his/ her own culture into perspective
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>78. Is open to new ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. Is fascinated by new technological developments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80. Senses when others get irritated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81. Likes to imagine solutions for problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82. Sets others at ease</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. Works according to strict rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. Is a trendsetter in societal developments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. Has a need for change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. Pays attention to the emotions of others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. Reads a lot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. Seeks challenges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. Enjoys getting to know others profoundly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90. Enjoys unfamiliar experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. Looks for regularity in life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART C: EXPECTATIONS  
(Ward & Kennedy, 1999)

Please indicate how much difficulty you experienced in your host country in each of the following areas.

Please tick the appropriate box for your response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>No Difficulty</th>
<th>Slight Difficulty</th>
<th>Moderate Difficulty</th>
<th>Great Difficulty</th>
<th>Extreme Difficulty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Making friends</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Finding food that you enjoy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Following rules and regulations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dealing with people in authority</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Taking the host country’s perspective on the culture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Using the transport system</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Dealing with bureaucracy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Understanding the host country’s value system</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Making yourself understood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Seeing things from a host national’s point of view</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Going shopping</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Dealing with someone who is unpleasant
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Difficulty</th>
<th>Slight Difficulty</th>
<th>Moderate Difficulty</th>
<th>Great Difficulty</th>
<th>Extreme Difficulty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Understanding jokes and humour

14. The standard of the accommodation

15. Going to social gatherings

16. Dealing with people staring at you

17. Communicating with people of a different ethnic group

18. Understanding ethnic or cultural differences

19. Dealing with unsatisfactory service

20. Worshipping

21. Relating to members of the opposite sex

22. Finding your way around

23. Understanding the host country’s political system

24. Talking about yourself with others
25. Dealing with the climate

26. Understanding the host country’s world view
27. Family relationships

28. The pace of life

29. Being able to see two sides of an intercultural issue

If you would like to receive a summary of the findings from this research, please provide an email address. However, please note that this data may not be available for up to 12 months.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance with this research

Associate Professor Michelle Barker
Amanda Daly