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ABSTRACT

Most of the research that pertains to study abroad focuses heavily on students, but not professionals who work in the field of international education. This thesis argues that a different perspective is useful to understand the growing trend of students who are studying abroad in developing or nontraditional countries, a different perspective is useful. Specifically, the study examines how international education professionals in the United States assess the qualities of successful study abroad programs in a developing country. Nigeria is used as a case study because this nation, despite its recent economic growth, hosts very few study abroad students from the U.S. each year, compared to other developing countries. The field of international education lacks a unified theory. As such, this research combines literatures from the fields of globalization, migration, networks, cosmopolitanism, competitive advantage and branding to frame the research and analysis. To answer the research questions, a multi-method approach was employed. Participants completed an online survey questionnaire or were interviewed based on their expertise in the field of international education. Additionally, a case study on Nigeria’s higher education and cultural environment was included as part of the data collection. The major findings of this research indicate that mitigating risk and ensuring safety for students is important. Additionally, input from faculty members is a key element that influences the
development of new study abroad programs in developing countries. This thesis addresses several implications for study abroad in Nigeria, given the globalized and growing international education market. This thesis concludes that a country’s overall reputation matters and further suggests that developing countries benefit from prominent faculty members building more connections with other academics from first world universities.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Over the last several decades, we have seen the rise and persistence of globalization as a facet of modern society. It has influenced the movement of people and ideas, while simultaneously promoting economic and technological expansion. Joseph Stiglitz’s definition of globalization as “the closer integration of the countries of the world,” (2007, 21) helps to explain the prevalence of Internet-mediated communication, high-speed travel, plus the global trade of goods and services. This reality causes many individuals to assume that there is now a fair playing field across nations. As Thomas Friedman boldly put it: “the world is flat” (2005, 5).

Even with globalization’s influence on the movement of money, ideas and people, the world is far from achieving equality. The manner in which globalization is structured causes irregular development and as David Grewal points out, globalization is an “uneven process” (2009, 3). Moreover, scholar Paul Collier (2007) shows how this unevenness is making economic development much harder for latecomers, who consistently struggle to play catch-up with the rest of the world. The uneven nature of globalization is due to the select concentration of global cities that have succeeded in restructuring their economies to meet the demands of modern-day global capitalism (Jacobs 1984; Sassen 2001). This has fostered stiff competition between nations so that the achievements of some countries greatly outshine others.

The race to become a leader in the age of globalization highlights the importance for countries to use and maintain their competitive advantages. Nations can accomplish this by making the most of their advantages: markets, networked relationships and branding strategies are prime examples. As Porter (1990) notes, countries can actually modify their competitive advantage while building upon their social capital to connect themselves with stronger resources
in the same economic network (Lesser 2000). One means by which they can do this is to present a strong image of trustworthiness and expertise (Ivy 2001; Erdem and Swait 2004). Developing countries’ continuing challenge requires them to hone in on their global strengths and weaknesses.

Tied closely with a country’s ability to overcome its disadvantages is its capability to attract foreigners through push-pull factors. As Mazzarol and Soutar (2002) explain, push-pull factors cause people to move from one location and go somewhere else. *Push factors* are the negative influences that cause a person to migrate away from their home country while *pull factors* are the opposite: they encourage migration to a host country that possesses higher standards of living. Ideally, nations should have more pull factors, but such is not always the case. Just as some countries are better at trading goods and services or more effective at maintaining a stable government, several countries are especially skillful in attracting migrants (that is, pulling) for short-term or long-term stays (Mazzarol and Soutar 2002). These push-pull factors help explain why some people tend to favor certain countries over others when planning their journeys.

The nature of globalization’s push-pull factors also extends into the field of higher education where there is a growing interest in global learning. International education expanded rapidly following the Cold War, at a time when foreign diplomats realized the dire consequences of cutting off communication from different cultures and political systems (Vestal 1994). Even now, as Altbach and Teichler point out, international education “remains largely a north-south phenomenon” (2001, 7). As a result, the academic exchange of students and scholars has traditionally remained in the hands of the most powerful host nations in parts of Europe and the
United States. For example, the 2013 *Open Doors Report* by the Institute of International Education (IIE) indicates that Europe dominated as a host region for U.S. students while the Middle East and Sub-Saharan Africa hosted only a 2.5 and 4.5 percent share of U.S. students, respectively (“Fast Facts” 2013). These figures reveal that international education is not exempt from globalization’s unevenness so that even in this case, certain regions of the world are still better at promoting their pull factors.

Nevertheless, we are now witnessing a changing trend in international education, especially in the field of study abroad. We see an undeniable rise of study abroad programs being hosted in ‘nontraditional’ regions such as Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, and the Middle East (Wells 2006). For instance, between the academic years 2010-11 to 2011-12, Sub-Saharan Africa saw an 8.3 percent increase in the number of U.S. students studying there, while Asia saw a 9.1 percent rise (“Fast Facts” 2013). These current trends (albeit gradual) should not be overlooked, as study abroad can be a way to bridge the gap of international education between developed and developing countries. Accordingly, this calls for closer investigation into the key factors that are influencing this trend.

Leading the globalization and international education efforts are cosmopolitans. Aptly described as world citizens (Hansen 2008), cosmopolitans cross geographic borders while constantly building new networks of connections (Tarrow 2005). They can be students, but they can also be individuals whose role is to organize and oversee the study abroad process. The most

---

1 During the 2011-2012 academic year Europe hosted 53.3% of all students from the U.S. who studied abroad (“Fast Facts” 2013).

2 For the purposes of this paper, “nontraditional” is used to describe developing countries and mid-to-upper-income countries that are located outside of Europe, North America, or Australia.
salient example are professionals who work at U.S. colleges or universities—people who help make decisions and interact with faculty, staff, and students planning to participate in a study abroad program. Academic cosmopolitans in the globalization process play an important role, since they are the persons actually carrying out their academic institution’s mission to help students acquire international experiences through cross-cultural exchanges.

Given the unevenness of the global playing field, many practitioners and scholars might not expect countries with vastly different political systems, cultural lifestyles or economic markets to increasingly attract more students from the industrialized world. That they are doing so is somewhat puzzling. This phenomenon raises a number of questions:

1) Given the uneven nature of globalization, what accounts for this shift?

2) To what extent are U.S. professionals in the field of international education affected by the push-pull factors of a country? As well, how do they decide what the necessary components are when their college or university is considering a new study abroad program in a nontraditional location?

3) Is the ratio of push-pull factors changing in the favor of developing countries and are they doing more to brand themselves as potential hosts?

4) Has the criteria that determines the site of foreign educational programs changed in the context of present-day globalization?

This paper addresses these questions. Taking into account globalization’s most multidimensional elements (such as migration, competitive advantage, and cosmopolitanism) we can identify many unanswered questions worth investigating. Likewise, it will be helpful to
explore whether there are other factors driving the growing trend of students studying abroad in nontraditional countries.

To address these research questions, the paper takes a multi-methodological approach consisting of quantitative and qualitative research. Three approaches will frame the research: a survey questionnaire, in-depth interviews, and a case study on a developing country. The online survey provides quantitative data about respondents’ experiences working in international education. To find out what experts had to say about study abroad in nontraditional countries, I conducted interviews with international education staff at colleges and universities in the U.S., as well as professionals at international education organizations. The last part of my methodological approach entails a country-specific case study. As a case, I have chosen post-colonial Nigeria. The World Bank considers Nigeria to be one of the fastest growing countries in Africa and it is geographically accessible to a number of other regions (Litwack 2013).

Past literature has not examined nontraditional study abroad in this context so this study will serve as a guide for developing countries to build and sustain study abroad programs that meet or exceed the criteria set by officials at first world universities. Chapter Two’s conceptual framework will synthesize existing literature on globalization, migration, push-pull theory, cosmopolitanism, competitive advantage, and branding. Chapter Three will inform readers about the state of the art in the field of international education and what is currently happening in the study abroad domain. Chapter Four lays out the three-prong methodological approach in accordance with the conceptual framework (survey, interviews, case study). Chapter Five describes and analyzes the data collected. Chapter Six, the concluding chapter, summarizes the thesis’ findings, offers recommendations for Nigeria, and provides suggestions for future
research. The interdisciplinary approach used to answer the research questions sets forth a new way of thinking about the challenges and opportunities that globalization has made in the field of international education and study abroad.
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

In order to answer the questions as to why there is a growing trend of nontraditional regions hosting study abroad students, we need to conceptualize the problem in the abstract. This chapter first lays out migration and push-pull theory in order to explain what typically causes people to move from one geographic region to another. Because international education depends on relationships and ties across national boundaries, this chapter next looks at network architecture to determine the structure of cross-border relationships. For these relationships to take place in academia, like-minded people must be empathetic of cultural differences when interacting with global students. To provide a base for understanding the importance of this empathy at globalized universities, the third section characterizes the literature on cosmopolitanism. Since international education is also part of a global tendency towards competitiveness, the fourth section will examine competitive advantage and branding among higher education institutions. By integrating these theoretical concepts, the final section will provide a review of related studies and an overall framework for the discussion in Chapter Three and Chapter Four.

Migration and Push-Pull Theory

According to educational scholar Jeff Thompson, there lacks a unified theory on international education (2012). To explain why developing countries are beginning to be leaders in education, we need first to consider international education more broadly in the context of
globalization. From this perspective, a sound starting point is the literature on migration, which lays the foundation for understanding the temporary movements of people. We can see that in general, more people are moving around the world (Castles and Miller 2009; Brettell and Hollifield 2013). There are a number of reasons for this trend. The motives include but are not limited to: tourism, employment, business, entertainment, politics and education (Massey et al. 1993; Rizvi 2009).

Writing in 1899, London geographer Ernst Ravenstein was quite puzzled by the phenomena described above. Studying the problem, he developed “The Laws of Migration” in a paper (1899). The seventh point of Ravenstein’s migration law, *dominance of the economic motive*, is equally relevant today. As he noted:

> Bad or oppressive laws, heavy taxation, an unattractive climate, uncongenial social surroundings, and even compulsion (slave trade, transportation), all have produced and are still producing currents of migration… (Ravenstein 1889, 286)

Ravenstein argued that a number of extrinsic social elements are what motivates a person to physically move from unfavorable circumstances.

Ravenstein’s theory provided the basis for a more encompassing explanation of mobility, as laid out by Everett S. Lee’s “A Theory of Migration” in 1966. Everett Lee’s theory defines migration as a “permanent or semipermanent change of residence” (1966, 49). According to Lee, migration can be conceived as a three-prong process in which “every act of migration involves an origin, a destination, and an intervening set of obstacles” (49). It is from this conceptualization that Lee developed a schema to illustrate his main points as shown in Figure 1:
For Lee (1966), immigration laws, distance, travel time, cost, or level of difficulty to reach a destination does not matter. The main linkages to mobility lie in the origin and destination factors presented in Figure 1. According to Lee, the “+” (plus) and “−” (minus) symbols in the origin and destination segments matter the most; if the destination has enough attractive (plus) features, a person will do whatever is in his or her interest to overcome the intervening obstacles. Lee’s characterization of migration based on his plus-minus dichotomy is an effective way to determine what attracts people to certain regions of the world (or away from it).

Lee’s “A Theory of Migration” (1966) has inspired what is now known as the push-pull theory of migration, which as we shall see is highly applicable to the field of international education. Today we know that mobility is largely controlled by the push-pull factors. As the theory implies, there are two driving forces that affect an individual’s destination: push and pull factors (Altbach 1998; Li and Bray 2007). Push factors are those that motivate a person to move away from his or her current country. Triggers can be anything from living in a tyrannical society (i.e., lack of religious freedom, racism, sexism), poor economic situations (low paying or

---

3 The zeroes are factors in which people are impartial (Lee 1966).
minimal job opportunities, high poverty, high cost of living), environmental concerns (high risk of natural disasters, pollution) or a perpetual sense of governmental instability like war or corruption (Mazzarol and Soutar 2002). Push factors simply motivate an individual’s inclination to move elsewhere due to the societal or economic forces that exist in a person’s current geographic region (Li and Bray 2007).

To address the pull factors, scholars typically focus their attention on the destination country. Pull factors hold more weight when attracting foreigners (Altbach 2004). According to Mazzarol and Soutar (2002), the pull factors of a nation are related to the belief that a society has a just government, high standards of living (access to healthcare, more jobs, extensive education systems, etc.) and few environmental risks (such as low pollution, rare natural disasters, and clean water). As reported by these scholars, individuals are driven more by the pull factors of a destination country due to its overall appeal and promising conditions (2002).

This type of research on pull factors encourages others to ask: does geography matter? With push-pull theory in mind, for example, one can better explain why people going abroad are concentrated in cities. As stated by Jane Jacobs (1984), cities are complex hubs that foster transnational interactions due to the proximity of persons, organizations, institutions and technologies. Likewise, sociologist Saskia Sassen (2001; 2005) finds that there is a rise in cross-border and non-political interactions occurring in global cities. For instance, the highly populated global cities of Buenos Aires, Lagos, New York, Shanghai and New Delhi already have international corporations, airports, and schools that help familiarize the city’s name (Sassen 2005; Abrahamson 2004). As noted by Buchanan (2003), in any setting “people naturally enjoy living among others with similar interests, tastes and backgrounds” (p 185).
Based on what we have seen thus far from the literature, these theories are very useful when thinking about the globalizing trend in education. Firstly, migration can be temporary (Lee 1966) and study abroad is an exemplar of this non-permanent movement across borders. Secondly, because of migration, we might expect that nations that retain the most push factors will have greater academic emigration and more difficulty attracting foreign students. Thirdly, we might posit that because of cities’ locational, economic and social advantages they may provide the greatest attraction as centers of international education (Jacobs 1984; Sassen 2001; Sassen 2005).

**Network Architecture for International Education**

This section makes a case for international education in the context of network theory. International education can be enriched via global networks of like-minded people and organizations (Collins 2008; Riel 1993). Such networked relationships can provide shared resources and the trust required for collective action and effective collaboration. How well they do depends on the structure of the relationships— that is to say, on network architecture. In simplest terms, a network is comprised of nodes and links that connect people, organizations, objects, et cetera (Grewal 2009; Buchanan 2003). Networks be they social or technical, generate assets through the exchange of ideas or goods (Tsai and Ghoshal, 1998; Uzzi et al. 2007; Borgatti et al. 2009).

One way in which networks create assets is by generating trust among network participants. James S. Coleman (1988) was among the first scholars to identify that trust could be achieved through strong ties within groups. He defined this trust as social capital. Others have
followed in Coleman’s tradition arguing that the social capital and the trust inherent in dense networks facilitate collaboration by increasing the incentives for collective action (Gulati and Singh 1998; Passy 2003). Strong ties not only allow information to travel more freely through the network (Krackhardt 1991; Cross and Sproull 2004); they also permit participants in the network to generate a common identity and generate norms that help constrain free riding (Garcia 2013).

Mark Granovetter provides an alternative view about network assets. In his research on individuals’ job searches, he found that people connected by weak ties (acquaintances) generally have better information than those located within an individual’s immediate strong tie network (Granovetter 1973). As he reasoned, those within a dense cluster are likely to possess only redundant information.

Others have argued that these two types of networks are not mutually exclusive. Sociologist Deepa Narayan, for instance, has argued that “cross-cutting ties” are necessary (1999, 1). Ron Burt, (1997; 2000; 2005) develops this idea with his notions of structural holes and structural autonomy. A structural hole refers to the empty spaces between social structures (2000). Burt (2000; 2005) describes bridges as the links that connect strong tie clusters across these holes. According to him, the ideal structure for collaboration is one of “structural autonomy” and as Burt (2005) describes:

---

4 Structural autonomy occurs when actors in a network are in the best position (node) for access to information; therefore they can control certain benefits (Burt 1997).
A structurally autonomous group consists of people strongly connected to one another, with extensive bridge relationships beyond the groups. A structural autonomous group has a strong reputation mechanism aligning people inside the group, and a strong vision advantage from brokerage outside the group (Burt 2005, cited in Garcia et al. 2007, 33).

Social network theory allows us to look at network relationship from two levels—the individual and the global. At the level of the individual (firm, organization) we can examine structural relations to determine how central an individual is in a network. Sociologist Linton C. Freeman argued that centrality might be measured quantitatively through distance and closeness (1979). According to Borgatti et al., network centrality refers to “the structural importance or prominence of a node in a network” (2009, 894). As such, network centrality is a useful concept for measuring influence or power (Borgatti et al. 2009; Brass 1984).

At the level of the network as a whole, we can measure the effectiveness of a network by comparing its structure to a small world network. Small world networks have been found to be associated with high performance. A small world network can be defined as a network that exhibits both high levels of clustering together with weak links that constitute a short path length (Garcia 2012). Such networks thrive off benefits that come from strong ties (with deep clusters) and weak ties (shortcut links to a new network) (Buchanan 2003; Borgatti, et al. 2009; Kleinberg 2010). By looking at these literatures on the architecture of networks, we can see how people or organizations might want to position themselves in certain types of network.

---

5 A common example of a small world that garners vast information and social assets is Silicon Valley (Fleming and Marx 2006)
**Cosmopolitanism**

Today’s globalized and multicultural environment suggests that engaging with people from various cultures, who speak different languages and maintain different lifestyles, is a key to success (Schattle 2009; Stevenson 2003). As the eminent philosopher Socrates asserted, “I am a citizen, not of Athens, or Greece, but of the world” (Montaigne 1958, 116). Likewise, in his 1795 paper called “Towards Perpetual Peace,” Immanuel Kant argued that politics should be universal and so should the communities in which people reside (Kleingeld 2013, 48). The term ‘cosmopolitan,’ originating with the Ancient Greeks and Roman Stoics, captures this idea of a world citizen, (Nussbaum 1997, 4; Schattle 2009), the subject of this section of the chapter.

Scholars agree that individuals become cosmopolitans by participating in various cultural customs and heritages as a global citizen (Schattle 2009). Doing so involves more than just a surface-level interest in global issues, as for example by following the international media or travelling for leisure. Instead, global citizenship requires people to value transcultural interactions and hold an international frame of reference (Hansen 2006; Weenink 2008; Linklater 1999). As Schattle (2009) asserts:

> Global citizenship has little, if anything, to do with how a person votes, or from which country one holds a passport, and everything to do with how an individual interacts with others and fits in wherever one should happen to be planted at any moment in time, even if only temporarily. (Schattle 2009, 14)

Global citizenship is legitimated when cosmopolitans acquire cosmopolitan capital. Cosmopolitan capital is the integration of a person’s global connections (to people, organizations or ideas) that enhances his or her proclivity to confidently participate in most, if not all, social situations involving diverse groups (Weenink 2008). Cosmopolitan capital is naturally developed
through foreign language proficiency, attendance of international conferences or political events, reading world-renowned literature and maintaining a “globally dispersed circle of friends or relatives” (2008, 1092). However, there are other ways to become a successful global citizen.

American philosopher Martha Nussbaum (1997) provides another view about cosmopolitans, arguing that cross-cultural empathy is a necessary precondition to develop into a world citizen. Her research on liberal education reasons that individuals must have the capacity to empathize with people from different cultures (1997). Nussbaum’s argument aligns with other literatures relating to cross-cultural empathy, for example, with the view that cosmopolitans should be genuinely open-minded towards intercultural differences (Hannerz 1990; 1996). More recently, Beck (2006) calls for ‘cosmopolitan empathy’ in which people discard the “either/or” categories of society, while still appreciating the cultural individuality of their own national background (5).

Notwithstanding the importance of empathy, cosmopolitans may maintain various types of identities in their quest to become a world citizen. In his work on world citizenship, Derek Heater finds that cosmopolitans enjoy “[t]he feeling of a universal identity” (1999, 137). This universal personality greatly influences cosmopolitans’ moral compasses including their views about human rights, the environment and international laws (Heater 1999). Political sociologist Sidney Tarrow (2005) further conceptualizes that cosmopolitans possess a unique identity of not one but many nations due to their multiple social relationships with different cultures. However, these identities can be associated with nefarious ends (e.g., militant uprisings, heated protests) or for harmonious purposes (e.g., raising awareness of social injustice) (2005).
Lastly, the literature on cosmopolitanism allows us to look at how individuals perform at the organizational level. In his study of social roles, sociologist Alvin Gouldner (1958) sought to explain the difference in expertise and loyalty among cosmopolitans and locals in organizations. Gouldner found that locals have a deep commitment to the organization’s formal and informal structures while cosmopolitans have little knowledge or loyalty to an organization or its members, and may feel compelled to leave an organization should better opportunities come their way (1958). Others such as Robertson and Wind (1983) and Rogers (1983) take a more positive stance towards cosmopolitans, arguing that they are often the first to innovate within an organization due to their focus on surrounding communities instead of just the local organization. According to Robertson and Wind (1983), the innovativeness among cosmopolitans is most visible in professional establishments such as hospitals, universities, and research institutions that must remain inventive in order to survive.

**Competitive Advantage**

Education is increasingly considered a service that can be traded in global competitive markets (Hoekman and Kostecki 2009; UNESCO 2004; Verger and Robertson 2012). Accordingly, the literature on competitive advantage is useful in understanding how nations position themselves in international competitive markets. While early economists such as Adam Smith (1776) and David Ricardo (1891) saw competitive and comparative advantage as a given, strategist Michael E. Porter argues that competitive advantage could be changed. Leading this

---

6 Gouldner (1958) defined ‘locals’ as “true believers” and classified them into four categories: The Dedicated, The True Bureaucrat, the Homeguard, and The Elders. Conversely, Gouldner defined ‘cosmopolitans’ as loosely engaged participants that fell into two categories: The Outsiders and The Empire Builders (446-50).
argument, Porter defines competitive advantage as firms’ capabilities to compete in the global market (1990). For Porter, competitive advantage exists when a company offers lower prices but equivalent benefits to customers than that of their competitors (1990; 2004). Porter applies his theory of competitive advantage to nations by arguing that “[n]ational prosperity is created, not inherited” (1990, 73).

To create competitive advantage, countries need to make their local companies highly productive. According to Porter, productivity is “the value of the output produced by a unit of labor or capital” (1990, 76). Productivity is sustained when existing industries improve the quality of their products, add new amenities, expand product technology and increase the rate of production (76). The key point for nations to realize is that neither a nation nor its companies can be competitive in every single industry. In other words, countries should choose the industries in which their firms are the most productive and creative (1990).

Tied to the productivity of a nation’s local firms is the competitive nature of their home-based industries (Porter 1990). Once demand for a nation’s homegrown products or services matures, local firms should be able to attract foreign interest (1990). Having undertaken an extensive four-year research investigation of the top ten trading nations, Porter concluded that home-based activities are extremely important for competitive advantage.\(^7\) As he found, home-based competitiveness develops from related industries where information and technical knowhow already travels between existing and potential firms (1990). For example, Porter credits the prosperity of Switzerland’s pharmaceutical industries to their earlier success in global

\(^7\) The nations Porter studied were: Denmark, Italy, Japan, Korea, Germany, Singapore, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the United States (1990, 74)
dye manufacturing, and Japan’s success in electronic keyboards to their former boom in acoustic instruments (83).

Nations continue to succeed in international competitive markets by innovating. As Porter contends, firms must—not should—“innovate and upgrade to compete” (1990, 79). Fortunately, innovation does not mean that a nation has to create a revolutionary new technology or tool (1990). Rather, innovation can be achieved when globally competitive industries frequently interact with one another (1990). The Italian footwear industry (Figure 2) is the most prominent example, in which shoemakers deliberately established clusters with other footwear manufacturers to stay current with emerging trends, learn new manufacturing methods and various skills (1990, 83).

Figure 2: The Italian Footwear Cluster. One can see how competitive advantage was forged in Italy’s footwear industry due to the well-connected companies working together. From Michael E. Porter, “The Competitive Advantage of Nations,” Harvard Business Review, Mar-April 1990, 84.
One caveat though, is that much of a nation’s capacity for long-term competitive advantage rests on their government’s willingness to foster competitiveness. With or without highly educated or talented people in a country, Porter argues that “government’s proper role is as a catalyst and challenger; it is to encourage – or even push – companies to raise their aspirations” to become highly competitive entities (1990, 87). More recently, strategist Michael H. Best (2001) argues that government support plays a critical role in a firm’s development of competitive technologies. Regardless of the type of competitive advantages, governments have the complicated responsibility of encouraging the growth of firms but limiting their political influences that might take a myopic approach to competitive growth (1990). As we will see in the next section, branding is one way that nations can lure foreign interest of homegrown goods and services.

**Core Principles of Branding**

Branding is another aspect that explains the global trend towards competitiveness in international education (Cambridge 2002). This section will cover three core theoretical concepts of branding: brand image, brand credibility and destination branding. Organizational theorist David Aaker (1991) is frequently credited for his succinct definition and purpose of branding: “to identify the goods or services of either one seller or a group of sellers, and to differentiate those goods or services from those of competitors” (7; emphasis added). Management scholar Phillip Kotler further explains the meaning of a brand as “a name, term, sign, symbol or design, or a combination of them” that distinguishes a seller from its competitors (1997, 443). Overall,
branding is a product or service’s ability to prove its uniqueness and originality in a way that competition has not yet matched (D. Aaker 1991; Ghodeswar 2008).

Brand image is just one component of branding. Although the field is relatively new, ‘classical’ theories of branding define brand image as “the set of beliefs held about a particular brand” (Kotler 1984, 127) as well as the “set of associations, usually organized in some meaningful way” (D. Aaker 1991, 109). Brand image has been linked to reputation (Nicolescu 2009) and brand personality (J. Aaker 1997; Hosany et al. 2006). A business that has admired logos or taglines providing a continued exposé in digital or hardcopy format further reinforces brand image (i.e., on web pages, letterhead, business cards, and so on) (Blain et al. 2005).

Regardless of the type of branding employed by an organization, institution or a group of sellers, the image and perception of a powerful brand should always be distinct, consistent and deliver on promises made (Papadopoulos 2004, 43; D. Aaker 2012).

Erdem and Swait’s (1998; 2004) research on brand credibility demonstrates an additional way to enhance competitiveness. At the theoretical level, brand credibility is associated with signals, that is, a product’s indication of quality or “believability” by consumers (Erdem and Swait 1998; Rao and Ruekkert 1994). Erdem and Swait (2004) expand this concept of signals by arguing that brand credibility can be broken down into two parts: trustworthiness and expertise. Trustworthiness is simply customers’ confidence that a firm will fulfill advertised promises and expertise is the anticipated ability to deliver such promises (2004). As is evident, companies that make their brands credible, trustworthy and functional have a much easier time staying competitive in their specific markets.

---

8 Jennifer Aaker defines brand personality as “the set of human characteristics associated to a brand” (1997, 347).
In contrast to the firm-centered conceptions of branding, literatures on destination branding have recently emerged as a way to apply branding to specific geographical regions (Papadopoulos 2004; Hosany et al. 2006). Synonymous with the term ‘place branding,’ the term “destination brand” is acknowledged as:

A name, symbol, logo, word mark or other graphic that both identifies and differentiates the destination; furthermore, it conveys the promise of a memorable travel experience that is uniquely associated with the destination; it also serves to consolidate and reinforce the recollection of pleasurable memories of the destination experience. (Ritchie and Ritchie 1998, 103)

As we can see, although destination branding is derived from classical theories of branding, it turns more towards the comfort and experiences that users gain from certain locations (Blain et al. 2005). Papadopoulos (2004) expresses how “some products deliberately include references to their origin in marketing strategies,” as for example in Volkswagen’s proud association with Germany, or New York State’s “I Luv NY” campaign (37-8).

These successful branding strategies related to places have been replicated by nations including Australia, Canada, the United Kingdom and the United States (Papadopoulos 2004). Primarily, countries are using destination branding as a way to attract skilled migrants from high-demand fields such as biotechnology, telecommunications and computer science (Papadopoulos 2004, 40). Examining branding as part of this chapter’s conceptual framework provides a deeper analysis of how organizations and countries might use branding in international education.

**Review of Related Studies**

I now wish to point out some of the previous studies that have influenced the methodologies implemented in Chapter Four. There is plenty of research on student perceptions,
motivations, and reasons for choosing study abroad destinations, which I use as a model for the survey design. In Kavakas’ (2013) research, he identified the role of marketing, pull factors, and personal experiences influencing student’s study abroad destination choice. By using a survey questionnaire, Kavakas analyzed students’ responses by gender, ethnic identity, field of study, price sensitivity and student concerns.\(^9\) Other studies that influenced the format of my survey questionnaire include Trilokekar and Rasmi’s (2011) research on student intent to study abroad plus Chieffo and Griffiths’ (2004) evaluation of students’ feelings towards short-term study abroad programs.\(^10\)

While there are minimal studies that specifically surveys international education professionals at colleges and universities, Ivy’s (2001) study on higher education institutions image aligns closely with the goals of this research project. Ivy mailed surveys to marketing, public relations, and admissions officers at universities in the United Kingdom and South Africa, which influenced some of the questions asked in this study’s survey questionnaire. For example, Ivy asked respondents what position they hold at work (“Admissions officer, Marketing officer, PR officer, Other administrative, Academic”) and asked respondents to share some of the marketing tools their institutions use such as “having lower tuition fees than competition” and “direct mail to schools” (2001, 278).\(^11\) Furthermore, Mazzarol’s (1998) study on international

---

\(^9\) Kavakas’ (2013) research influenced the survey’s questions that asked professionals about scholarships, campus amenities, and emergency management (questions 16-18).

\(^10\) Trilokekar and Rasmi (2011) consider housing, academic advising, recreational and computer facilities components of social and institutional support at the university level. These concepts influenced the survey question about amenities.

\(^11\) Ivy’s (2001) question of respondent’s position influenced the survey question that asked respondents to indicate their current position (“Executive Director, Assistant/Deputy director, Other leadership role”). The question
education marketing followed a similar methodological approach, by targeting universities’ international offices and marketing administrators. These abovementioned studies provide a framework for developing my survey and interview questions, presented in Chapter Four.

**Conclusion and Conceptual Framework**

This chapter presented six theoretical concepts and a review of previous studies to help frame the puzzle concerning foreign study in nontraditional locations. Since international education still lacks a unified theory (Thompson 2012), I will use the multiple concepts discussed throughout the chapter to guide the rest of this paper. As shown, Figure 3 is a conceptual model that I have devised and will use as a roadmap for the discussion on international education, the data analysis, and final recommendations:

![Figure 3: Conceptual Framework](image)

**Figure 3: Conceptual Framework.** This conceptual model illustrates how six main factors determine U.S. professionals’ view of a nontraditional or traditional study abroad host destination.

---

pertaining to marketing tools influenced the survey questions about branding. (See Appendix B1 for the full survey questionnaire).
The conceptual framework in Figure 3 illustrates how the current literature applies to the paper. I use the term “continuous influencers” to highlight the factors that influence a professional’s decision to favor one study abroad region over another. The arrows that lead to traditional destinations are solid because the continuous influencers (migration, push-pull, network architecture, cosmopolitanism, competitive advantage and branding) are already well established and positively reinforce the reasons to study there. Conversely, the arrows that lead to nontraditional destinations are dotted since the continuous influencers are still developing. If more people continue to study in developing countries, we may find that the arrows leading to the nontraditional side will eventually become solid, indicating fewer negative perceptions.

It is still unclear if there are other continuous influencers that form the decisions of university staff when considering new study abroad partnerships in nontraditional regions. Nevertheless, the literature on competitive advantage and branding suggests that these two factors may be the most practical way for countries to develop the positive perceptions required as a host destination. Nations that make higher education as part of their competitive advantage and use branding strategies to market their educational institutions are a step ahead of other countries vying for attention in the global market. With this thought in mind, Chapter Three will assess international education in further detail by integrating some of the definitions and concepts explained in this chapter. As we will see, international education has a long history, and study abroad is becoming more important.

---

12 Arrows leading to nontraditional destinations are still developing because the continuous influencers (such as migration) might commonly cause people to perceive nontraditional regions as an unfavorable place to study.
CHAPTER THREE: SELECTED TOPICS IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

Introduction

The theoretical concepts described in Chapter Two serve as a stepping-stone for this chapter, which speaks to the realities of international education as we see it today. This chapter first provides a historical narrative of the topic followed by a present-day characterization as depicted by practitioners. The next section on student mobility highlights the increasing frequency of migration for educational purposes. This movement of students sheds light on educational networks and cross-border collaborations, which will be discussed in the fourth section. The last section addresses how higher education institutions are becoming increasingly competitive by using strategic branding efforts to attract international attention.

International Education: History and Foundations

Colleges and universities are common channels in which international education is delivered. Scholars generally agree that universities are major international institutions that date as far back as the Middle Ages (Scott 2006; Altbach and Teichler 2001). Higher educational institutions have served and continue to serve governments, communities, religious affiliates, and individuals in the quest for knowledge (Scott 2006). Thanks to the nature of globalization, we now see the interplay among these groups magnified to a greater degree. International education is now a means for students and scholars to learn about other societies in the world (Scott 2006).

These learning efforts are not new to this century and international education has a long history. According to Fry (1984), between 500-300 B.C., academics actively migrated to popular
scholarly cities including Alexandria, Athens, and Rome. Educational scholar Daniel Tröhler (2009) claims that the first instance of international education began with Jesuits who countered the Reformation in the latter part of the sixteenth century. To this end, the Jesuits built institutes in Europe and elsewhere, assembling their own curriculum with the help from international scholars (2009).

The proclivity towards global learning has not faded over time. As Sobe and Ortegon (2009) report, in the early nineteenth century, Frenchman Marc-Antoine Jullien de Paris argued that certain ideas originating in one country could be physically transferred to another (51). By the twentieth century, a model of international education (the German Humbolditian model) became prominent mostly because of the international nature of scientific research (Altbach and Teichler 2001, 6). Today, learning is influenced not only by the international nature of academic disciplines but also by the “liquidity of knowledge” in which ideas, information, and dialogue rarely stays in one place (2009, 49). This interchange of knowledge has been (and still is) a highly valued component of a global education and learning.

Throughout history, nations have also used international education as a way to protect their national interests. In the post-World War II and Cold War eras, many industrialized nations made higher education a priority to reduce the disastrous effects of limited communication among intellectuals (Tröhler 2009). For example, former U.S. Senator David Boren acknowledged in 1991 that “to compete internationally and to protect our diplomatic and national security interests, we need to think internationally…If we fail to do so, we will be ignoring a critical threat to our national security and to our ability to remain a world leader”

---

13 de Paris (1775-1848) was known as one of the fathers of comparative education, an active writer, and revolutionist during the Enlightenment and Revolutionary period of France (Sobe and Ortegon 2009).
(Vestal 1994, 2). According to Boren, international education is a prime way to maintain an internationally conscious society (1994).

**Characterizations of International Education**

Although international education is now seen as playing a vital role in the 21st century, it can be interpreted in a number of different ways. Generally speaking, international education includes any formal or informal academic movement of people relating to research, teaching or learning abroad; the modification of curricula to encompass cross-cultural or international affairs; specific regional studies; or intellectual exchange programs with international organizations and companies (Vestal 1994; Knight 2008). Use of the term ‘internationalization’ is gaining momentum, as its definition includes cross-border institutional partnerships (such as foreign branch campuses) and also on-campus initiatives exposing students and faculty to international content (Knight 2008; Altbach and Knight 2007). To limit the scope of this paper, I will focus on international education at the postsecondary level.\(^\text{14}\) An exemplar of international education and academic mobility is study abroad.

Study abroad is a unique category of international education. While there are a variety of nuanced definitions, study abroad is widely conceived of as “the international movement of students and scholars” (Harari 1992, 69). More precisely, the United States National Center for Education Statistics calls study abroad the “arrangement by which a student completes part of the

\(^{14}\) This discussion does not center on international education at the K-12 level or internationalization for community colleges. For further discussion, see Dolby and Rahman’s piece on internationalization (2008) and Frost and Raby’s (2009) work on community colleges.
college program studying in another country” (NCES, n.d.). Based on the theoretical foundations from the previous chapter, my working definition of study abroad is: the temporary international migration of scholars and students for academic pursuits. These definitions apply regardless of the length of study abroad programs, which are usually classified into three categories: short-term (less than eight weeks, typically as a summer or winter session), mid-length (a semester or one to two quarters), and long-term (a full academic or calendar year) (“Fast Facts” 2013; Chieffo and Griffiths 2009, 365).

As a component of international education, study abroad programs provide numerous benefits for students and their institutions. Higher education scholar Nadine Dolby (2004) explains how students experience the daily lifestyle of a new culture, practice another language and learn how other people value their country’s political, societal or economic structure. These study abroad experiences lay the foundation for students to: become global citizens; prepare for an international workforce; tackle culture shock; and turn into lifelong learners (Dolby 2004; Skelly 2009). On the institutional level, study abroad is a means for colleges and universities to modernize their curriculum, enhance their visibility, and attract bright individuals from across the globe (ACE 2012; Wells 2006).

Given the advantages of study abroad, more attention is now being paid to the specific locations of such programs. Study abroad programs can be parsed into two categories based on geographic location: traditional and nontraditional. The United States, Great Britain, France, Germany and Australia are all traditional countries that host high numbers of foreign students.

---

15 Study abroad is also frequently termed “overseas study,” “academic exchange,” “foreign study,” and “education abroad” to name a few. Study abroad is more than a trip to another country, as it must involve taking courses for academic credit (“Forum on Education Abroad” 2014).
annually (Altbach and Teichler, 2001, 7). What makes a host country ‘traditional’ entails numerous factors–most apparent is the country’s early establishment of world-class research universities, its current or previous role as world a power, English as a spoken language, and the continuous flow of students studying there each year (Altbach and Teichler 2001; Wells 2006). Familiarity with the nation’s culture and its Western customs also strengthen the popularity of study abroad programs in traditional locations (Che et al. 2009). Nonetheless, students are increasingly seeking new experiences that diverge from traditional study destinations.

Nontraditional study abroad locations are regions of the world that have historically seen low student participation rates for academic exchanges, most notably in Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Middle East (Che et al. 2009; Wells 2006). Many reasons account for minimal academic movement to these areas. One reason is the “Eurocentric curricular focus common to social studies,” as well as the cautionary tones from authorities such as the United States Bureau of Consular Affairs’ travel warning lists (Che et al. 2009, 106). Woolf (2013) contends that security risks, political insecurities, substandard infrastructures, and poor lines of communication tarnish the perceived benefits of nontraditional study locations. Not surprisingly, then, during the 2011-2012 academic year, Sub-Saharan Africa hosted just 4.5 percent of U.S. students who went abroad and the Middle East/North Africa region hosted only 2.5 percent of the population studying abroad (“Fast Facts” 2013).

Despite the realities of nontraditional study abroad locations, the developing world is progressively seen as a viable place to gain an international education (Che et al. 2009; Wells 2006). As illustrated in Figure 4, Wells (2006, 114) maps out this increase over a fifteen-year range (from 1987-1988 to 2002-2003):
The Institute of International Education’s subsequent *Open Doors Reports* supports Well’s conclusions about a growing interest in nontraditional study abroad (2006). During the 2005-2006 academic year, 8,459 U.S. students studied in Africa; 20,811 studied in Asia; 33,902 studied in Latin America; and 2,585 went to the Middle East (“Institute of International Education” 2007). In just six years, the those numbers increased again, with Sub-Saharan Africa hosting 12,859 U.S. study abroad students; Asia welcoming 35,016 students, Latin America hosting 44,677 students and the Middle East/North Africa accommodating 6,947 students during the 2011-2012 year (“Institute of International Education” 2013a). Some scholars are hesitant in interpreting these trends, claiming that student interest might be caused by a temporary interest in adventure travel or an exotic getaway (Engle and Engle 2002; Woolf 2013). Keeping

---

16 The IIE now classifies Africa into two regions: Sub-Saharan Africa and North Africa (including some Middle Eastern countries).
these uncertainties in mind, we now turn to the current discussions of student mobility, which may clarify further why nontraditional study abroad locations are growing in popularity.

**Student Mobility**

Related to the concepts of migration, student mobility is a central dimension of international education and study abroad. The term student mobility “refers to students who have crossed a national border to study, or are enrolled in a distance learning programme abroad” (UNESCO 2014, sec 2). Between the years 2000 to 2011, the number of international students worldwide has doubled, indicating that more educational migration is taking place (OECD 2013, 1).17

There are two kinds of international student mobility—vertical and horizontal (Kehm 2005; Teichler 2001; Rivza and Teichler 2007). According to Kehm, vertical mobility refers to student flows from “East to West and from South to North,” (2005, 19). In other words, vertical mobility involves students who move from low socioeconomic world regions to industrialized countries (Teichler 2001). Horizontal mobility is the movement of international students to nearby countries with similar higher educational systems (Brooks and Waters 2011; Teichler 2004).

Some of the ongoing trends in student mobility raise concerns about reciprocity in study abroad. Reciprocity is “the practice of exchanging things with others for mutual benefit, especially privileges granted by one country or organization to another” (Oxford 2013). This definition highlights a discrepancy in the field of international education insofar as some

---

17 According to the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, there are nearly 4.5 million postsecondary students studying for an academic degree (or part of their degree) in another country (2013, 1).
countries send more of their students abroad, yet do not receive an equal intake of foreign
students. According to Wells (2006), for example:

Rather than implying an increase in the size of the nontraditional slice of the study abroad
pie at the expense of the traditional slice, the goal should be to increase the size of the
entire pie, thereby allowing nontraditional experiences to grow without decreasing other
opportunities. (Wells 2006, 125)

The country, Nigeria, illustrates Wells point. Nigeria sends thousands of its students each
year to study abroad (OECD 2013). Yet, according to the most recent *Open Doors Report*,
Nigeria hosted just 23 U.S. students for formal study abroad programs during the 2011-2012
school year (Institute of International Education 2013a) while 7,028 Nigerian students studied in
the U.S. during the same time frame (“Fast Facts” 2013). There is nothing inherently ‘wrong’
with many students from Nigeria or other developing countries studying in the first world, but as
Falk and Kanach (2000), Baruch et al. (2007), and other scholars contend, the large disparity of
students from the developing world studying in developed regions, might limit valuable
exchanges of cross-cultural ideas.\(^{18}\)

Many of the issues relating to reciprocity can be explained by the push-pull factors
addressed in the previous chapter. At the most basic level, push factors account for why students
move (Macready and Tucker 2011). McMahon’s (1992) examination of international student
flows during the 1960s and 1970s found that push factors are rooted in the origin country’s
economic wellbeing, involvement in global trade, strength of existing educational programs and
governmental policies. If a student’s origin country possesses multiple undesirable push factors,
it will propel him or her to seek an education abroad (McMahon 1992; Mazzarol and Soutar

\(^{18}\) It should be noted that the ideas of ‘brain drain,’ ‘brain gain,’ and ‘brain circulation’ are rarely separated
from this topic. Scholarly work has covered this topic extensively. See: Lowell and Findlay (2001); Capuano and
Marfouk (2013); Cheng and Yang (1998) for a starting point.
2002). At the same time, there are obstacles (such as a lack of funding, immigration delays, minimal family support, and so on) that make it harder for a student to leave an unfavorable origin location (Macready and Tucker 2011).

Pull factors, on the other hand, relate directly to the host country’s perceived value of its academic institutions (Davis 1995; Macready and Tucker 2011; Mazzarol and Soutar 2002). For students going abroad (to any region), favorable pull factors generally consist of: a program’s affordability; the ease of obtaining visa documents; access to language-specific programming (typically in English); the university’s global academic rankings; and extent of work or travel opportunities (Macready and Tucker 2011; Kavakas 2013).

An understanding of pull factors helps to explain why seven out of the top ten study abroad destinations among U.S. students are in Europe and Australia (‘Fast Facts’ 2013). However, when we consider the top twenty-five destinations of U.S. study abroad students, fifteen are situated outside of Europe–many are in developing, emerging, or newly industrialized countries–as shown in Figure 5. As can be seen from this data, included among these nations are: Argentina, Brazil, China, India, South Africa and South Korea (‘Fast Facts’ 2013). These countries have not always been leaders in attracting U.S. students, but evidently their academic institutions are becoming well equipped to pull mobile foreign students.
Together with the push-pull factors of a country, the growing global labor market influences a student’s proclivity towards international mobility (Ong 1999; Altbach and Teichler 2001). A rising number of students are realizing the benefits that study abroad and other international experiences might have on their future employability (NASFA 2008; Brooks and Waters 2011). For some students, studying abroad is a stepping-stone for their future international careers (Kehm 2005; Findlay et al. 2006) while others use study abroad to hone their foreign language competency (Park and Bae 2009; Brooks and Waters 2011). Some internationally mobile students are drawn to nontraditional regions that offer students the opportunity to gain hands-on experience with environmental issues and practices (Woy-Hazelton 1999; Wells 2006). These and other career building experiences gained from studying abroad are
of greater value when study abroad destinations are well connected to global networks of people, institutions and organizations.

Global Educational Collaboration

Study abroad host destinations enhance their visibility among students and education professionals through international collaboration and partnerships with other international players. Altbach and Teichler (2001) identify five of these core actors that shape internationalization and cultural exchange: the academic community, the government, the business community, nongovernmental organizations and multilateral organizations (17). Within each county, these groups operate to either promote or discourage study abroad (2001). The countries that work with these groups and their constituents are better inclined to become active participants in global education networks that foster study abroad programs.

As per Altbach and Teichler (2001), the academic community, namely colleges and universities, is a critical enabler of academic exchange. According to the American Council on Education’s 2012 “Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses” report, academic communities rapidly expand their global influence or “global engagement” through collaboration and partnerships with overseas universities and educational organizations (ACE 2012, 20). Academic exchange or collaboration may be as simple as a faculty’s research connection to a foreign institution, or it might entail a formal agreement, in the form of a comprehensive memorandum of understanding (MOU) with foreign partners (2012). Colleges and universities also look to study abroad programs as a way to promote international partnerships. These
collaborations and affiliations are among the first steps academic institutions take to build their international programs and global influence.

Not surprisingly, establishing international academic exchanges is more difficult for universities in nontraditional study abroad destinations (Altbach 2013). Scholars find that universities in developing countries need access to world-class research facilities, locally innovative personnel and first-rate faculty (Altbach 2013; Altbach and Teichler 2001). Even to consider new study abroad partnerships, it is necessary for foreign universities, global businesses or other academic communities to have a connection to these three resources (2013). Complex issues such as outdated technology, emigrating academics, and poor governance hinders universities’ efforts to develop a fully innovative institution (2013). As Fuchs (2007) argues, a nation’s ongoing political tensions, out-of-date infrastructure, and limited communication throughout local communities significantly add to these challenges.

These hindrances have not, as many might assume, prevented academic institutions in nontraditional regions from developing study abroad programs. By working with global academic communities, a number of study abroad destinations are increasing their visibility to foreign students and international educators. For instance, Thailand and Vietnam are emerging as study abroad hubs in Southeast Asia—some of their universities now have over 90 MOU’s with foreign institutions (Altbach and Knight 2010; Hue University 2012). While Africa has not seen as much international collaborative activity, a range of countries such as South Africa, Kenya and Mauritius partner with foreign information technology (IT) firms and higher education institutions throughout Europe and the U.S. (2010, 128). The need for universities and their
nations to appeal to international audiences while remaining visible in the global educational networks that are active today is further discussed in the next section on branding.

**Branding in Higher Education**

The challenge of remaining competitive extends to the globalized higher education environment because colleges and universities are increasingly entrepreneurial in nature (Brooks and Waters 2011). Using a student-as-consumer model, Wells (2006, 123) argues that academic institutions garner interest from potential consumers by having more ‘products’—that is, academically related courses, programs and activities for students. This paper considers study abroad not as a product, but more as an educational service offered by universities in host countries. Establishing competitive study abroad programs or any other forms of campus internationalization requires a high level of interest from college administrators as well as students (NASFA 2008). The following discussion shows how branding strategies, brand images, and national branding magnifies an institution’s strength (or lack thereof) as a global player.

Universities eager to host foreign students need a sound branding strategy and a positive brand image to influence the destination choice of prospective students (Mazzarol and Soutar 2002; Brooks and Waters 2011). Basic branding strategies involve the use of promotional materials (traditional print materials, webpages, virtual tours, welcome videos, etc.) plus positive word-of-mouth referrals (Gray et al. 2003; Mazzarol and Soutar 2002; Allsop et al. 2007). Brand image refers to how universities “tell their own story” (Judson et al. 2009, 66). With a positive brand image in place, universities can continue to improve their competitive advantage (Parameswaran and Glowacka 1995; Hemsley-Brown and Goonawardana 2007).
These elements of branding are central to meeting the expectations of students or administrators (Nicolescu 2009).

Part of a university’s branding strategy that often gets overlooked is the quality and leadership of its staff or administration (Medina and Duffy 1998). As the Association of International Educators points out, “experienced and responsible leadership is necessary for the success of any program or organization” (NASFA 2008, 9). Understanding how international education professionals in the U.S. perceive a university’s staff in nontraditional study destinations is key because staff members represent their university’s overall image and perceived academic prestige. Additionally, Judson et al. (2009) argue that higher education administrators often have “frequent opportunities to sell the brand while interacting with outside constituents of the university” (55). Given these roles, staff or administrators from any type of academic institution have some responsibility for leading efforts to brand their institutions in a positive light.

As part of their academic branding strategies, universities are paying closer attention to the advertisements of specific study abroad programs. Zemach-Bersin (2009) asserts that there is a “…calculated, institutional, widespread, and commercial framing of international education,” the end goal of which is to encourage students to study overseas (304). As Mazzarol (1998) finds, colleges and universities should emphasize the numerous positive attributes associated with studying abroad. To capture the attention of prospective participants, some study abroad programs are now advertised much like adventure travel or tourism campaigns (2009). Words such as “enrich, rich, wealth, and invaluable” as well as colorful, bold and captivating images frequent the pages of study abroad descriptions (Zemach-Bersin 2009, 306; Shumar 2013).
On a national level, host countries are branding themselves separately from university efforts in the interest of boosting overall global educational rankings (Brooks and Waters 2011). As Brooks and Waters (2011) stress, “…countries, too, are subject to scrutiny by prospective students seeking a national education ‘brand’” (161). The favorable brand of a nation is critical, since “students opting to study overseas…tend to choose a country first, and then select an institution” (Srikatanyoo and Gnoth 2002, 143). Whereas traditional study abroad host countries might brand themselves based on their long-established prestige, nontraditional and developing countries do not always have such luxury (Brooks and Waters 2011). As a result, some countries in Asia (namely Singapore, Hong Kong and Malaysia), are working with their governments to brand themselves as educational centers (Yonezawa 2007; Brooks and Waters 2011). As we can see, there are medleys of ways that colleges and universities self-endorse their academic quality or global competitiveness through branding.

Conclusion

This chapter described how mobility, educational networks, collaboration, and branding shapes the current field of international education. It described the distinct nature of study abroad, the benefits based on location, and current data supporting the trend towards more students studying in nontraditional destinations. The section on student mobility touches upon the uneven flows of international students to certain parts of the world, including Nigeria. This chapter also emphasizes how several universities are becoming fully engaged in global educational networks, cross-border collaboration, and branding in order to remain competitive.
Based on the conceptual framework presented in Chapter Two, study abroad destinations (especially nontraditional host countries), must stay cognizant of the continuous influencers and current discussions of international education today. This chapter sets the stage for Chapter Four, which introduces the survey questionnaire, in-depth interviews and case study on Nigeria.

To recap, the six main continuous influencers are: migration, push-pull factors, network architecture, cosmopolitanism, competitive advantage and branding.
CHAPTER FOUR: DATA AND METHODS

Introduction

This chapter lays out the methods by which data for this thesis were collected, organized and analyzed based on the concepts discussed in Chapter Two and Chapter Three. For this project, I use a mixed methods approach combining the strengths of quantitative and qualitative research. First, I introduce the primary research method – the survey questionnaire. Having discussed the implementation and purpose of the survey, I describe how data were gathered through a series of in-depth interviews with international education practitioners. In each data collection section, I restate the original research questions that were used to guide the study. Lastly, I provide a brief case study on Nigeria’s push-pull factors, with specific regard to the country’s postsecondary educational system.

The overall aim of this study is to: (1) measure how nontraditional host countries’ push-pull factors have an effect on their ability to host foreign students and (2) assess how U.S. professionals within the field of international education decide what constitutes sustainable study abroad programs in nontraditional destinations. Although there is an abundance of study abroad research, much of it focuses on students, rather than international educators and administrators. To help fill this research gap, I surveyed and interviewed professionals in the field of international education to determine their thoughts and perceptions about nontraditional host destinations. As this chapter will show, research concerning professionals in the study abroad process is just as valuable as research about students, and offers insights lacking from a student-based approach.
Survey Questionnaire

Overview and Instrumentation:

The major quantitative aspect of this project is the survey questionnaire. According to Thomas (2003), “surveys are most useful for revealing the current status of a particular entity” (44), such as the group of international education professionals that I surveyed. The first goal of the survey was to gather professionals’ thoughts relating to the push-pull factors of study abroad. In particular, I wanted to grasp how professionals consider several pull factors that nontraditional host countries (such as Nigeria) should have. Such pull factors may attract study abroad students from developed countries, namely the United States. Another goal of the survey is to see how respondents’ academic institutions participate in the study abroad process and assess the overall makeup of their institutions (geographic setting, geographic region, type of institution). The survey also gathers information about participants’ personal engagement with global society, such as their prior experience studying abroad, frequency of international travel, and years of experience working in the field of international education.

The survey was specifically designed to answer the original research questions (2) and (4) as outlined in the first chapter:

- To what extent are U.S. professionals in the field of international education affected by the push-pull factors of a country? As well, how do they decide what the necessary components are when their college or university is considering a new study abroad program in a nontraditional location?

- Has the criteria that determines the site of foreign educational programs changed in the context of present-day globalization?
During the spring semester of 2014, an online survey was administered to college and university professionals in the United States. Participants were personally recruited via email invitation to take a 25-question anonymous survey. The entirety of the survey took place online using SurveyMonkey, an Internet-based survey platform. The survey was proofread and pre-tested for readability among my colleagues and advisors before the final distribution. On average, respondents took 10 – 15 minutes to complete the survey.

Approval from the Georgetown University Institutional Review Board (IRB) was secured before proceeding with the investigation. All survey respondents were asked to acknowledge their consent to participate in the study by selecting “I consent to participate” or “I refuse to participate” on the survey’s welcome page prior to answering any questions. The survey was open for 20 days, and a follow up email was sent 1.5 weeks after the initial survey request to boost response rates.

Before exploring the data, it is useful to grasp the characteristics of the survey respondents. The survey covered general demographics including: gender, ethnic/racial identity, level of education, current work position, number of years working in international education, type of institution (public or private) and the location of institution. Table 1 summarizes the key demographic findings of the survey (to be further analyzed in the next chapter):

---

20 The approved IRB number for this study is: 2013-1361.
Table 1: General Demographics and Institution Type of Survey Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>N Responses</th>
<th>% Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong> (N=64)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong> (N=64)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college credit, no degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s/Trade degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/Law degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate degree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years Worked in Int’l Education</strong> (N=65)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 or more years</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identity</strong> (N=62)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White or European</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, Pacific Islander or American Indian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial/ More than one race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Institution</strong> (N=69)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U.S. Geographic Location</strong> (N= 69)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U.S. Geographic Setting</strong> (N= 64)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For ‘Other’ category, two participants indicated their institution is in a college town or mid-sized town

Note: Percentages rounded to nearest tenth
As is shown in Table 1, survey participants were in greater proportion female (65.6%) than male (32.8%) and a large majority of respondents identified themselves as White or European (87.1%). A large majority of participants have either a master’s degree (51.6%) or doctoral degree (29.7%), while over forty percent of respondents (41.5%) have worked in the field of international education for more than 11 years. Of those surveyed, most work for private institutions (59.4%) as opposed to public institutions (40.6%) and a majority of respondents’ institutions are housed in the Northeastern (40.6%) or Midwestern (29.0%) region of the United States. In addition, there is a relatively even representation of respondents’ colleges or universities that are situated in urban, suburban or rural settings (29.7%, 32.8%, and 34.4% respectively).

Participant Selection:

Because I was targeting higher education professionals, population sampling of U.S. institutions had to be done first. Most recent data from the National Center of Education Statistics (NCES) indicates that during the 2012-2013 academic year, there were a total of 2,244 four-year, public and private colleges and universities in the United States (degree-granting Title IV institutions). Specifically, there were 689 4-year public and 1,555 4-year private postsecondary institutions in the U.S. (NCES 2013). For this research, I choose to sample only four-year public and private institutions, because for-profit institutions have limited study abroad options. Due to the limited timeframe and scope of this study, initial oversampling (of roughly 21 Title IV intuitions according to the National Center for Education Statistics provide “aid to students includ[ing] grant aid, work study aid, and loan aid” (NCES, 2013).

NCES included branch campuses in their final count of U.S. postsecondary campuses.
ten percent) was done so I could sample and select potential participants from at least 600 schools.

I decided to use the Boren Awards for International Study’s campus representative list (http://www.borenawards.org/institutions), which offers a comprehensive list of colleges and universities in the United States, according to state. For each list of institutions, I selected every fourth school and entered them into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet, obtaining a total of 709 potential institutions.\(^\text{23}\) This list, however, included two-year and for-profit schools, so a system of exclusion was established. I eliminated all of the for-profit, community colleges, two-year technical colleges, graduate-level institutions, law schools as well as any four-year institutions that had no mention of a formal, centralized office devoted to international education or study abroad (this included theological seminaries, medical schools and institutions with only faculty-led or departmental study abroad programs).

The next step was to search for potential survey respondents from the 709 institutions in the population sample. I chose to contact staff in leadership roles such as directors, assistant/associate directors, study abroad advisors, and education abroad coordinators. My choice of participants is guided in part by the Association of International Educators (NASFA), an organization that stresses the importance of having experienced and responsible leaders to manage study abroad programs or activities. NAFSA also points out how “…study abroad requires specialized knowledge to effectively manage the complex academic, programmatic, operational and cross-cultural issues inherent in the field” (2008, 9). For the survey, I wanted to

\[\text{\textsuperscript{23} The reason for taking every fourth school was based on the 2244 total number of schools divided by my target population of 600 (2244 ÷ 600 = 3.74), therefore, I rounded up to choose every 4^{th} school by state in the Boren list.}\]
hear from key personnel of an academic institution’s international education or study abroad offices who deal directly with the academic exchange of students.

While searching for survey respondents, I went directly to the institution’s international education, global education, study abroad (or similar) webpage to gather publically available contact names and email addresses. During the search process, I looked at whether the contact information was unclear or incomplete, and if so, I eliminated the institution. It is important to note that this exclusion process might cause coverage bias, for example, if more schools from one U.S. geographic region were excluded solely based on the limited information on their website. I contacted only one person per school in order to reduce redundancy among response rates (e.g., geographic location). I also chose not to send the survey to generic ‘study abroad’ email addresses without a direct contact listed, to reduce ambiguity or contact information.

In all, I contacted 269 international educational professionals from four-year, U.S. public and private colleges and universities. At the close of the survey, there were 89 survey responses, indicating a response rate of 33.0 percent.24 There were 63 fully completed surveys, for a completion rate of 70.8 percent.25 Respondents were not required to answer every question; therefore the survey’s analysis was conducted on a question-by-question basis, indicated by ‘N’ (number of responses) for each question type.

---

24 This number accounted for the exclusion of 4 trial run surveys during the initial screening process.

25 The survey was considered ‘fully completed’ when participants answered all 25 questions. The survey completion rate is calculated by dividing the total competed surveys by the total survey responses (63 ÷ 89).
Survey Design:

The survey instrument included rating scales, multiple choice, percentage, and comment box questions. Rating scale questions were asked using a five point Likert scale (where 1 = Strongly Agree and 5 = Strongly Disagree). Several of the close-ended questions allowed respondents to select an “Other” category in which they could clarify or elaborate on their answers. There was also one open-ended comment box question where respondents were asked: *In a few words, please describe the process that your institution uses to establish new study abroad partnerships, particularly in developing countries* (an analysis of responses is provided in Chapter Five).

Participants answered survey questions grouped into five categories. After the request for respondents’ consent to participate, the survey asked respondents to describe their nature of work in international education (questions 2-6) and respond to an open-ended question about establishing study abroad programs in developing countries (question 7). Next, the survey asked about respondents’ engagement with global society (questions 8-12) and the ideal academic environments for study abroad programs (questions 13-16). Then respondents selected the types of institutional support study abroad programs in developing countries should have (questions 17-19) followed by questions on branding and advertising approaches (questions 20-22). Finally, demographic questions (questions 23-26) were asked at the end of the questionnaire.

Some of the questions asked respondents to state their level of agreement with statements such as: *I believe that global education is a central part of my university,* or *A summer or semester-long study abroad program in a developing country can be just as rewarding for students as a program in a developed country.* Other questions, for example, asked respondents
to select what regions of the world their academic institution sends its students abroad and to choose the types of amenities that study abroad programs should offer to students (housing, medical services, recreation, etc.). The full survey questionnaire is available in Appendix BI.

Data Collection and Process of Analysis:

The goal throughout this project was to derive a reliable data set for the final analysis and discussion. Complete survey responses were downloaded from SurveyMonkey, entered into an Excel spreadsheet, and finally transferred into SPSS statistical package 22 for the coding and analysis. I used SPSS to provide univariate and bivariate analyses, including frequencies, cross-tabulations and chi-square tests to show certain patterns and statistical relationships from respondents’ answers. Appendix B2 provides the coding sheet for the survey questionnaire.

The one qualitative-based question from the survey (question 7) was reviewed for noticeable patterns and specific themes after several readings. Comments were sorted into five categories based on how respondents characterized the process of establishing a new study abroad program. For example, the categories of faculty support and third-party affiliates appeared the most frequently out of the 61 total valid comments. Overall, responses from the open-ended question generated a wealth of information that will be further discussed in the next chapter.

In-Depth Interviews

Overview and Participant Selection:

To supplement the case study and survey, in-depth interviews were conducted between February and March 2014 with U.S. practitioners in the field of international education.
According to Thomas (2003), in-depth interviews allow participants to elaborate on their responses and beliefs in ways that most quantitative surveys cannot. Through this qualitative method, I spoke with professionals whose role relates directly to the study abroad process or internationalization efforts of their university or organization. Experts from Cultural Vistas, Georgetown University, George Washington University, New York University, Syracuse University and Washington and Lee University graciously granted me interviews. These discussions provided a first-hand look into the administrative thought process and planning that goes into establishing or maintaining study abroad programs in traditional and nontraditional host destinations.

I conducted a total of eight interviews with U.S. international education professionals. Interview participants were selected on a convenience basis due to their physical proximity throughout the Mid-Atlantic and Northeastern regions of the United States and also based on their availability during the data collection period. Email invitations were sent out over the course of two weeks; each potential participant and their contact information were coded to ensure data confidentiality. Five out of the eight professionals that I interviewed took place in-person at the interviewees’ university; two took place over the phone; and one took place via Skype videoconferencing technology. Participants’ involvement in international education ranged from directors, advisors, and professors (many have dual roles) who contribute to the process of students studying overseas in some capacity. In addition, none of the interviewees took the survey questionnaire, as I wanted to gain separate qualitative data from this cohort.

The interview protocol consisted of a predetermined set of seven to eight questions in relation to my study’s original research questions, specifically questions (1) and (3):
• Given the uneven nature of globalization, what accounts for the shift of students studying in nontraditional destinations?

• Is the ratio of push-pull factors changing in the favor of developing countries and are they doing more to brand themselves as potential hosts?

As noted in the previous chapter, the scope of this study remains at the level of postsecondary education in the United States. Nontraditional study abroad destinations, especially in Nigeria, can potentially benefit from the specific insights I gained while talking to experts in the field.

Instrumentation:

Before conducting this part of the data collection, I received Georgetown University IRB approval to conduct non-anonymous interview research and received permission by all participants to digitally audio record each interview. Each interview was structured, and lasted no more than 45 minutes due to professionals’ busy schedules and to ensure data manageability during the analysis. All interviewees were first asked to share their previous experience studying abroad. They were asked to state what location(s) they had previously studied abroad, and how that experience shaped their career trajectory in international education. Some interview questions were tailored to each participant, depending on his or her professional background, position and institution (e.g., where their school already sends students abroad). A synopsis of the standardized interview questions that international educators were asked is as follows:

26 Two participants opted to not have their full name used in the research investigation, and their requests have been duly granted. See Appendix C1 for the full list of interview questions and Appendix C2 for the IRB forms.
1) How does a study abroad program prepare students for global citizenship?

2) What advantages might developing countries have if their universities are in large cities?

3) Do you have any ideas as to what it will take to attract students to study abroad in Nigeria? (Do you think it matters if developing countries are close to other countries that have been successfully growing their study abroad programs such as Ghana and Cameroon?)

4) How important is it for potential study abroad host universities to have a strong brand image?

5) How important is it for schools to track student movement to different regions each year?

Process of Analysis:

Some common themes and patterns emerged from the eight interviews. Overall, most interviewees acknowledged the influence of globalization on international education and their institution’s study abroad endeavors. Seven out of the eight participants previously studied abroad, either at the high school, undergraduate, or graduate level. All of the interviewees’ universities and organizations currently sends students to nontraditional locations including (but not limited to): Accra, Ghana; Amman, Jordan; Buenos Aires, Argentina; Grahamstown, South Africa; and Quito, Ecuador.

Due to the complex nature of collecting and analyzing qualitative data, I conducted a thematic analysis based on Thomas’ (2003) and Taylor-Powell and Renner’s (2003) guidelines for qualitative interview data. The five specific themes chosen for the analysis center on the

27 A deeper analysis of the patterns and common themes will be discussed in Chapter Five.
project’s research questions and the conceptual framework outlined in Chapter Two (migration, push-pull factors, networks, cosmopolitanism, and competition/branding). After each interview was completed, I listened to each audio recording multiple times and took notes based on my predetermined themes. Relevant subcategories of themes emerged from the interviews and were incorporated into the analysis as applicable. Once the thematic analysis was complete, I considered how the interviewees’ responses connected back to the research questions and goals of this project.

To answer some of the specific questions pertaining to Nigeria that the survey instrument and in-depth interviews could not answer, the case study in the next section provides a basis. According to Merriam (2002), case studies allow for an in-depth concentration of a single individual, group, institution or community. Nigeria is an appropriate country on which to conduct a case study on, because few literatures or empirical research considers the country as a potential study abroad destination. Instead, most research focuses on the local student population already in this country, brain drain, or the lack of technology in Nigerian universities.\(^\text{28}\) The case study also seeks to identify why international education professionals from first world countries might seek out, reject, or remain neutral to the prospect of study abroad programming in Nigeria.

**Case Study on Nigeria**

**Introduction:**

The third component of Chapter Four’s methodology is the case study on Nigeria. This brief case study examines Nigeria’s higher education system in regards to globalization and the

\(^{28}\) Extensive scholarly research exists regarding Nigeria’s current student population, job prospects and brain drain. See Jagboro (2003), Oni (2000) and Radwan and Pellegrini (2010) for further analysis.
push-pull factors associated with the nation. The main reason for using Nigeria as a case study is to understand how U.S. international education professionals might regard this country as a potential nontraditional study abroad host region. According to the World Bank’s 2013 “Nigeria Economic Report,” Nigeria is one of “the fastest growing economies in the world” as well as a regional leader within Africa (Litwack 2013, 2). Nonetheless, Nigeria continues to struggle with weak social cohesion, political unrest and sporadic governance from its leaders (Peters 2011). This country’s multifaceted position in our global society affects its general perceptions of development, including international education.

Nigeria’s economic development is not exempt from the forces of uneven globalization. Economically, Nigeria has annual Gross Domestic Product (GDP) growth rates of over seven percent in non-oil industries (Litwack 2013). Yet, in 2011 the country faced an unemployment rate of 24 percent and a 12 percent inflation rate (2). According to Radwan and Pellegrini (2010), Nigeria is currently “at the ‘factor-driven’ stage of development,” based on Michael Porter’s national competitive development framework (90). At the factor-driven stage, a nation relies heavily on its natural resources, unskilled labor, and has yet to transition into a knowledge-driven economy (Porter et al. 2001; Radwan and Pellegrini 2010). Given these points, it is understandable that Nigeria’s economy still focuses heavily on its massive oil supplies as the number one priority for economic growth, albeit volatile (Radwan and Pellegrini 2010).

---

29 A knowledge-driven economy is essentially when countries are highly innovative by using technology to create products and services previously unattainable (Radwan and Pellegrini 2010).
Push-Pull Factors:

To understand how Nigeria can break into the existing field of international education, we must first understand the political and social context of this country. Ever since its independence from Britain in 1960, Nigeria has struggled with “geo-ethnic politics” that have yet to mitigate (Anyanwu, 2011, 208). With over 250 ethnic groups and a population of over 174 million (“The World Factbook” 2014), the country lacks a strong national identity (Anyanwu, 2011). The map shown in Figure 6 highlights some of the major ethnic groups of Nigeria:

![Figure 6: Map of Nigeria’s Major Ethnic Groups. Source: Ogechi E. Anyanwu, The Politics of Access, University of Calgary Press, 2011, 24.](image)

This map shows how varied Nigeria’s cultural landscape is. Each of these ethnic groups have their own subculture, traditions and indigenous language; all of which contributed to the virulent Nigerian Civil War (1967-1970) and present-day religious conflicts between the north
and the south (Anyanwu 2011, 104). As we have seen thus far, Nigeria has a conflicting mix of cultural, social, economic and political histories. These factors are largely Nigeria’s push factors, which inhibit the country’s ability to attract a large number of foreign students (especially from the developed world) looking to study in a nontraditional country. These push factors also spill over into Nigeria’s postsecondary institutions.

The higher educational system within Nigeria officially was set in place in 1948, with the establishment of the University of Ibadan by the British government (Anyanwu 2011, 2). Initially, the University of Ibadan offered joint degrees with the University of London but this endeavor only lasted until the 1960s (Radwan and Pellegrini 2010). During the 1970s and 1980s, there was an upsurge of Nigerian-founded universities. However, by the 1990s when Nigeria faced harsh dictatorship rule, the educational standards of these institutions and their funding diminished (2010). Based on the Nigeria’s National Universities Commission’s (NUC) list of tertiary institutions, there are currently 40 federal universities, 38 state universities and 50 private universities in Nigeria (2014). The quality of these institutions, however, varies significantly (2011).

The current state of Nigeria’s universities is another push factor that limits foreign academic collaboration with first world universities. According to the U.K.-based Observatory on Borderless Higher Education organization, “the university sector is still struggling to overcome years of political unrest and continued under-funding” in addition to capacity barriers (“Recent Development” 2005, 3). These challenges mean that many Nigerian university classrooms are overcrowded, face power outages, have intermittent Internet access and are stocked with dated textbooks (Radwan and Pellegrini 2010). Furthermore, the faculty and
administration leading Nigeria’s universities often go on strike, which reduces the motivation among Nigerian students to graduate on time (“Recent Development” 2005; Radwan and Pellegrini 2010).

Nigeria’s current push factors relate back to the issues of student mobility in Chapter Three. Expectedly, significant populations of Nigerian students choose to obtain their postsecondary education abroad. The chart in Table 2 illustrates the top destinations of Nigerian students studying overseas between the years 2007 and 2010:

Table 2: Nigerian Students Studying abroad from 2007-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Top five overseas host countries (number of Nigerian students)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>U.K. (16,486)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>U.K. (14,380)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>U.K. (11,783)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>U.K. (11,136)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UIS GED (2012 – 2009)

As is evident, developed and industrialized countries like the United Kingdom, the United States and Canada dominates in attracting Nigerian students. Both Malaysia and South Africa are considered ‘upper middle income’ countries, which have somewhat less of the abovementioned educational struggles that Nigeria faces (The World Bank 2014) Ghana, while it is considered a ‘lower middle income’ country by the World Bank, is an example of horizontal student mobility as described in the previous chapter.
Despite the numerous push factors causing students to leave Nigeria, there are some pull factors within the country that might appeal to international education professionals and students from the developed world. First and foremost, Nigeria has a large English-speaking population, even with its diverse cultural groups. To encourage the reading and writing of English, early British missionaries made many Nigerians learn Britain’s official language in addition to their indigenous languages (Anyanwu 2011). English as a main language is a major pull factor for this country because there is a generally held trend that students and faculty tend to gravitate towards study abroad programs that offer some instruction in English (Altbach and Teichler 2001).

Other pull factors attributed to Nigeria are the few academic institutions becoming exceptional players in international education. The American University of Nigeria (AUN), located in the northeastern Nigerian city of Yola (Adamawa state), is one example. AUN was founded in 2005 as a private, non-profit university boasting 24/7 wireless Internet access and constant power (Ensign 2012; “Recent Development” 2005). This American-style institution was founded by Atiku Abubukar with initial help from The American University in Washington D.C. and Tulane University New Orleans (Ensign 2012). AUN’s mission concentrates heavily on recruiting top international and national faculty, the use of advanced technologies, and engagement with the local community of Christians and Muslims (2012). Moreover, AUN’s transparency concerning its tuition and fees makes potential students and institutional partners less weary of attending a school far from the American model of first world educational systems (2012).
A third pull factor for Nigeria is its proximity to successful study abroad programs in the West African region. Ghana remains the leading West African country attracting foreign students; for instance, in the 2011-2012 academic year 2,190 American students studied there (Institute of International Education 2013a). Prominent U.S. institutions such as New York University (NYU) claim that its students can “sit in class with the best and the brightest of Ghana’s youth,” and learn from Ghana’s local professors or intern at reputable nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) (New York University 2014). These already established study abroad programs in relative proximity to Nigeria means that the West African region is indeed visible on the global study abroad map—some countries are just more recognized than others.

It should not go unstated, though, that Nigeria has made efforts to brand itself in order to highlight its pull factors. Some of the first structured branding projects for Nigeria emerged during the 1990s such as the “Giant of Africa” initiative and the “Nigeria Image Project” (Ntamu 2011, 5). However, they failed to leave a lasting impact. Later, in 2009, a Nigerian professor helped launch the “Good People, Great Nation” branding effort (Rundell 2010, 66). More recently, discussions center on Nigeria’s burgeoning Nollywood film industry to help brand the country in a positive, entertaining light (Karvelyte and Chiu 2011). Even though these branding initiatives have yet to drastically change the world’s perception of Nigeria, scholars maintain that much of the country’s branding can occur simultaneously while it attempts to make tangible progress towards poverty reduction, anti-corruption regulations, and business developments (Rundell 2010; Collins and Gbadamosi 2011).

---

30 Countries geographically situated near Nigeria that host foreign students each year are: Cameroon, Gambia, Ghana, Côte d’Ivoire, and Senegal. For exact numbers, consult UNESCO’s Global Education Digest report on inward student mobility (2012) or the Institution of International Education’s 2013 Open Doors Report.
Summary:

This case study looked at Nigeria’s economic, political and cultural climate in relation to international education. By analyzing existing empirical data on Nigerian student mobility, I showed how the prevailing push factors within Nigeria’s postsecondary institutions continue to encourage outward mobility of its students. Other push factors discouraging study abroad partnerships with first world universities include: political unrest, cultural and religious clashes, and an oil-dependent economy. However, with a large English-speaking population, some standout universities like the American University of Nigeria and national branding initiatives, there are indeed pull factors present in the country. What matters, then, is how international education professionals generally view these kinds of push-pull factors, which will be analyzed in greater detail in the next chapter.

Conclusion

I used a multi-method approach to address the puzzles relating to nontraditional study abroad destinations, and to investigate how international educators evaluate new study abroad partnerships. Chapter Four outlined how the data were collected, due to the detailed and intricate process required for the research. The survey and in-depth interviews provide the main quantitative and qualitative data, while the case study on Nigeria offers a deeper analysis of the country’s historical development and current higher education system. In this way, Chapter Four bridges the conceptual chapters with the empirical chapters. Henceforth, the next chapter focuses exclusively on the research findings and analyses that will lead into the final discussion and recommendations for Nigeria.
CHAPTER FIVE: RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

Introduction

Chapter Five presents the results of the mixed methods approach. By utilizing multiple methods for this research, I was able to gather data from international education professionals who are highly familiar with the study abroad process. These educators and administrators at U.S. colleges and universities have detailed knowledge of their institutions’ global initiatives and academic exchange procedures. This method also helps to show why a country such as Nigeria might be held back due to its push-pull factors when trying to attract students from all regions of the world. The first section of this chapter provides an analysis of the survey questionnaire. Building on that quantitative analysis, I review the results from the in-depth interviews using a thematic analysis. I close the chapter by addressing the study’s limitations.

Survey Analysis

Overview:

The overall goal of the survey is to assess the pull factors that host universities in nontraditional locations should possess and the push factors that limit a nation from having attractive global institutions. In addition, the survey accounts for the criteria that determine the site of study abroad programs according to experts and also how such factors matter for nontraditional destinations. The survey analysis incorporates both descriptive statistics (frequencies, cross tabulations) and inferential statistics (correlations, chi-square significance testing). After reviewing some of the key demographic findings to construct a general picture of
the survey population, I take a closer look at the respondents’ engagement with global society to see if they assume cosmopolitan personas. Then, I review the results of the questions relating to study abroad program criteria and branding approaches before disaggregating the data based on study abroad locations in Africa. Lastly, I evaluate the responses for the survey’s one open-ended question. The results and analysis of the survey leads into the supplemental in-depth interview analysis.

Demographic Findings:

As Table 1 in the previous chapter indicated, survey participants were in greater proportion female (65.6%) than male (32.8%) and a large majority of respondents identified themselves as White or European (87.1%). Interestingly, these numbers resemble the general study abroad trends among U.S. students going abroad. According to the most recent Open Doors Report, during the 2011-2012 academic year, more females than males (64.8% and 35.2%, respectively) studied abroad, and a greater number of White students (76.4%) went abroad than other races or ethnicities (Institute of International Education 2013b).

For the analysis, I wanted to see if any differences emerged based on respondents’ type of college or university (four-year public or private institution). It is widely known that academic institutions each have their own variation of funding models and approaches to providing educational services (including study abroad) to students and faculty. Of the survey population, more respondents were affiliated with private non-profit institutions (59.4%) than public non-profit institutions (40.6%). The breakdown of respondents corresponds to the current (2012-13) distribution of 4-year degree-granting postsecondary institutions in the U.S. – there are more
private non-profit institutions (1,555) than public non-profit institutions (689) in the United States (NCES 2013).

**Cosmopolitan Characteristics of Respondents:**

After responding to demographic and location-related questions, I wanted to see the extent to which the survey population assumed cosmopolitan roles, if any. I speculated that if respondents’ characteristics were similar to that of cosmopolitans or world citizens, it might affect their overall understanding of global cultures and their consideration of study abroad destinations. Accordingly, participants were asked questions based on their engagement with global society. This category within the survey questionnaire first asked respondents to rate their level of agreement with the statement: *I believe that global education is a central part of my college or university’s mission*, ranked on a scale from 1=Strongly Agree to 5=Strongly Disagree (M=2.41; SD=1.163). Over 60% of respondents agree or strongly agree with the statement, suggesting that the U.S. colleges or universities they work for acknowledge the importance of international education. Figure 7 illustrates the distribution of responses.
Apart from how respondents’ felt about their institution’s educational mission, they were asked about their prior study abroad experiences, foreign language proficiency, international travel experience, and frequency of following international news. I chose to ask these questions because scholars such as Trilokekar and Rasmi’s (2011) note how “…students who study abroad tend to have prior international experiences, including travel and foreign language fluency” (505). While Trilokekar and Rasmi’s work centered on students’ intent to study abroad, their statement encouraged me to find out if the same was true for international educators. The difference is that I consider respondents’ intent to approve study abroad programs in nontraditional destinations.

Unsurprisingly, when asked if respondents had studied abroad before, a majority (67.2%) indicated that they have prior experience going abroad as a student, as shown in Figure 8. On average, most participants (71.2%) indicated that they know one or two languages other than English as opposed to the respondents who claimed proficiency in three or more foreign

![Figure 7: Respondents’ Level of Agreement to Global Education Question](chart)

- Strongly Agree: 28.24%
- Agree: 46.36%
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Level of Agreement
languages (10.6%) and respondents who indicated that they have proficiency in no languages other than English (18.2%).

![Respondents' Previous Participation in Study Abroad](image)

**Figure 8: Respondents’ Study Abroad Experience**

Nearly half of respondents (48.4%) said they travel two to four times per year for leisure or for work; 39.1% said they travel one or fewer times per year; and 12.5% of respondents travel more than four times a year. When asked, *how frequently do you follow international news (via television, Internet, newspaper and/or magazines)*? a majority of respondents (60.0%) said that they monitor international news five to ten hours per week. Just 30.8% of respondents said that they follow international news four or less hours per week and 9.2% said they follow international news for more than 11 hours per week (See Figures 15-16 in Appendix A1 for a visual breakdown of these responses). The results from the survey’s questions about global engagement strongly suggest that participants have many opportunities to interact with multicultural societies and maintain their global identities due to the nature of their professional environment and previous international experiences.
Criteria of Study Abroad Sites:

The next part of the survey’s analysis focuses on the criteria relevant for study abroad program sites in developing countries. Respondents were asked using a 5-point Likert scale to rate the importance of academic environments and institutional support that study abroad programs in nontraditional regions should have. Table 3 identifies the three measures based on respondents’ level of agreement with the following statements:

Table 3: Academic Environments and Institutional Support Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q#13</td>
<td>“The study abroad program should offer specialized fields of study that are not offered at a students’ home institution”</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q# 17</td>
<td>“I believe that the host university abroad should offer some scholarships to students (to help offset tuition, housing and transportation costs).”</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q# 19</td>
<td>“The host university should have an emergency management and response system in place, and immediately notify campus administrators in the U.S. if any crises should arise.”</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note for Mean score: 1 = Strongly Agree; 5 = Strongly Disagree
Cronbach’s alpha = .408

The most prominent result is from question 19 about having an emergency protocol in place. The average rating score for this question is 1.20, which reveals that a large majority of respondents (84.4%) strongly agree that host universities should plan for emergencies or disasters. In fact, no respondents (0%) said that they disagree or strongly disagree with the statement in question 19. This result is shown in Figure 9. On the other hand, respondents were rather lukewarm to the question about the host university offering scholarships to their students (37.1% said they neither agree nor disagree with the statement). For question 13, a plurality

---

31 See Figures 17 and 18 in Appendix A1 for graphic representation of survey responses for questions 13 and 17.
agreed (38.3%) that the study abroad program should offer specialized academic programs that
students might not be offered at their home university, but 20% of respondents disagreed with
the same statement. While the Cronbach’s alpha suggests that the internal consistency of these
items is somewhat low, looking at each question individually can still provide meaningful
information regarding study abroad program development.

The other component of the academic environment and institutional support categories of
the survey was question 18, which asked participants to: select the amenities that a study abroad
program in a developing country should offer students. This question allowed participants to
select more than one option; therefore a multiple response analysis was run in SPSS to
summarize the results. A breakdown of the descriptive statistics is as shown in Table 4.
Table 4: Summary of Respondents’ Choices Regarding Study Abroad Amenities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing amenities</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical and health amenities</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer and Internet amenities</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library and research amenities</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational and sport amenities</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other amenities</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>244</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we can see, the subcategories of housing and medical/health amenities dominated respondents’ answers. This means that securing accommodation and having access to medical care are the two most important amenities that developing countries should have if they are hosting foreign students. There was an option for respondents to select ‘Other’ and fill in their own responses. Some people indicated that orientation and travel excursions are useful, as well as cultural activities so students can interact with the local community. Additionally, some respondents mentioned that having an on-site local contact or staff is needed as well as the host destination having emergency assistance services, which relates back to the survey question about emergency protocols.

Branding and Marketing Approaches:

In order to answer the research questions pertaining to the push-pull factors of a country and how they affect U.S. international educators, I analyzed the survey questions related to branding and marketing. Respondents answered Likert-scale questions for three factors associated with branding and study abroad. Table 5 summarizes the findings, and Figures 10-12
provide an illustration of the results. As we will see, data from these questions help to show how developing countries’ might want to brand themselves to appeal to foreign students and administrators.

Table 5: Respondents’ Thoughts Relating to Branding Strategies for Host Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#20</td>
<td>“The host institution should maintain an updated campus website with information regarding its study abroad programs.”</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#21</td>
<td>“The university abroad should have a social media presence (such as Facebook, Twitter, Google Plus, and/or LinkedIn).”</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>.868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#22</td>
<td>“The host institution should have a prepared set of brochures, fliers, postcards and other informative material (electronic and/or hard copy) that can be disbursed to prospective students and faculty members.”</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>.738</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: for Mean score 1= Strongly Agree; 5 =Strongly Disagree
Cronbach’s alpha = .715

As shown in Figure 10, a majority (62.5%) strongly agreed that foreign host institutions should maintain an updated website while half (50.8%) of respondents agreed that the host institution in a developing country should have promotional materials for potential students or
faculty members. Conversely, more respondents were indifferent (M=2.41) to the prompt: *The university abroad should have a social media presence (such as Facebook, Twitter, Google Plus, and/or LinkedIn)*, as shown in Figure 12. The results suggest that respondents care more about the foreign host university having an up-to-date website with pertinent information and tangible information (such as fliers, e-brochures, etc.) than the university abroad maintaining a social media presence. With a relatively high Cronbach’s alpha (.715), the three questions about branding are closely related and have internal consistency, which further emphasizes the importance of asking these types of questions.

![Host University Should Have a Social Media Presence](image)

*Figure 12: Responses to Social Media Presence Question*

For the next part of the analysis on the branding questions, I used inferential statistics to see if there were relationships between variables by running correlations in SPSS (See Table 6). The findings imply that there are statistically significant relationships between branding
variables. In other words, respondents thought highly of these survey items, especially when thinking of them as a group.

Table 6: Correlations Between Website, Social Media and Marketing Materials Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Host university should maintain updated website</th>
<th>Host university should have social media presence</th>
<th>Host university should prepare marketing materials (brochures, fliers, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Host university should maintain updated website</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.377**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host university should have social media presence</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.377**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host university should prepare marketing materials (brochures, fliers, etc.)</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.674**</td>
<td>.392**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note*: **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Having an updated website correlates quite strongly with the marketing materials variable (r=0.674). This result suggests that the international educators who care about the host institution maintaining their website also think that having a set of marketing materials for potential students and faculty is important. The factor examining a host institution’s website and social media presence (r=0.377) does not correlate as strongly as the previous variables, but a positive relationship does exist. The marketing materials variable and social media variable are also correlated to each other (r=0.392), meaning that respondents who said marketing materials are important also think social media is important for host universities in developing countries.
Analysis of Study Abroad Locations:

The survey’s analysis also shows how respondents answered questions based on the geographic location of study abroad destinations. Cross tabulations with chi-square tests were conducted to go beyond the basic descriptive analyses. This approach allowed me to see which criteria and pull factors are the most important for study abroad destinations in nontraditional locations. First, I wanted to gain a general understanding of respondents’ level of agreement with the following statement: A summer of semester-long study abroad program in a developing country can be just as rewarding for students as a program in a developed country. A vast majority of respondents (73.0%) strongly agreed with the statement above, suggesting that students can benefit from studying in nontraditional regions as well as traditional regions. Figure 13 shows how people responded.

![Figure 13: Respondents’ Level of Agreement to Study Abroad Type of Location](image)

Figure 13: Respondents’ Level of Agreement to Study Abroad Type of Location
In terms of specific study abroad destinations, one question asked respondents to identify where their institution sends students abroad, based on six of the world’s continents. This question allowed participants to choose more than one region, so a multiple response analysis was conducted in SPSS to summarize the results. Of the 62 people who answered the question, all respondents (100%) indicated that their institution sends students to study abroad in Europe. This result is consistent with earlier discussions of Europe being the dominant and traditional study abroad host country for foreign students. Since the focus of this paper is on Nigeria, I chose to look more closely at the responses specific to the African world region.

I further disaggregated the data by looking at how respondents who said their U.S. institution sends students to study in Africa relate to the amenities these regions should have. Table 7 summarizes these findings.

Table 7: World Region Africa and Amenities Selected as Important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amenities</th>
<th>N (Yes)</th>
<th>Pearson Chi-Square</th>
<th>Significant? (p&lt;.05)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.807</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical and health</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer and Internet</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.660</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library and research</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational and sport</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.592</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>183</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the people who said their U.S. institution sends students to study in Africa, 44 said yes – that housing should be provided. However, after running cross tabulations in SPSS, none of the chi-square tests indicated levels of significance between the two variables. Nevertheless, Table 7

\[32\text{ Note: The world regions question did not include an option to choose “Multiple Destinations” or a separate category for “Middle East/North Africa.” See the Limitations section of this chapter for further discussion.}\]
reiterates the fact that more respondents consider housing and medical/health amenities to be the most valuable resources to provide to foreign students in a nontraditional country.

Next, I ran cross tabulations based on the African world region and the questions associated with branding. Of the people who indicated that their U.S. institution sends students to Africa, none of the associations between this region of the world and branding were statistically significant (Table 8 displays the findings). Although the chi-square values did not indicate the relationships between variables as significant, we can see from the table that generally, branding was considered to be important among respondents (i.e., no respondents strongly disagreed with the statements).

Table 8: Study Abroad World Region Africa and Branding Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Branding</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Pearson Chi-Square</th>
<th>Significant? (p&lt;.05)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Host university should maintain updated website</td>
<td>N=30</td>
<td>N=15</td>
<td>N=4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1.048</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host university should have social media</td>
<td>N=6</td>
<td>N=19</td>
<td>N=20</td>
<td>N=4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.986</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host university should have marketing materials</td>
<td>N=13</td>
<td>N=24</td>
<td>N=10</td>
<td>N=1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1.330</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 'N/A' means that respondents did not choose the scale item

African Regions:

I continued to explore the data by analyzing several variables in relation to the survey question: *To which of the following regions in Africa does your college or university currently send study abroad students?* This was also a multiple response question, and participants had the
option to choose from: North Africa; West Africa; Central Africa; East Africa; Southern Africa; and Not Applicable. Overall, Southern Africa was the most selected region of Africa, which resembles the 2011-2012 Open Doors Report that Southern Africa receives the highest number of U.S. students who study abroad in Africa (Institute of International Education 2013a).

Breaking down the data further by regions in Africa provides a clearer understanding for what a country like Nigeria (which falls under the West Africa category) needs to do to become a stronger study abroad host country.

Since housing and medical/health amenities were the most popular choices, I ran cross tabulations on both relationships based on each of the African regions. Table 9 presents the findings.

**Table 9: African Study Abroad Regions and Amenities Selected as Important**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>African Region</th>
<th>Amenities</th>
<th>N (Yes)</th>
<th>Pearson Chi-Square</th>
<th>Significant? (p&lt;.05)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Africa</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medical and health</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.205</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Africa</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.105</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medical and health</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.500</td>
<td>Yes (p=0.0338)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Africa</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.518</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medical and health</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.588</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Africa</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.508</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medical and health</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.224</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medical and health</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the people who said that their institution does send students to these specific regions of Africa, we can see how again, none of the chi-square tests indicated statistically significant relationships, except for the West African region. What this result suggests is that respondents who send students to West Africa are more likely to indicate that medical and health amenities are the most important type of service that host universities should provide for visiting students.
To see if the results mirrored the earlier analysis of the Africa regions and branding, I ran a cross-tabulation with chi-square tests for the West African region and branding, shown in Table 10.

**Table 10: West Africa Study Abroad Region and Branding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Branding</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Pearson Chi-Square</th>
<th>Significant? (p&lt;.05)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Host university should maintain updated website</td>
<td>N=16</td>
<td>N=7</td>
<td>N=1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>.950</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host university should have social media</td>
<td>N=3</td>
<td>N=8</td>
<td>N=10</td>
<td>N=3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1.279</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host university should have marketing materials</td>
<td>N=4</td>
<td>N=16</td>
<td>N=3</td>
<td>N=1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5.478</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: 'N/A' means that respondents did not choose the scale item*

The results from the table above show that there are no significant differences between the branding variables when considering just West African study abroad regions. Cause for these results can also be attributed to the limited number of cases. Even though there is no statistically significant relation, we can see how these branding measures were still ranked relatively high by respondents. This quantitative analysis of the survey questionnaire provides useful information that can be applied to a country like Nigeria. The discussion section and recommendations for Nigeria use these findings as the basis for further discussion.

**Open-Ended Question Analysis:**

The survey questionnaire also provided respondents with the opportunity to respond to the open-ended question: *In a few words, please describe the process that your institution uses to establish new study abroad partnerships, particularly in developing countries.* Using a thematic
analysis from the 61 valid responses, I grouped data into five categories that naturally emerged from the respondents: faculty/academic connections; third-party affiliates; direct partnerships; on-site visits/research; and no set processes. While most respondents limited their answers to a few words or a sentence, some people provided a thorough walk-through of the process (see Figure 14). Overall, open-ended responses revealed a strong inclination toward faculty networking and professional connections among colleagues in the field of international education.

- **Faculty**: “New partnerships are generally faculty-initiated.”
- **Affiliates**: “We generally work with study abroad organizations, such as CIEE, which already has an established program and onsite resident director”
- **Direct Partnerships**: “We begin with Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) signed by both institutions’ leaders (Presidents, Rector, etc)”
- **On-site Visits/Research**: “Location, assessment of standards, visit.”
- **No-set process**: “We do not have an official process yet in place”

**Figure 14: Comments Related to Study Abroad Partnerships in Developing Nations**

Most notably, nearly half of responses indicated that faculty plays a major role in the development of new study abroad partnerships. Survey participants explained that faculty members often have input into the design and academic focus of a study abroad program. Faculty members are typically the ones to approve student petitions for independent studies and they participate in site visits to potential study destinations. Several respondents also noted that faculty-led study abroad programs are a critical part of their institution’s academic exchange initiatives, and four responses directly indicated that students’ overall interests are considered when faculties propose new programs. As one professional pointed out, “…geographic diversity

---

33 Note: All responses remain anonymous and cannot be traced back to the original participant since the survey did not collect any personal information.
in [our institution’s] overall portfolio leads us to work with faculty to identify curricular connections to countries/disciplines…” It was interesting to see how there appear to be many different approaches to study abroad program development.

The other major theme that emerged from the open-ended data relates to faculties’ connections with other professionals and organizations. One person’s comment lends meaning to the importance of cross-border relationships, as noted, “[m]ost partnerships come from relationships that faculty members have with colleagues at other institutions.” Interestingly, more than one person expressed the value that simple conversations (i.e., through existing relationships or at conferences and events) can have in building international educational strategies. The array of responses relating to the role of faculty in the study abroad process relates back to the literature on networks, which emphasizes the value of strong and weak ties, collaboration, and information sharing. The open-ended survey question provided further insight into the intricate process of establishing study abroad partnerships that would have been hard to measure solely through quantitative data.

Interview Analysis

Overview:

The personal interviews with practitioners in the field of international education helped to contextualize the current trends we see in study abroad. Through my discussions with eight experts, I was able to assess their thoughts on what it might take for Nigeria to break into the realm of study abroad and attract more foreign students from the developed world. I analyzed the qualitative results from these discussions using a thematic analysis based on the paper’s
conceptual framework: migration, push-pull factors, networks, cosmopolitanism, competitive advantage, and branding. Table 11 provides a summary of the key points raised in respect to these themes.  

Table 11: Key Themes as Reported Through In-Depth Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Migration/Mobility</th>
<th>Push-Pull</th>
<th>Networks</th>
<th>Cosmopolitans</th>
<th>Branding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More movement to nontraditional destinations</td>
<td>Perceived security level</td>
<td>Connection to on-the-ground local directors</td>
<td>Global citizenship</td>
<td>Honesty in marketing materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data to track student flows and evaluate host destination popularity</td>
<td>Experience “exotic” cultures</td>
<td>Geographic neighbors</td>
<td>Growing international workforce</td>
<td>Country’s overall reputation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum 8-10 students typically needed for new study abroad programs to launch</td>
<td>Language opportunities (English or foreign)</td>
<td>Technology to facilitate study abroad process</td>
<td>Previous study abroad experience linked to career interests</td>
<td>Word-of-mouth referrals and social media</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subcategory: Risk and Safety**  
Political instability, access to quality healthcare, limited Internet connectivity, transportation, housing

In reviewing the interviews, I saw that experts’ narratives reiterated several themes that were previously discussed in the theoretical and empirical literatures about international education. The interviewees all expressed similar challenges that Nigeria faces as an emerging study abroad destination. By far, issues about the country’s push-pull factors (and the subcategory of risk) as well as branding stood out the most. The analysis first summarizes the points raised with regard to mobility and cosmopolitanism, to gain a general notion of globalization’s influence on higher education. The analysis then delves into the key recurring themes of push-pull factors, risk, and branding.

---

34 See Appendix C1 (Interview Questions for Practitioners) for the complete list of interview questions.
Migration / Mobility:

A major theme that arose from the interviews involves student mobility. Interviewees did not hide the fact the Europe is still the dominant study abroad region for U.S. student mobility. However, several international education professionals acknowledged that students are moving to different parts of the world. In my interview with Craig Rinker, Director of Overseas Studies at Georgetown University on March 5, 2014, he noted how “we’re starting to see the development of more programs in nontraditional locations. It’s becoming more accessible” (Rinker, personal communication). The increased migration to nontraditional and developing countries might be attributed to students’ desires to experience the exoticness of a different culture (the term ‘exotic’ came up more than once). According to my interview with Dr. Jason Sanderson, Senior Overseas Studies Advisor at Georgetown University on February 27, 2014, students simply “want to experience something different” and those who go to Africa particularly want an experience “that’s really going to push themselves outside their envelope of comfort” (Sanderson, pers. comm.). Nontraditional destinations are now popular channels for students who want a learning experience unlike Europe, especially if they have traveled there before.

Equally related to the theme of migration and mobility, I asked interviewees to share their thoughts about the influx of study abroad data and how their institution keeps track of student flows. All of the experts expressed how collecting study abroad data is extremely relevant in the age of globalization. In a Skype interview with Dr. Laurent Boetsch, Director of International Education at Washington and Lee University on February 28, 2014, he explained that data and technologies help institutions to “see where we go and where we ought to be going” (Boetsch,
According to Dr. Laura Engel, Assistant Professor of International Education and International Affairs at George Washington University on February 24, 2014, “these data are incredibly useful for research terms–for trends–but also for decision-making on a day-to-day” basis (Engel, pers. comm.). Other experts echoed this sentiment, noting how data are important for university-level research, including the assessment of a host destination’s interest, plans to construct new buildings abroad, or the hiring of more faculties.

Cosmopolitanism:

When asked if studying abroad can help students become global citizens, a general consensus formed among respondents that it is not the only way for individuals to acquire the identity of a world citizen. Nevertheless, interviewees emphasized that spending time abroad during one’s academic career typically makes students more aware of global cultures. On February 28, 2014, I had the opportunity to talk via phone with Angela Shaeffer, Program Development Director at Cultural Vistas (a non-profit cultural exchange organization). Shaeffer noted how “there’s really a renewed focus placed on people being ready to work not just in any country really, but rather, with people from any country – from any cultural background” (Shaeffer, pers. comm.). Other interviewees shared similar views, highlighting the need for empathy and an active engagement with other cultures instead of simply vacationing abroad for leisure or passively watching international media.

I also asked how professionals in the field of international education might assume cosmopolitan roles. Reflecting on his time at Georgetown University’s Office of International Programs (OIP), one respondent characterized of his colleagues: “I think they have a personal
investment of wanting to always expand their knowledge of cultures—many of them that’s their passion for why they’re here” (Rinker, pers. comm.). In our discussion on March 10, 2014, Dr. Margaret Himley, Associate Provost for International Education and Engagement at Syracuse University agreed. She pointed out that people in international education are “…open to difference; they like traveling; they themselves tend to be pretty adventuresome people” (Himley, pers. comm.). As expected, a majority (seven out of eight) of the interviewees studied abroad as a student. Their experiences largely influenced their career trajectory and interest in the field of international education.

**Push-Pull Factors:**

The literature in Chapter Two explored how cities might be positive pull factors for nations. Accordingly, I asked experts to think about the advantages developing countries might have if their study abroad programs are housed in major cities. There was some variation in people’s response to the question. Based on my discussions, South Africa came up as a Sub-Saharan African location with many well-known cities. For instance, Cape Town attracts a number of Georgetown students because of the city’s natural beauty and due to “the strength of some very good universities there” (Rinker, pers. comm.). A city like Cape Town offers students the opportunity to discover a nation’s unique history while being exposed to several languages and a diverse academic populace. For these reasons, more students tend to “gravitate towards cities” and can “take advantage of nightlife, cultural aspects, travel—however you want to look at it,” according to one expert (Rinker, pers. comm.).

On the other hand, some respondents noted how small towns or villages outside of cities
could be beneficial for students. While Dr. Boetsch believes that “being anchored in a city is an advantage” for study abroad destinations, he did mention how smaller towns offer something different to students compared to a country’s bigger metropolises. Dr. Engel agreed that study destinations “outside of cities offers very unique perspectives into cultural practices” and “the life of a community” (Engel, pers. comm.). She added, “Urban centers can be...thought of or perceived as more crime-ridden” in addition to the perception that “urban environments don’t give you the ‘real’ perspective of life of a country” (Engel, pers. comm.). These discussions of geographic push-pull factors often transitioned into the topic of risk.

Risk and Safety:

While risk was not a predetermined theme for the interview questions, all the respondents had much to say about risk and safety when it comes to administering study abroad programs in nontraditional destinations. According to Dr. Himley, U.S. institutions must consider “the general on-the-ground political stability” of the potential study abroad destination because “so much of it is risk” (Himley, pers. comm.). Part of her experience working for Syracuse University’s study abroad office involves the administrative oversight of new study abroad partnerships (such as their program in Istanbul, Turkey). Himley brought up several of the challenges that U.S. institutions face with rapidly changing environments. Oftentimes, the political or cultural situations of a country change dramatically over a short period, no matter how safe the region has been in years past.

Two respondents shared how countries listed on the U.S. State Department’s Travel Warnings site have much more to prove to U.S. academic institutions. The utmost priority for
host destinations is to ensure foreign students’ safety while studying abroad. Dr. Engel used the term “risk management” to express the university-level system that should already be in place when students go abroad. For instance, “Risk management comes in when you talk about moving a group into rural areas for field visits…and there’s no known addresses” (Engel, pers. comm.). For some nontraditional destinations, Internet connectivity is still intermittent, so finding one’s location is not as simple as using Google Maps. The key takeaway from these discussions on risk and safety indicates that international education professionals take seriously their institution’s role of reducing risk and ensuring security for its students when they participate in academic exchange programs, especially in nontraditional and developing countries.

Branding:

Given the challenges associated with risk and safety for study abroad programs, I asked experts how branding might play a role in the way U.S. academic institutions and professionals perceive developing nations and their universities. Several respondents mentioned how countries can present themselves in a positive light via branding. However, if branding is not skillfully done, poor strategies can create even more misconceptions about a nation. As Angela Shaeffer expressed: “as a former advisor and as a former study abroad participant myself, something that’s really important is to be very honest with people” (Shaeffer, pers. comm.). Her point echoes earlier points from the literature review that the best branding is trustworthy and credible.

For U.S.-based organizations that send students to nontraditional destinations, branding also plays a role. For example, Cultural Vistas does not promise “five-star accommodations” when advertising its programs in nontraditional destinations (Shaeffer, pers. comm.). Rather, the
organization’s marketing strategy promises an experience “that’s going to challenge students” and according to Shaeffer, “we promise them they’re going to learn a lot” while developing their language skills, gaining professional experience, and sharpening their academic interests (Shaeffer, pers. comm.). Many respondents expressed how nontraditional destinations, such as Nigeria, should recognize that most students want to know what their actual experience will entail, and do not want to scour through misleading marketing materials that claim to mimic the experience of traditional destinations.

Considerations for Nigeria:

Emerging from the questions related to branding, the international education professionals offered some of their own insight as to why Nigeria has a low global profile as a study abroad destination. Aptly put, Nigeria is “a tough sell” to U.S. academic institutions and study abroad offices according to Dr. Boetsch. Dr. Sanderson explained how “probably the biggest challenge for Nigeria unfortunately is reputation,” and “when it does get press in the U.S. media it is never positive,” citing the frequent stories about ethnic conflicts or oil (Sanderson, pers. comm.).

So what will it take for U.S. universities or program providers to consider Nigeria as a reputable study abroad destination? According to Sanderson, faculty members can push for a particular program abroad, especially if there is likely collaboration or “potential for doing research jointly,” which tends to accelerate the approval process (Sanderson, pers. comm.). Likewise, Nigeria can break into the study abroad field by honing in on its regional strengths and existing academic partners. As one expert suggests, “the way to do this is, somehow, to think
about connecting Nigerian academics and intellectuals with their counterparts in the United States. Those kinds of relationships are what eventually produce collaboration” (Boetsch, pers. comm.). Boetsch’s comment relates to earlier discussions about educational networks and the positive externalities that arise when people or organizations create more relationships via collaboration.

As well, Nigeria’s universities can extend their academic reach by networking with their regional neighbors. One example is Ghana, a nation that offers academic exchange opportunities for U.S. and foreign students. In my discussion with Dr. Engel, she stated, “I think there’s a lot of value in seeing what regionally, your neighbors are doing” and considers Ghana as a practical example to “think through what exactly has been successful” in terms of the country’s academic strategies (Boetsch, pers. comm.). Of course, if an emerging country like Nigeria were to model after other countries’ study abroad strategies, it should be contextualized to meet the specific needs of the nation.

**Limitations of the Study:**

Several limitations exist from this research study. While administering the survey questionnaire online eliminated costs and reduced response times for participants, technical difficulties may have affected the final completion rate. In terms of the survey’s design, respondents only had to answer questions they felt comfortable responding to, so the analysis was conducted on a question-by-question basis. Survey question 6, (study abroad world regions) should have been categorized based on the eight regions in the IIE’s recent *Open Doors Report*
and not six of the seven world continents.\textsuperscript{35} Including a ‘multiple regions’ option or ‘other’ category, would allow participants to distinguish between Semester at Sea programs and multi-city study programs. The survey questionnaire also did not attempt to measure an institution’s finite counts of student study abroad participation rates. Instead, respondents’ estimations and knowledge of their institutions’ study abroad and international education endeavors are the basis of the results.

For the in-depth interviews, I selected participants through a non-probability sampling process based on their geographic location and availability during the study’s limited timeframe. Therefore, my decision process for choosing participants was convenience-based and not as robust as a larger study with funding or multiple research staff. In addition, the ideas expressed by international education experts in this study may not fully reflect all the opinions of experts from other U.S. colleges and universities, especially from other geographic regions not represented in the study.

The small sample size of the survey and interview population does not allow me to generalize data beyond the group of participants who responded. I also do not attempt to make broad claims about all nontraditional study abroad destinations. Given the varied cultural, political and economic backgrounds of every country, I use Nigeria as just one example of a developing nation that can become a stronger study abroad host destination. Finally, this thesis is not a longitudinal study or intended to track student mobility to nontraditional destinations. Instead, the thesis offers some of the general opinions and thoughts that international education

\textsuperscript{35} The regions were: Sub-Saharan Africa, Asia, Europe, Oceania, Middle East & North Africa, Latin America & Caribbean, North America, Antarctica and Multiple ("Fast Facts" 2013).
professionals have when their institutions are considering study abroad programs in developing countries.

Conclusion

Throughout this analysis of the survey and interviews with international education professionals, we have seen how the themes from the paper’s conceptual framework run parallel to the ideas expressed by the experts. Data extrapolated from the quantitative survey questionnaire informed us of how factors such as housing, medical care, and branding influence experts’ thoughts of a foreign university. Even with the various opinions and thoughts from the interviews, many experts agreed that Nigeria struggles with a poor country image and that its universities need to convince U.S. institutions or cultural exchange providers that safety is a top priority for visiting students. The survey and interviews also revealed the crucial role of faculty in the brainstorming and implementation phases of program development. Through this multi-method research, I gathered series of data that speaks to the challenges Nigeria needs to overcome to become a more competitive global education leader.
CHAPTER SIX: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

The last chapter, Chapter Six, ties together the research project. I begin with interpretations and a discussion of the findings and then outline some recommendations that Nigeria can apply from this research. This last chapter also suggests directions for future research, before the concluding remarks. The discussion is based on my four original research questions and conceptual framework. I reemphasize that the most significant findings from this research emerged from factors that I did not originally foresee, namely, perceived risk and faculty engagement. As we shall see, the unanticipated and anticipated factors that I expected to hold true heavily influence the trend of U.S. students studying abroad in nontraditional destinations.

Discussion of the Main Findings

This study examined the qualities that nontraditional study abroad program sites should have, according to the values of international educators and administrators. In particular, it examines the relationship between several push-pull factors and a college’s or university’s intent to recommend (or not recommend) a new study abroad program in a developing country. The research questions concerning push-pull factors and the criteria for study abroad sites relied on the survey for answers, while the research questions about the general trend towards nontraditional study destinations and branding looked to experts’ answers from the in-depth
interviews. During the analysis, I encountered some overlap when I considered the results from the survey and interviews together.

For the first research question that asked what accounts for the shift towards nontraditional study abroad destinations in light of globalization, I expected to find supporting evidence that students are becoming more and more cosmopolitan. In turn, students’ identities as world citizens would contribute, at least in some part, to their inclination to study abroad in nontraditional destinations. The interview data supported this notion. For example, experts argued that the importance to have transferable skills for a global workforce is growing. Also, the interviews suggested that students who wish to study abroad in Africa often want to interact with distinctive cultures on a deeper level, in ways that are not offered to them in Europe or other traditional regions.

I also expected to find that many international education professionals themselves carry the persona of cosmopolitans, and use it in their day-to-day work. Whether it is to encourage students to consider all of their study abroad options or to help students gain a better understanding of a country’s cultural and social environment, becoming a cosmopolitan helps inform their decisions. Both the interviews and the surveys supported this expectation. The previous chapter showed how a majority of the survey and interview respondents had previously studied abroad, suggesting they had at least some interest in global cultures at an early age. The survey results also showed that most participants travel internationally at least two to four times per year, watches or reads international news several hours per week, and is skilled in at least one language other than English. While not all the respondents may consider themselves as
cosmopolitans, the literature suggests that these factors may be the steppingstones for a person to begin to engage with others as a global citizen.

In contrast, I did not expect to find that academic faculty members are really the drivers behind new program development in nontraditional study abroad destinations. More faculty interest in nontraditional regions such as Asia, Latin America and Africa can potentially counter globalization’s uneven forces that favor education abroad to traditional destinations. The analysis of the survey’s open-ended question revealed how many institutions rely on faculty members to build partnerships with foreign institutions through professional and academic networking. Furthermore, several U.S. institutions use short-term faculty-led summer programs as a gateway into new study abroad programs in nontraditional countries, and it is often faculty members that assist study abroad offices or university administration in the initial site visits or logistical planning.

The next research question asked how the push-pull factors of a country affect U.S. international education professionals and what the necessary components are in determining new study abroad programs in a developing country. Limited risk and high safety were the most critical pull factor that a nontraditional study abroad country should have. Push factors are inter alia, high chances of political instability, wars, or environmental disasters that drive students away from the country. To limit the potential for risky situations, host institutions need to have an emergency management and response system in place, as indicated by results from the survey (95% of respondents either strongly agreed or agreed to the statement that an emergency response system is important). It should be noted that I did not expect to find such a strong
pattern to emerge around the theme of safety and risk among interviewees or the survey’s questions.

Relating to a host country’s ability to convince U.S. institutions that successful academic exchanges can take place, is the research question that asked whether the ratio push-pull factors are changing in the favor of developing countries and if branding plays a role. While the research did not reveal much about the specific ratio of push-pull factors, data collected in relation to branding paints a picture of how international educators within this population associate branding to study abroad program development in nontraditional destinations. The survey’s three questions about branding and marketing approaches supports earlier discussions about the literature focusing on destination and place branding. Basically, consumers value products or services from developed countries more than products or services from developing nations (Papadopoulos 2004).

In response to two of the survey questions related to branding, a majority of survey respondents agreed that the foreign host university should maintain an updated website and should have a prepared set of marketing materials for potential students and institutions. One can argue that these host universities should brand themselves in ways that illustrate their seriousness of sharing accurate information and communicating their benefits to patrons. Since the question about social media had mixed levels of agreement, this aspect of branding should only be a secondary approach, if at all, among institutions in nontraditional destinations.

Thematic analysis from the interview suggests that branding matters for a country like Nigeria. Experts stressed the importance for a country to have a positive reputation. Such a reputation (positive or negative) spills over to a nation’s higher education institutions.
Unfortunately, Nigeria continues to struggle with a perception that the entire country is unsafe and risky even though much of it is regional (Rinker, pers. comm.). Therefore, if a student or faculty from the U.S. expresses his or her interest in studying abroad in Nigeria, campus authorities (such as risk management or institutional research committees) will be very hesitant to approve a program there. Plus, negative word-of-mouth publicity and poor personal referrals hold significant weight in a country’s overall brand perception as noted by interviewees.

The last research question: *has the criteria that determines the site of foreign educational programs changed in the context of present-day globalization*, did not measure how much the criteria has changed over time, but the results did reinforce which conditions are the most important for experts in terms of amenities offered to students while they are abroad. The multiple-choice survey question ranked housing accommodations and medical services as the leading amenities that nontraditional host destinations should provide. Although amenities such as research and library resources, Internet access, recreation and sporting facilities all bear weight, housing and medical access for a country like Nigeria should be the top priority. The high statistical significance between housing and medical amenities and respondents who said their institution sends students to West Africa supports this argument.

Although I expected more statistically significant relationships between certain amenities and study abroad regions of Africa, housing and health-related services relate back to the dominant theme of safety while being abroad. If students are guaranteed secure accommodations and they know that their medical needs will be met, university administrators can focus on the more nuanced details specific to the needs of an institution’s goals and learning outcomes. Moreover, the discussions and interpretations imply that my original conceptual framework
should include the factors of faculty support and risk management. Nevertheless, I am still able to offer basic recommendations for Nigeria, outlined in the next section.

**Recommendations for Nigeria**

Based on the findings from the study, I present some recommendations that Nigeria should consider if it wants to host more foreign students for study abroad programs. As the literatures have shown, a nation can alter its competitiveness by enhancing its local firms’ innovativeness or its organizations’ productivity (Porter 1990). For this paper, a developing country can increase the competitiveness of its universities by changing its national policies and strengthening the unique educational resources that are not offered elsewhere. It is only then that more students, faculty, and researchers from abroad will be willing to migrate temporarily for academic purposes. The bases for Nigeria’s recommendations are organized into two categories: one with reference to the university-level and the other to the national-level.

On the university level, Nigeria’s academic institutions should rely heavily on the university’s existing professoriate and expand its course development. Nigerian professors, especially those who have previous study abroad or research experience from first world universities, should maintain their personal connections to international scholars and global organizations. As the data from the interviews and survey suggests, university partnerships often arise from faculty connections and networking that build relationships over time. Nigerian faculty members can use their established relationships with other international faculties, to help Nigerian universities develop courses that most foreign students cannot take at their home institution. Some examples could be courses on public health, environmentalism, or energy...
studies, as the literature and interviews noted how students who study in nontraditional locations tend to gravitate towards these academic disciplines.

On the national level, Nigeria can gradually become a stronger study abroad host destination by learning from its geographically strong neighbors and focusing on its regional strengths within the country. Governmental organizations such as the Federal Ministry of Education might consider building partnerships with neighboring countries such as Ghana or Cameroon, because these nations already attract foreign students from the U.S. and elsewhere for short-term and long-term study abroad programs. Nigeria can see what these countries are doing successfully and transfer back some of those strategies to fit the cultural, political, and economic context of Nigerian society. Also, Nigeria should focus on regions that are not generally prone to ethnic conflicts or major political instabilities as potential study abroad sites. For instance, the University of Ibadan, the University of Lagos and UNIBEN (The University of Benin) are major Nigerian universities in the country’s southern or western region that do not face as much geopolitical instability as often reported by international media.

At both levels, Nigeria needs to rework its overall communication strategy. As stressed by many of the interviewees, Nigeria has an overwhelmingly negative country perception. The country needs to develop a destination branding and international communication strategy that dispels existing myths but remains honest about the Nigerian cultural experience to attract more foreign visitors as a place for leisure, business and education. Should Nigeria’s postsecondary institutions decide to reach out to first world universities for academic partnerships, they must have an updated website and marketing materials with up-to-date, honest information for professionals and potential students. These recommendations are by no means exhaustive, but
they are ways to help Nigeria be perceived as a place where one can receive a quality education through study abroad.

**Directions for Future Studies**

There is much room left for discussion and debate concerning the topic of study abroad in nontraditional destinations. Because the recommendations in the previous section were not comprehensive nor did they offer step-by-step approaches, a more thorough policy analysis on Nigeria’s higher education system would be beneficial. In my mention of Nigerian academics’ role to build international partnerships, a deeper investigation can take place about Nigerian professors or university administrators at Nigerian universities, to compare their thoughts about study abroad to those of U.S. education professionals. More data collection relating to a country’s risk factors (and the ability to measure it in a quantifiable way) might also tell us why some nontraditional destinations are more popular study abroad hosts. There are countless ways to extend the work of this cross-disciplinary thesis, especially since the field of international education is rapidly changing and expanding.

A unique next step for this thesis that speaks to the modernity of our society would consider the potential for virtual or technologically enhanced study abroad. During the interviews, I asked some experts if they thought study abroad could ever happen virtually. Many indicated that study abroad would be extremely difficult to fully replicate online due to the need for face-to-face interaction. However, several respondents suggested that technologies could certainly ease or streamline the experience. For example, study abroad students might be able to “meet” their foreign site directors, their international classmates, or get to know the city through pre-departure virtual activities and simulations. This study could also be repurposed to ask
international educators questions strictly related to the role of technology in study abroad in nontraditional destinations. I expect to see more attention paid to the merger of technology and international education in the coming years.

**Conclusion**

This thesis makes a valuable contribution to the field of international education and study abroad. Findings from this study may be useful for international education administrators, study abroad directors, educators, researchers and also individuals with an interest in Nigeria’s higher education system. By surveying and interviewing international education professionals, the thesis helped to tighten the gap of study abroad research that mainly focuses on student perceptions and their inclination to study in nontraditional destinations. Likewise, I was able to add to the limited discussion about Nigeria as a potential study abroad host country.

My findings helped to further inform our understanding of the essential criteria that nontraditional study abroad destinations need to attract foreign students and secure approval from university administrators in first world institutions. Much thought and planning goes into the preparation for new study abroad partnerships, and developing study abroad programs regardless of the site is a gradual—not immediate—process. The initial puzzle about students’ growing desires to study in developing or emerging countries is now slightly less of a mystery. We have seen how elements of migration, competitiveness, networks, culture, and branding all work in tandem to pull students to study in either traditional or nontraditional study abroad countries. These factors, plus the effect of faculty and perceived risk, require a country to manage these elements if it wants to become a leader in international education.
Nigeria is a case in point of how globalization’s unevenness extends to the field of international education. Because the nation’s overall development fails to keep pace with that of industrialized nations, building international academic partnerships or collaborations through study abroad is not the country’s top priority. Still, data from this thesis leads me to remain cautiously hopeful about the future of study abroad programming in Nigeria. International educators from this study population indicated that academic exchange is just as rewarding in a developing country as in a developed one; plus students are now generally more aware of global cultures and the value of an international education.

We are now at a point where education is inherently international. Yet many countries in Africa are not regarded as places where one can receive the best global education. This research was not meant to create a dichotomy between traditional and nontraditional study abroad regions. Rather, my intent was to further the conversation about the benefits that emerge from studying abroad in developing countries such as Nigeria – and to gain a deeper insight into the administrative aspects of study abroad program development. There is still plenty of room for discussion, and I anticipate that future interdisciplinary explorations will continue to pay attention to the growing interest in nontraditional study abroad destinations.
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Survey Questionnaire

Study Abroad Programs Questionnaire

1. Survey Introduction

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey for a Master of Arts thesis project called "Rethinking Study Abroad." Your feedback is very helpful.

This survey should only take about 10-15 minutes of your time. Any questions marked with an asterisk (*) require an answer in order to progress through the survey. You will be asked to complete a survey/questionnaire about your experience in international education, your institution’s role in study abroad, and perceptions regarding the characteristics of study abroad programs in a foreign country.

Terminology: For the purposes of this survey, “Host institution” is the foreign university that admits students from your institution for a summer or semester term. “Home institution” is your college or university in the U.S. that welcomes international students. Most inquiries are multiple choice, open-ended or ranking scale questions that will ask how well you agree with a statement, ranging from “Strongly Agree” to “Strongly Disagree.” After completing this first section, you will be asked to fill out four (4) confidential demographic questions.

Participation in this study is entirely voluntary, and you can choose not to participate. Please note: if you later decide not to participate following completion of the entire survey (after clicking ‘Done’), your responses cannot be deleted. However, you still have the option to exit this survey at any time.

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me:

Uwa E. Oduwa
Master’s degree candidate, Communication Culture & Technology
Georgetown University
email: uo10@georgetown.edu
Tel: 518-844-9378

In order to progress through this survey, please use the following navigation buttons:

Click the Next button to continue to the next page.
Click the Previous button to return to the previous page.
Click the Submit button to submit your survey.

*1. Please check the option below indicating your consent or refusal to participate in this study.

☐ I consent to participate in the aforementioned study.
☐ I refuse to participate in the aforementioned study.

2. Questions 2-7

Questions 2-7 will ask about the nature of your work in international education.
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2. Please indicate the position you currently hold at your college or university's international education or study abroad department (Choose one):
   - [ ] Executive Director
   - [ ] Assistant/Associate Director
   - [ ] Other Leadership Role

3. Is the college or university where you work a public or private institution? (Select one):
   - [ ] Public U.S. college or university
   - [ ] Private U.S. college or university

4. What is the U.S. geographic location of your institution? (Please Choose one):
   - [ ] Northeast [New England or Mid-Atlantic]
   - [ ] Midwest [East North Central, West North Central]
   - [ ] South [South Atlantic, East South Central, West South Central]
   - [ ] West [Mountain, Pacific]

5. Please indicate the number of years you have worked in the field of international education at the postsecondary level:

6. Estimate from 0-100%, what proportion of students from your institution go to the following regions to study abroad each academic year (enter numbers only):
   - [ ] Africa [Eastern, Central, Northern, Western, or Southern Africa]
   - [ ] Asia [Eastern, South-Central, South-Eastern, or Western Asia]
   - [ ] Europe [Eastern, Northern, Southern, or Western Europe]
   - [ ] Latin America and the Caribbean [Central America, South America or the Caribbean]
   - [ ] North America [Canada, U.S. Minor Outlying Islands]
   - [ ] Oceania [Australia, New Zealand, Polynesia]
7. In a few words, please describe the process that your institution uses to establish new study abroad partnerships, particularly in developing countries:

3. Questions 8-12

Questions 8-12 will ask about your personal engagement with global society.

8. Please indicate how much you agree with the following statement:

“I believe that global education is a central part of my college or university's mission.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Have you ever participated in a study abroad program at the undergraduate or graduate level? (Offered through your college, university, or affiliate in which you received academic credit).

- C Yes
- C No
- C Not Sure/Don't remember

10. Aside from English, how many other languages are you proficient in? (Having the ability to read, write or speak in another language)

   Number of Languages (Please enter a digit):

   Number

11. On average, how often do you travel internationally? (For work or for leisure)

   Times Per Year (Please enter a digit):

   Times

12. How frequently do you follow international news? (via television, Internet, newspapers, and/or magazines)

   Hours Per Week (Please enter a digit):

   Hours

4. Questions 13-16

Questions 13-16 address the type of academic environments that study abroad programs may possess.
13. The study abroad program should offer specialized fields of study that are not offered at a students' home institution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Class sizes when studying abroad should NOT exceed:

- 15 students
- 20 students
- 25 students
- More than 25 students is acceptable
- Other (please specify)

15. Please indicate whether or not you agree with this statement:

“A summer or semester-long study abroad program in a developing country can be just as rewarding for students as a program in a developed country.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. To which of the following regions in Africa does your college or university currently send study abroad students? (Select all that apply):

- North Africa
- West Africa
- Central Africa
- East Africa
- Southern Africa
- Not Applicable

5. Questions 17-19

Questions 17-19 relate to the level of institutional support that universities in developing countries should provide students visiting from abroad.

17. I believe that the host university abroad should offer some scholarships to students (to help offset tuition, housing and transportation costs).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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18. Please select the amenities that a study abroad program in a developing country should offer students

- Housing accommodations (dormitories, host family options)
- Medical and health services
- Computer labs with Internet access
- Library/Research resources
- Recreational/Sporting facilities
- Other (please specify)

19. The host university should have an emergency management and response system in place, and immediately notify campus administrators in the U.S. if any crises should arise.

6. Questions 20-22

For Questions 20 – 22, think about how universities from developing countries can brand or advertise their program to appeal to administrators and students worldwide.

20. The host institution should maintain an updated campus website with information regarding its study abroad programs.

21. The university abroad should have a social media presence (such as Facebook, Twitter, Google Plus, and/or LinkedIn).

22. The host institution should have a prepared set of brochures, fliers, postcards and other informative material (electronic and/or hard copy) that can be disbursed to prospective students and faculty members.

7. Demographic Questions

Please respond to these four (4) brief demographic questions:
23. What is your gender?

- Male
- Female
- Prefer not to answer

24. Please indicate the highest degree or level of education you have completed. If currently enrolled, highest degree received to date (Choose One).

- Some college credit, no degree
- Trade/technical/vocational training
- Associate degree
- Bachelor's degree
- Master's degree
- Professional/Law degree
- Doctorate degree

25. How do you identify yourself? (Choose all that apply)

- White or European
- Hispanic or Latino
- Black or African American
- Asian, Pacific Islander, or Hawaiian
- Native American or American Indian
- Middle Eastern
- Multiracial / More than one race
- Other (please specify)

26. Which of the following best describes the location of your college or university? (Choose One).

- Urban
- Suburban
- Rural
- Other (please specify)
### 8. End of Survey

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. Your responses are much appreciated!
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## Survey Coding Sheet

1) **Agree to Participate:** Yes = 1 / No = 0

2) **Position Held:**
   - 1 = Executive Director
   - 2 = Assistant/Associate Director
   - 3 = Other Leadership Role

3) **Public or Private Institution:**
   - 1 = Public
   - 2 = Private

4) **U.S Geographic Location:**
   - 1 = Northeast
   - 2 = Midwest
   - 3 = South
   - 4 = West

5) **Number of Years worked:**
   - 1 = 1-5 Years
   - 2 = 6-10 years
   - 3 = 11 or more years

6) **World Regions**
   - 1 = Africa
   - 2 = Asia
   - 3 = Europe
   - 4 = Latin America
   - 5 = North America
   - 6 = Oceania

7) **Process to establish new study abroad partnerships in developing countries**
   = open ended

8) **Global Education (Likert)**
   - 1 = Strongly Agree
   - 2 = Agree
   - 3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree
   - 4 = Disagree
   - 5 = Strongly Disagree

9) **Participation in study abroad program before:**
   - 1 = Yes
   - 2 = No
   - 3 = Not Sure/Don’t remember

10) **Foreign Language Proficiency:**
    - 0 = None (0 languages)
    - 1 = 1-2 languages
    - 2 = 3 or more languages

11) **International travel frequency**
    - 1 = 0-1 times per year
    - 2 = 2-4 times per year
    - 3 = More than 4 times per year

12) **Following international news frequency**
    - 1 = 0-4 hours per week
    - 2 = 5-10 hours per week
    - 3 = 11 or more hours per week

13) **Study abroad specialized fields**
    (Likert)
    - 1 = Strongly Agree
    - 2 = Agree
    - 3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree
    - 4 = Disagree
    - 5 = Strongly Disagree

14) **Class sizes**
    - 1 = 15 students
    - 2 = 20 students
    - 3 = 25 students
    - 4 = More than 25 students
    - 5 = Other (please specify)

15) **Summer vs. semester study abroad program (Likert)**
    - 1 = Strongly Agree
    - 2 = Agree
    - 3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree
    - 4 = Disagree
    - 5 = Strongly Disagree
16) African Regions
1 = North Africa
2 = West Africa
3 = Central Africa
4 = East Africa
5 = Southern Africa
6 = Not Applicable

17) Offer scholarships:
1 = Strongly Agree
2 = Agree
3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree
4 = Disagree
5 = Strongly Disagree

18) Study Abroad Amenities:
1 = Housing accommodations
2 = Medical/Health services
3 = Computer/Internet services
4 = Library/Research resources
5 = Recreational/Sporting facilities
6 = Other (please specify)

19) Emergency management system in place (Likert)
1 = Strongly Agree
2 = Agree
3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree
4 = Disagree
5 = Strongly Disagree

20) Updated campus website
1 = Strongly Agree
2 = Agree
3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree
4 = Disagree
5 = Strongly Disagree

21) Social media presence
1 = Strongly Agree
2 = Agree
3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree
4 = Disagree
5 = Strongly Disagree

22) Marketing materials:
1 = Strongly Agree
2 = Agree
3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree
4 = Disagree
5 = Strongly Disagree

23) Gender:
1 = Male
2 = Female
3 = Prefer not to Respond

24) Level of education:
1 = Some college credit, no degree
2 = Trade/technical/vocational training
3 = Associate degree
4 = Bachelor's degree
5 = Master's degree
6 = Professional/Law degree
7 = Doctorate degree

25) Identity:
1 = White or European
2 = Hispanic or Latino
3 = Black or African American
4 = Asian, Pacific Islander, or Hawaiian
5 = Native American or American Indian
6 = Middle Eastern
7 = Multiracial/More than one race
8 = Other (please specify)

26) U.S. setting of institution:
1 = Urban
2 = Suburban
3 = Rural
4 = Other (please specify)
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Survey IRB Informed Consent Form

IRB #2013-1361
Title: “Rethinking Study Abroad”
Page 1 of 1

INFORMED CONSENT FORM FOR ANONYMOUS SURVEY RESEARCH

You are invited to participate in a research study titled “Rethinking Study Abroad.” This study is being conducted by Uwa E. Oduwa, master’s candidate in the Communication, Culture & Technology program at Georgetown University. Results will be used for a thesis project analyzing how higher education professionals determine criteria for new study abroad partnerships in developing countries.

Participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You can choose not to participate or to leave the study at any time. Regardless of your decision, there will be no effect on your relationship with the researcher or any other negative consequences.

You are being asked to take part in this study because you are an administrator at a U.S. college or university. Your expertise in the field of international education is beneficial for this study and your responses will be anonymously gathered along with other higher education administrators across the United States.

If you agree to participate, you will be asked to fill out one (1) survey about the academic standards required to establish a new study abroad program in a developing country. Questions will fall under the area of personal/work experiences, marketing, academic environment, and institutional support. This survey should take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Responses from the survey will be collected electronically after completion, using SurveyMonkey software.

All of your responses to this survey will remain anonymous and cannot be linked to you in any way. No identifying information about you will be collected at any point during the study, and your survey will only be identified with a random code number. Study data will be kept in a digital format on a secured network connection and will be protected by multiple passwords. Only the principal investigator and the two thesis advisors will have access to the data.

There are no risks associated with this study. Information collected in this study may benefit others in future research about the field of study abroad. Responses will also illustrate the critical role of administrators when considering new university partnerships abroad.

If you have any questions regarding the survey or this research project in general, please contact the principal investigator, Uwa Oduwa, at uo10@georgetown.edu or 518-844-9378. You may also contact her faculty advisors, Dr. Leticia Bode (lbb71@georgetown.edu) and Dr. Linda Garcia (garcia1l@georgetown.edu) by email or via phone at 202-687-6618 if necessary. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, please contact the Georgetown University IRB at 202-687-6553 or irborder@georgetown.edu.

By completing and submitting this survey, you are indicating your consent to participate in this study. Thank you for your time and interest.

With kind regards,
Uwa E. Oduwa
Principal Investigator
Georgetown University
uo10@georgetown.edu
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Interview Questions for Practitioners

- Please provide a brief overview of your career experience in international education.
- As an undergraduate or graduate student, did you study abroad? If so, in what locations? How did such experience(s) shape your current beliefs, values, etc.?
- Why do you think students are increasingly drawn to ‘nontraditional’ locations outside Europe?
- How does a study abroad program prepare students (or faculty) for global citizenship?
- How important is it for international education administrators and staff to be global citizens? To have cross-cultural awareness other societies?
- As an advisor for programs in [region] Africa, what types of students have interest in this area? What are their main concerns? Levels of anticipation?
- My research considers how Nigeria currently has very low interest as a study abroad destination. What might this country learn from its neighbors (such as Ghana and Cameroon) that currently host many students from developed and industrialized nations?
- What region of Africa do you see the strongest increase in student study abroad participation?
- What advantages might developing countries have if their universities are in large cities?
- Can you briefly walk-through the formal process for initiating new study abroad partnerships? Who usually drives or pushes for new programs and how long does it take to get from A to Z?
- How important is it for potential study abroad host universities have a strong brand image?
- How important is it for schools to track student movement to different regions each year? (Is the data useful for measuring the effectiveness of international education?)
- What role(s) does technology have in academic exchange programs? Could study abroad ever happen virtually?
- What are [your institution’s] goals for international education in the next 2-3 years? 10+ years?
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Interview IRB Informed Consent Form

Georgetown University
Consent to Participate in Research Study

INTERVIEW

STUDY TITLE: Rethinking Study Abroad: Academic Exchange in Developing Nations and the Case for Nigeria

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Uwa E. Oduwa
ADVISORS: Dr. Leticia Bode and Dr. Linda Garcia

TELEPHONE: 518-844-9378

INTRODUCTION
You are invited to participate in this research study. Please take as much time as you need to make your decision. Feel free to discuss your decision with whomever you want, but remember that the decision to participate, or not to participate, is yours. If you do decide to participate, please sign and date where indicated at the end of this form. If you have any questions, please ask the principal investigator.

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE
This study is part of a master’s thesis project aimed to investigate the criteria used by higher education professionals to develop and implement new study abroad programs. Instead of surveying students (where extensive research already exists), I will conduct in-depth interviews with professionals in the field of international education. This research will gather varied perspectives about study abroad program development. Additionally, it will contribute to the field of international education by adding pertinent literature about implementation of home-grown study abroad programs in developing countries, particularly in Nigeria.

This study is being done in order to gain a deeper understanding of experts’ knowledge of study abroad as a form of international education. The study specifically aims to analyze common standards, if any, that educational professionals deem necessary when establishing or maintaining a study abroad program in a developing country. The results will be used to determine any common themes that may exist. Results will also be used alongside quantitative data to develop an action plan for Nigeria so its higher education institutions can appeal to administrators and students worldwide.

STUDY PLAN
You are being asked to take part in this study because you are an employee of a U.S. college or university, or an expert in the field of international education. Your response will be highly beneficial for this study. Approximately 25 other participants will take part in this study.

The study will consist of one (1) interview and should last around 30-45 minutes. It will take place at the interviewee’s workplace (college, university, or organization). During the
interview, you will be asked questions about your career experience in international education, decision-making processes for program development (and implementation), perceptions of study abroad in developing countries, and challenges facing developing countries when seeking new partnerships with U.S. universities.

This study involves audio recording and/or videotaping to transcribe participants’ responses. You will have the option to opt in or opt out of being recorded by electronic device under the ‘Consent of Participant’ section.

You can stop participating at any time. However, if you decide to stop participating in the study, we encourage you to talk to the principal investigator first.

RISKS
There are very few risks associated with participating in this study. It is possible, but unlikely, that this study could expose private information, such as your employer’s address or your email address. If private information about you is accidentally disclosed to others, the principal investigator will try to reduce this risk by notifying you, notifying the thesis advisors and then doing a security audit to prevent the breach from happening again.

BENEFITS
If you agree to take part in this study, there will be no direct benefit to you. However, there are indirect benefits to the academic community. Information gathered in this study may provide insight into the topic of study abroad in developing countries, especially in Nigeria. Your responses will help to understand the critical role that professionals in the field of international education use when making decisions about establishing and maintaining new programs abroad.

CONFIDENTIALITY
Every effort will be made to keep any information collected about you confidential. However, it is impossible to guarantee absolute confidentiality.

In order to keep information about you safe, electronic study data will be kept in a password-protected file on the principal investigator’s personal computer. Hardcopy study data will be kept in a locked file cabinet and can only be accessed by the principal investigator. Data from interviews will be directly linked to participant names and may be used in the final thesis publication. Identifiable data will only be shared with the principal investigator’s two thesis advisors at Georgetown University for the purposes of data analysis and thesis editing. Identifiers will be destroyed at the close of this study (December 30, 2014) by shredding paper documents and permanently deleting electronic files.

The principal investigator would like to include your name and institution in the final thesis and presentation that results from this research project. Also, the principal investigator would like to identify and describe your line of work for attribution and
explanatory purposes. However, you have the option to not have your name used when
data from this study are published; if this is the case, please indicate so on the last page of
this form. The Georgetown University IRB (Institutional Review Board) is allowed to access
your study records if there is any need to review the data for any reason.

**YOUR RIGHTS AS A RESEARCH PARTICIPANT**
Participation in this study is entirely voluntary at all times. You can choose not to
participate at all or to leave the study at any point. If you decide not to participate or to
leave the study, there will be no effect on your relationship with the principal investigator
or any other negative consequences.

However, if you decide that you no longer want to take part in the interview, you are
encouraged to inform the principal investigator of your decision. The information already
obtained through your participation will be included in the data analysis and final report
for this study.

**QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS?**
If you have questions about the study, you may contact Uwa E. Oduwa at 518-844-9378 or
uo10@georgetown.edu. You may also contact her faculty advisors, Dr. Leticia Bode
(lb871@georgetown.edu) or Dr. Linda Garcia (garcidl@georgetown.edu) by email or via
phone at 202-687-6618 if needed.

Please call the Georgetown University IRB Office at 202-687-6553 (8:30am to 5:00pm,
Monday to Friday) if you have any questions about your rights as a research participant.
STATEMENT OF PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR OBTAINING INFORMED CONSENT

I have fully explained this study to the participant. I have discussed the study’s purpose and procedures, the possible risks and benefits, and that participation is completely voluntary.

I have invited the participant to ask questions and I have given complete answers to all of the participant’s questions.

Signature of Principal Investigator ___________________________ Date ____________________

CONSENT OF PARTICIPANT

I understand all of the information in this Informed Consent Form.
I have gotten complete answers for all of my questions.
I freely and voluntarily agree to participate in this study.
I understand that I will be audio recorded as a part of this study, unless otherwise indicated below.

Please indicate whether you agree to be audio recorded as a part of this study.
(If you change your mind about this at any point please let the researcher know)

☐ YES: I agree to be audio recorded as part of this study:

Participant Signature ___________________________ Date ____________________

Printed Name of Participant ___________________________

☐ NO: I do not wish to be audio recorded as part of this study:

Participant Signature ___________________________ Date ____________________

Printed Name of Participant ___________________________
Please indicate whether you agree to have your full name as well as your organization’s name and/or job title used alongside your comments in the final publication and presentation that results from this research. (If you change your mind about this at any point please let the researcher know)

☐ YES: I agree to have my full name used:

Participant Signature ___________________________ Date ____________

Printed Name of Participant ___________________________

☐ NO: I do not wish to have my full name used:

Participant Signature ___________________________ Date ____________

Printed Name of Participant ___________________________

☐ ALTERATION:

Name or pseudonym to be used: ___________________________

(e.g. first name only, initials only, random pseudonym, only work position/title, only institutional affiliation etc.)

Participant Signature ___________________________ Date ____________

Printed Name of Participant ___________________________

Once you sign this form, you will receive a copy of it to keep, and the principal investigator will keep another copy in your research record.
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