Journal of Leisure Research
2011, Vol. 43, No. 3, pp. 403-426
Copyright 2011
National Recreation and Park Association

Educational Travel and Global Citizenship

Michael A. Tarrant
University of Georgia

Lee Stoner
The Diabetes Research Institute

William T. Borrie
University of Montana

Gerard Kyle
Texas A & M University

Roger L. Moore
Annette Moore
North Carolina State University

Abstract

We examined whether participation (n = 623 students) in educational travel programs influenced support for environmental policies across different citizen types (justice-oriented, participatory, personally responsible, and non-citizen). Findings showed that (1) participation increased support for environmental policies across all groups, (2) justice-oriented citizens reported the highest support, while non-citizens demonstrated the lowest support, and (3) significant interaction effects suggest these main effects cannot be interpreted without considering the effects of (a) destination/country and (b) student major. If educational travel programs are to respond to calls to foster global citizenry, they should focus less on promoting personal responsible citizenry and more on a critical assessment of the justice issues surrounding global environmental problems.

KEYWORDS: Educational travel, study abroad, global citizenship, environmental policies, curriculum development, leisure studies, tourism

---

Michael A. Tarrant is Josiah Meigs Distinguished Teaching Professor at the University of Georgia; Lee Stoner is with the Diabetes Research Institute, Canterbury District Health Board, New Zealand; William T. Borrie is a professor at the University of Montana; Gerard Kyle is an associate professor at Texas A&M University; Roger L. Moore is an associate professor and Annette Moore is a lecturer at North Carolina State University.

Data for the study was collated and analyzed by the Office of Global Programs in Sustainability (www.discoverabroad.uga.edu) at The University of Georgia.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Michael A. Tarrant, 180 East Green Street, Warnell School of Forestry and Natural Resources, The University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602-2152. Email: Tarrant@uga.edu

With anticipated passage of the Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Foundation Act,[1] there are increasing calls for studies to empirically demonstrate the link between study abroad and global citizenry. In response to these calls, we examined the extent to which participation in short-term, educational travel, study abroad programs to the South Pacific influenced support for environmental policies across different citizen types, and the effect of destination (Australia or New Zealand) and student characteristics (gender and major) on this relationship.

Global Citizenship

The notion of citizenship is typically associated with the rights and duties of a particular nation-state; however, global citizenship cannot be extended in this way since there is no global government (Noddings, 2005). While contemporary definitions of global citizenship remained focused on notions of obligations and justice, they also incorporated a concern for environmental protection and many argued that global citizenship was firmly rooted in an environmental context (Attfield, 2002; Bryant, 2006; Dobson, 2003; Dower & Williams, 2002; Shallcross & Robinson, 2006; Winn, 2006). Attfield (2002), for example, suggested "environmental responsibilities form the most obvious focus of concern for global citizens, as well as the territory where global obligations most clearly arise" (p.191). Similarly, the environment provided the basis of Dobson's (2003) post-cosmopolitan view of citizenship, as an obligation to reduce our ecological footprint to sustainable levels; i.e., to act as an "Earth Citizen."

According to Dobson (2003), the concept of justice is used to distinguish between a community of citizens and that of humans: A "Good Citizen" is one who accepts a political obligation to act in a just and fair manner, in contrast to a "Good Samaritan" who may act out of a duty. The distinction between justice and duty is illustrated using the example of climate change, "if global warming is principally caused by wealthy nations, and if global warming is at least a part cause of strange weather, then monies should be transferred as a matter of compensatory justice rather than as aid or charity…. globalization then changes the source and nature of obligation" (Dobson, 2003; p. 31). The global nature of many environmental issues such as climate change, ozone depletion, the supply and distribution of renewable and non-renewable resources, and biodiversity and species loss transcend national boundaries with effects distributed across the planet. It follows therefore, that the civic concern expressed by citizens most appropriately concerns the sustainable use and conservation of earth's resources. As such, global citizens are not simply international by reason of their world travel but as a result of their ecological footprint—the quantity of nature (specifically, the amount of natural resources) required and consumed to sustain their lifestyle choices and behaviors. Moreover, global citizenship in this sense is not just a matter of being a good community member, rather in recognizing an ethical imperative or willingness to reduce one's ecological impact and support a sustainable footprint that

[1]The Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Foundation Act was approved on June 10, 2009 by the House of Representatives as part of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act and is presently with the U.S. Senate. Its goal is to increase the number of U.S. students studying abroad to one million within 10 years of enactment and to promote study abroad as a norm (and not as the exception) within undergraduate curricula.

may have no immediate, personal value but ultimately benefit others around the world.

Westheimer and Kahne (2004) have proposed three types of citizens: (a) *personally responsible citizens* (someone who acts responsibly in his/her community, obeys laws, recycles, gives blood, and/or volunteers in times of crisis); (b) *participatory citizens* (someone who is an active member of civic and community organizations, organizes community efforts such as environmental clean-ups, etc); and (c) *justice-oriented citizens* (someone who critically assesses social, political and economic structures to see beyond surfaces and challenges injustice, knows about social movements, and explores the root causes of problems). The distinction among these three citizen-types is described as follows, "if participatory citizens are organizing the food drive and personally responsible citizens are donating food, justice-oriented citizens are asking why people are hungry and acting on what they discover" (p. 3). Westheimer and Kahne, as well as others (e.g., Brown, 2006; Bryant, 2006; Dolby, 2007), further maintained that academia, and educational systems generally, have failed to foster civic obligations and responsibilities, especially at the justice-oriented level, resulting in a student body apathetic to the politics of democracy and global citizenship. While students may gain the practical skills (and concerns) of personally responsible citizenship (recycling, park and river clean-ups, donating blood) and of participatory citizenship (participating in civic and community groups and organizations), the programs rarely empowered students to address social problems through a critical assessment, with the goal of affecting profound social change and justice.

By definition, these three types of citizens (plus a fourth group, not explicitly addressed by Westheimer and Kahne but included in our study, of non-citizens) are likely to differ with respect to their support for sustainable (pro-) environmentalism; however, there are no known published findings to this effect. Westheimer and Kahne acknowledged that, "a focus on justice guarantees neither the motivation nor the capacity to participate in democratic change. Many—ourselves included—would applaud programs that manage to emphasize justice-oriented citizenship inextricably linked to a desire and capacity for participation" (2004, p.6). Our study was intended, in part, to address this research gap and explore how participation in educational travel programs influences support for environmental policies across these different citizen types. For example, are justice-oriented citizens more or less likely (than other citizen groups) to support sustainable environmental policies as a result of studying and traveling abroad?

Educational Travel

Educational travel[2] characterizes the classical notion of leisure (*schole*) as an experience that nurtures citizenry or citizenship (Gray, 1998). Aristotle, in *Politics* (translated by Rackham, 1932), maintained that a virtuous citizenry (*paideia*) was a primary extension of *schole*, suggesting leisure-oriented experiences that foster

[2]Educational travel is defined by Mill and Morrison (1985, p. 36) as, when "education itself serves as the primary reason for travel." Subsequently, Sirakaya, Sasidharan and Sonmez (1999) identified educational travel as a major theme of ecotourism that specifically "generates environmental awareness and imparts natural and cultural education" (p. 171).

citizenry may be of the highest good. Such citizenry is often associated with *logos*, the ability to engage in a thoughtful, articulate, political discourse in which new ideas and beliefs can be exchanged and defended. Moreover, Socrates maintained that this was essentially a public activity – members of the community had a civic obligation to practice and seek out new dialogical partners and justify their beliefs. Socratic citizens are considered to be "citizens of neither the Left nor Right, they reject pre-packaged platforms and sound-bite analyses" (Talisse, 2006). The first self-proclaimed global citizen, *cosmopolite* (citizen of the world), was thought to be Diogenes (born 404BC), who rejected the contention that citizenry could only be practiced and nurtured in a democratic city where politics and discursive equality resided (Yonge, 1853). In more modern times, Virginia Woolf (in Reid, 1966) argued for globalization in the study of arts and, in identifying herself (and women, generally) as an outsider and second-class citizen, she declared, "as a woman, I have no country. As a woman, I want no country. As a woman, my country is the whole world" (p. 109).

Skocpol (2003) suggested that the foundation of a functioning democracy lies in a voluntary, participatory civil society. This importance of greater participation in the educational and developmental aspects of society has been mirrored in the leisure literature. Glover (2004) has, for instance, demonstrated how active participation in leisure activities can build both a sense of citizenship and responsibility, as well as an increased sense of community and belonging. Hemingway (1999), too, documented a primary linkage between leisure activity and citizenry involvement, both participatory and representative. Specifically, he argued that "democratic social capital grows out of leisure activity that fosters democratic norms like autonomy, trust, cooperation, and open communication" (p. 162). As such, educational travel may be an effective instrument for fostering autonomy, trust, cooperation and communication among its participants. Typically, educational travel, in particular group study abroad, is comprised of educational, experiential, social and leisure opportunities. In a sense, educational travel may be equated to dynamic leisure experiences in that both are "dependent upon a sequence of episodes (i.e., interactions between a leisure participant and other features, including people and physical attributes in the natural environment)" (Lee, Shafer, & Kang, 2005, p. 94). During study abroad group travel experiences, participants are immersed to varying degrees in the host country's culture and physical environment. Students share many common experiences (educational and leisure, formal and informal) and explore a variety of environments (natural and built). Study abroad then represents opportunities for unique dynamic leisure and educational experiences for participants (Chieffo & Griffiths, 2004; Harrison, 2006; Litvin, 2000; van 't Klooster, van Wijk, Go, & van Rekom, 2008). While students in travel groups may experience similar experiences and environments, they each bring their own personal background, and their own self-perception. This interplay between one's "situated self-identity" and other people, places and events may combine to create the rich and, perhaps lasting, emotional and behavioral impacts, associated with the study abroad experience (Lee & Shafer, 2002).

There is also a growing body of research addressing issues of curriculum development in educational travel. For many years, the academic rigor of study

abroad has been questioned (Vande Berg, Balkcum, Scheid, & Whalen, 2004) and with the growing popularity of short-term, travel-based, study abroad programs, these concerns are likely to remain prevalent. General consensus, however, is that well structured educational travel programs, of any duration, have the potential to promote learning outcomes that go beyond the impact of traditional campus-based instruction (e.g., Chieffo & Griffiths, 2004; McKeown, 2009; McLaughlin & Johnson, 2006; National Survey of Student Engagement, 2007). Such learning outcomes include not only goals such as personal development (e.g., Harrison, 2006), functional knowledge and/or learning (e.g., McKeown, 2009), and inter-cultural awareness (e.g., van 't Klooster, et al, 2008), but also extend to global citizenship.

Educational Travel and Global Citizenship

Notwithstanding the potential negative environmental and cultural impacts tourism can pose (such as reliance on fossil fuels for airline travel, effects on local community systems, etc), educational travel can be a useful context for examining global citizenship since it provides a medium in which students struggle and negotiate their national identity while interacting with people from different geographic locations and cultures in an educational environment (Dolby, 2007; Shallcross & Robinson, 2006; Westheimer & Kahne, 2004). Current congressional interest in study abroad and educational travel stemmed from a report by the bi-partisan Lincoln Commission (Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program, 2005) calling for greater attention to U.S. (a) global competence and (b) national needs. The former was in response to increasing demands that nations respond to the global environmental crisis (U.N. Inter-governmental Panel on Climate Change, 2007). The second reason concerned national security and a growing need for U.S. leadership and economic competitiveness in the international community. Both objectives reflected an interest in nurturing a global citizenry that was not only sensitive to, and aware of, complex human–environment relationships but was also willing to act in ways appropriate to ever-changing needs and demands facing society. In a globalized world, domestic concerns will be increasingly driven by foreign conditions and dynamics. As such, a primary outcome of the Lincoln Commission has been a directive to nurture a global citizenry in the U.S. through promoting study abroad and educational travel.

While only about 2.1% of all U.S. students currently study abroad, the Institute of International Education's Open Doors Report (2009) shows that the past 15 years have witnessed unprecedented growth in student numbers with an increase of over 300% from 75,000 students in 1994 to 262,416 students in 2007/08. Moreover, the fastest growing segment of study abroad is the short-term, educational travel market, which has grown in popularity, in part, because of lower costs and fees (as compared to semester- or year-long programs) and availability in the shoulder seasons of the academic calendar (i.e., either in the winter break or summer semester) thereby allowing students to receive additional credits and not jeopardize their graduation requirements. In one of the few studies on this issue, Donnelly-Smith (2009) found that global engagement (defined as levels of civic commitment and volunteerism) was unrelated to the length of the study abroad program suggesting that even short-term programs have pronounced learning out-

comes. There is also evidence that simply having participated in study abroad is sufficient to nurture a global ethic (see also Chieffo & Griffiths, 2004; McKeown, 2009).

Confounding Variables

We explored three variables hypothesized to influence the extent to which participation in educational travel influences support for environmental policies across different citizen types: Study abroad destination (country), students' major, and gender. These variables were selected because either (a) previous literature identified their role in determining the learning outcomes of study abroad (i.e., destination and gender) or (b) the variable (i.e., major) is directly related to the dependent measure under study (environmentalism).

Study abroad destination. U.S. students study abroad on every continent, including Antarctica. While European destinations remain the most popular (the U.K., Italy, Spain, and France were the top four countries to study abroad in 2007/08), both Australia (with a total of 11,042 students) and New Zealand (with 2,629 students) rank in the top 25 (6th and 21st, respectively) (Institute of International Education, 2009). Study abroad programs have traditionally focused on language acquisition and cultural exposure, however, there is increasing emphasis on programs with a sustainable development focus and Australia and New Zealand, given their natural environments (Australia actively promotes itself as an eco-tourism destination and New Zealand has its 100% pure, clean and green image), have become increasingly attractive destinations for students.

There has been little cross-cultural investigation of study abroad and studies have reported contradictory findings. Litvin (2000, 2003) argues that travel promotes understanding and increased tolerance toward others' views, but the direction of attitude change depends on both the countries of origin and destination; notably, Singaporean students had increasingly negative attitudes towards their hosts after studying abroad in Egypt but more positive attitudes towards Israelis after traveling in Israel. In other work (e.g., Pizam, 1996; Pizam, Jafari, & Milman, 1991), tourism experiences resulted in minor (and often negative) changes in the attitudes and opinions of the tourists to their hosts. If any general consensus can be drawn from past studies it is that post-trip attitude change depends on the country visited. Nyaupane, Teye, and Paris (2008), for example, found that while attitudes of U.S. students toward their host country after the study abroad experience were more positive towards Europeans (Dutch and Austrians), negative towards Australians, and mixed toward Fijians, the level of attitude change was partially dependent on pre-test scores (i.e., negative attitude change was associated with host countries that had the highest pre-trip attitudes, such as Australia).

Major of study. No prior published work on the effect of the student's major on study abroad outcomes was found. However, it is feasible that since students in the biophysical sciences will likely have had broader exposure to environmental issues (through their respective academic coursework) than social science students, participation in an environmentally-focused study abroad program may have different effects on the level of support for environmental policies of the two groups of students. This is consistent with previous studies in the social-psychological lit-

erature showing that knowledge can influence pro-environmental behaviors and/or behavioral intent as a mediator in the attitude–behavior relationship (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980; Rajecki, 1982; Zanna, Olson, & Fazio, 1980).

Gender. Study abroad participation is dominated by female students with almost twice as many women than men participating in international programs (Institute of International Education, 2009). Pre-departure, females have been found to express greater concerns about inter-cultural issues (Carlson & Widaman, 1988) and accommodations and social contacts (Martin & Rohrlich, 1991) than males; but it is unclear how participation in the program affects the sexes. Hett (1993) suggested that study abroad programs produce higher post-test scores on global mindedness for females (than males), while Kehl and Morris (2007) reported the opposite effect (males score higher on global mindedness) following participation. It has been argued that females exhibit stronger pro-environmental behaviors than males because of higher altruistic and cooperative behavior levels in women (Stern & Dietz, 1994; Stern, Dietz, & Kalof, 1993; Zelenzy, Chua, & Aldrich, 2000).

Purpose of Study

This study explored the extent to which participation in short-term, educational-travel, study abroad programs to the South Pacific (Australia and New Zealand) influenced support for environmental policies across four different citizen types: Justice-oriented citizens, participatory citizens, personally responsible citizens, and non-citizens. In addition, the effect of three confounding variables (study abroad destination–Australia versus New Zealand, gender, and major – biophysical sciences versus social sciences) on environmental support across citizen types was examined.

Null hypothesis 1: Country of destination. The program destination (Australia versus New Zealand) will not significantly impact the extent to which the educational travel program influences support for environmental policies across citizen types.

Null hypothesis 2: Major of study. A students' major (biophysical sciences versus social sciences) will not significantly impact the extent to which the educational travel program influences support for environmental policies across citizen types.

Null hypothesis 3: Gender. A students' gender will not significantly impact the extent to which the educational program influences support for environmental policies across citizen types.

Methods

Sample and Educational Travel Program

The sample was comprised of students from 10 U.S. universities participating in four-week/six-credit educational travel programs to either Australia or New Zealand in May, June, and/or July in 2008 and 2009. The two programs form part

of a suite of courses offered through a consortium of universities working together to provide short-term, faculty-led, programs to the South Pacific. All programs focus on a mix of social and environmental sciences under the academic theme of Sustainable Development: Sustaining Human Societies and the Natural Environment and utilize a combination of classroom-based study (at host institutions in the South Pacific) with field coursework and educational travel (including service-learning research/monitoring projects, cultural activities and multi-week field trips). The primary form of assessment is a series of field modules comprised of essay-based, inter-disciplinary questions addressing relatively complex ecological, environmental and social issues related to sustainability.

Collectively, the field modules drive the academic content of the program and, as such, represent a key component of the treatment effect (educational travel program). As an excerpt from the "Module Overview" reveals, this approach demands that students actively engage in the learning process by building pieces of knowledge from all aspects of their experience:

> You are actively engaged in finding the pieces of information from multiple sources. True, one of these sources is the traditional classroom lecture, but there are also mini field-lectures, class discussions on the road, informal conversations with field faculty, meetings with specialists and professionals, service-learning projects, field assignments and activities, and direct experience and observation, as well as the related readings. The module approach obliges you to be an active learner, an active participant in the learning process.

This approach forces students to reconsider their traditional (and often rigid) beliefs about environmental issues and to form new interpretations of existing phenomena (albeit in new contexts) by molding inter-disciplinary information. Such learning is active—it occurs with faculty from host institutions, dedicated (24/7) field guides, and faculty from their own institution in peer-based, field situations—and is arguably more sophisticated in that it requires reconciling multiple (and often diverse) viewpoints. All of the educational material (field and non-field) is directed toward the module questions; i.e., the field activities are led by a trained guide/educator (often a professor or lecturer at a local academic institution) who provides instruction in that specific geographic locale in the context of the specific sub-theme and set of module questions. In turn, the modules require students to contrast their current beliefs with new beliefs and value orientations; this is conducted within the realm of broad human–environment relations in which questions of responsibility and actions/responses are key considerations.[3] In Australia the primary field destinations (for all students) included the Great Barrier Reef, the Rainforest, and the Outback; in New Zealand, all students circum-navigated the South island of New Zealand including the Southern Alps, Queenstown,

[3]All of the program content is divided into classroom and field hours, in which a one-semester credit course is equivalent to 15 classroom contact hours (where two field instruction hours equate to one classroom contact hour). A six-semester credit course, for example, would require 90 classroom equivalent contact hours.

Fjordland, West Coast (and glaciers), Abel Tasman, Kaikoura, Banks Peninsula and Christchurch. The field module questions were developed by faculty representing the disciplines of anthropology, geography, international affairs, and forestry/recreation and tourism. Sample module themes common to both the Australia and New Zealand programs included: Indigenous perspectives of conservation; historical approaches to natural resources management; environmental values; preservation and sustainable development; and human impacts to the environment.

Research Design

A pre-test post-test design was adopted in which students voluntarily completed a survey instrument on the first day (pre-program) and last day (post-program) of the program in the destination country. Surveys were matched using three variables: Date of birth, gender, and zipcode of permanent residence.

Variables

Citizen-type was measured according to the three-item categorical scale by Westheimer and Kahne (2004) plus one additional item (non-citizens). Respondents to the pre-program survey were asked to select, from one of four citizen-types, the one category that best describes them: "Someone who recycles, gives blood, and/or volunteers in times of crisis" (Personally Responsible), "Someone who actively participates in civic and community organizations" (Participatory), "Someone who knows about social movements and explores the root causes of social and environmental problems" (Justice-oriented) or "None of these best describes me" (Non-citizen).

Support for environmental policies was measured on both the pre-program and the post-program surveys using three willingness-to-sacrifice items representing environmental policy support (EPS) from Stern et al., (1999): "I would be willing to pay much higher taxes in order to protect the environment;" "I would be willing to accept cuts in my standard of living to protect the environment;" and, "I would be willing to pay much higher prices in order to protect the environment." A 7-point response scale from 1 ("Strongly Disagree") to 7 ("Strongly Agree") with a mid-point of 4 ("Neither Agree nor Disagree) was used. The scale has a reported internal reliability (alpha) of .78 (see Stern et al., 1999) and was selected because it represents notions of obligations (a willingness to act) and civic responsibility (i.e., toward paying higher taxes, reducing standards of living, and protecting the environment) inherent in contemporary thinking about global (or Earth) citizenship.

As a measure of external reliability, results should be replicable across time (Cook & Campbell, 1979); i.e., in the short term, there should be no difference between data collected in one year versus another. For this reason, a variable called year was created that represented study abroad programs completed in 2008 versus 2009. (Data had not been collected in previous years.)

Analysis

A repeated measures multivariate analysis of variance (SPSS Version 17.0, 2009) with a significance level of p=.05 was used to test all hypotheses. The design was a one-way within factor measure (representing pre- and post-program scores)

by two-way between factors (representing citizen type and one of the following independent variables: year, destination, major of study, and gender).[4] Items for the pre- and post-program EPS scales were summed and Cronbach's alpha was used as an indicator of internal consistency. Tukey's statistic provided the post-hoc test to examine for significant differences in mean scores for each citizen type (four levels) and Levene's statistic tested for equality of variance in the samples.

Results

Descriptive Findings

Of the total sample of 696 students, 89.5% (*n*=623) completed both surveys; non-respondents were comprised entirely of pre- and post-program surveys that could not be matched because of illegible hand-writing, or inconsistent/unmatched or blank responses. Fifty-five percent (*n*=383) participated in 2008 programs and 45.0% (*n*=313) in 2009 programs. Overall, 97 respondents (15.6%) were classified as non-citizens, while there were 285 (45.7%) personally responsible citizens, 147 (23.6%) participation citizens, and 94 (15.1%) justice-oriented citizens. Over two-thirds (70.0%) of the total sample was female and almost one-half (45.3%) were seniors (with 2.2% freshmen, 12.8% sophomores, 36.2% juniors, and 3.5% graduate students). This compares to the overall breakdown for all U.S. university and college study abroad programs in 2007/08 (the most recent data available) of 65.1% female and 35.9% juniors, 21.3% seniors, 13.1% sophomores, 3.5% freshmen, with the remainder unspecified or graduate level (Institute of International Education, 2009). Over one-fifth (21.4%) of our sample was business majors, while other prominent academic disciplines included biology (11.9%), natural resources/environmental sciences (10.8%), journalism (6.0%), psychology (5.4%), health promotion (5.1%), engineering (4.6%), and parks and recreation (3.5%). The pre-test and post-test scales for EPS demonstrated internal reliabilities (Cronbach's alpha) of .87 and .90, respectively.

Multivariate Analysis

Results were interpreted according to the highest-order interaction effect or, in the case of a non-significant interaction effect, by the respective main effects. The following effect titles were used for all tests of the hypotheses: Within-subjects (pre- and post-program) refers to differences in EPS scores across pre- and post-test programs; between-subjects (citizens/year/country/major/gender) refers to differences in EPS scores between the four citizen types/two sample years/two countries/two types of majors/two genders; and interaction effects occur when there is a significant two-/or three-way interaction effect among the within- and between-subject factors.

Year (2008 versus 2009). Table 1 shows descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, and sample size) that supported a significant within-subjects (pre- and post-test program) effect (Pillai's = .085, F=57.01, p<.001) and significant

[4]The sample size was too small to generate cell sizes of at least 30 respondents (the minimum number considered sufficient) for three- or four-way between factors analyses.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics (Mean, Standard Deviation, and Sample Size) for Pre- and Post-test Scores on Environmental Policy Support (EPS) by Citizen Type and Year

	Citizen Type														
	Non-Citizen			Personally Responsible Citizen			Participatory Citizen			Justice-Oriented Citizen			Overall		
	Mean	S.D.	n	Mean	S.D.	n	Mean	S.D.	n	Mean	S.D.	n	Mean	S.D.	n
2008															
EPS pre-test	11.71	3.87	55	13.68	2.89	136	12.69	4.09	81	14.38	3.95	48	13.20	3.65	320
EPS post-test	12.31	3.51		14.67	3.41		13.70	3.83		15.21	4.09		14.1	3.75	
2009															
EPS pre-test	12.26	3.45	42	13.28	3.89	149	12.02	4.46	66	14.33	3.33	46	13.02	3.94	303
EPS post-test	13.64	3.88		14.30	3.89		13.50	4.05		15.07	3.67		14.15	3.91	
Overall															
EPS pre-test	11.95	3.69	97	13.47	3.45	285	12.39	4.26	147	14.35	3.64	94	13.11	3.79	623
EPS post-test	12.89	3.71		14.47	3.67		13.61	3.92		15.14	3.87		14.12	3.83	

Note. EPS consisted of three items measured on a "Strongly Disagree" (1) to "Strongly Agree" (7) response scale.

between-subjects (citizen) effect (F=9.606, p<.001), but non-significant main effects for year (2008 versus 2009) (F=.001, p=.989) and non-significant interactive effects for program by year (Pillai's = .002, F=1.25, p=.264), program by citizen (Pillai's = .002, F=.476, p=.699), year by citizen (F=1.012, p=.387), and program by year by citizen (Pillai's = .003, F=.537, p=.657). Levene's Test supported equality of (i.e., non-significant differences in) error variances for the pre-program (F=1.636, p=.122) and post-program (F=.798, p=.589) EPS scores. The strongly significant within-subjects effect suggested that EPS scores were higher in the post-program than in the pre-program for all citizen groups. The post-hoc test demonstrated that overall EPS scores for justice-oriented citizens (mean=14.75) were significantly higher than participatory citizens (mean=12.98) and non-citizens (mean=12.48). There was no significant difference between (a) personally responsible citizens (mean=13.98) and justice-oriented citizens and (b) participatory citizens and non-citizens.

Null hypothesis 1: Country of destination (Australia versus New Zealand). Hypothesis 1, suggesting that the program destination (Australia versus New Zealand) will not significantly impact the extent to which the study abroad program influences support for environmental policies across citizen types, was rejected. Table 2 shows descriptive results that support a significant within-subjects (pre- and post-test program) effect (Pillai's = .055, F=33.24, p<.001), significant between-subjects (citizen) effect (F=7.20, p<.001), and a significant interaction effect for program by country (Pillai's=.019, F=11.09, p=.001), but non-significant main effects for country (New Zealand versus Australia) (F=.2.42, p=.120), and non-significant interactive effects for program by citizen (Pillai's = .001, F=0.12, p=.951) and program by country by citizen (Pillai's = .004, F=.820, p=.483). Levene's Test supported equality of (i.e., non-significant differences in) error variances for the pre-program (F=1.32, p=.239) and post-program (F=.656, p=.709) EPS scores. The strongly significant within-subjects effect suggests that EPS scores are higher in the post-program than in the pre-program for all citizen groups. However, the significant program by country interaction effect supersedes interpretation of the within-subjects main effect: New Zealand students' pre-program EPS scores (mean=13.76) were significantly higher than Australian students (mean=12.70), but there was no significant difference in the comparable post-program EPS scores for New Zealand students (mean=14.13) and Australian students (mean=14.03). Once again, the post-hoc test demonstrated that overall EPS scores for justice-oriented citizens (mean=14.60) were significantly higher than participatory citizens (mean=13.02) and non-citizens (mean=12.44). There was no significant difference between (a) personally responsible citizens (mean=13.93) and justice-oriented citizens and (b) participatory and non-citizens.

Null hypothesis 2: Major of study (biophysical sciences versus social sciences). Hypothesis 2, suggesting that the students major (biophysical sciences versus social sciences) will not significantly impact the extent to which the study abroad program influences support for environmental policies across citizen types, was rejected. Table 3 shows descriptive results that support a significant within-subjects (pre- and post-test program) effect (Pillai's = .086, F=56.17, p<.001), significant between-subjects effects for citizen (F=10.26, p<.001) and for

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics (Mean, Standard Deviation, and Sample Size) for Pre- and Post-test Scores on Environmental Policy Support (EPS) by Citizen Type and Country Visited

	Citizen Type														
	Non-Citizen Mean	**S.D.**	**n**	**Personally Responsible Citizen Mean**	**S.D.**	**n**	**Participatory Citizen Mean**	**S.D.**	**n**	**Justice-Oriented Citizen Mean**	**S.D.**	**n**	**Overall Mean**	**S.D.**	**n**
New Zealand															
EPS pre-test	12.20	3.41	30	13.83	3.48	95	13.79	4.04	42	14.79	4.19	38	13.76	3.78	205
EPS post-test	12.13	4.04		14.21	4.07		14.07	3.73		15.58	4.16		14.13	4.11	
Australia															
EPS pre-test	11.86	3.92	63	13.25	3.43	163	11.87	4.34	99	13.67	3.09	48	12.70	3.80	373
EPS post-test	13.27	3.58		14.51	3.44		13.41	4.07		14.63	3.76		14.03	3.71	
Overall															
EPS pre-test	11.97	3.75	93	13.47	3.46	258	12.44	4.33	141	14.16	3.64	86	13.08	3.82	578
EPS post-test	12.90	3.75		14.40	3.68		13.61	3.97		15.05	3.95		14.06	3.86	

Note: EPS consisted of three items measured on a "Strongly Disagree" (1) to "Strongly Agree" (7) response scale.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics (Mean, Standard Deviation, and Sample Size) for Pre- and Post-test Scores on Environmental Policy Support (EPS) by Citizen Type and Major

	Citizen Type														
	Non-Citizen			Personally Responsible Citizen			Participatory Citizen			Justice-Oriented Citizen			Overall		
	Mean	S.D.	n	Mean	S.D.	n	Mean	S.D.	n	Mean	S.D.	n	Mean	S.D.	n
Biophysical sciences															
EPS pre-test	12.66	3.83	41	13.83	3.53	110	13.44	3.76	61	15.41	3.26	39	13.79	3.67	251
EPS post-test	12.90	3.77		15.21	3.53		14.23	3.66		16.59	2.62		14.81	3.63	
Social sciences															
EPS pre-test	11.36	3.52	53	13.30	3.38	164	11.58	4.49	84	13.47	3.72	51	12.63	3.84	352
EPS post-test	13.00	3.69		14.06	3.54		13.15	4.10		13.98	4.32		13.67	3.83	
Overall															
EPS pre-test	11.93	3.70	94	13.51	3.44	274	12.37	4.28	145	14.31	3.64	90	13.11	3.80	603
EPS post-test	12.96	3.80		14.52	3.57		13.61	3.94		15.11	3.89		14.15	3.79	

Note: EPS consisted of three items measured on a "Strongly Disagree" (1) to "Strongly Agree" (7) response scale.

major (F=17.88, p<.001), and a significant three-way interaction effect for program by citizen by major (Pillai's=.019, F=3.89, p=.009), but non-significant interactive effects for program by citizen (Pillai's = .001, F=0.27, p=.845), program by major (Pillai's=.001, F=.678, p=.411), and citizen by major (F=1.32, p=.268). Levene's Test supported equality of (i.e., non-significant differences in) error variances for the pre-program (F=1.26, p=.268) and post-program (F=1.38, p=.210) EPS scores. As in previous analysis, the strongly significant within-subjects effect suggests that EPS scores are higher in the post-program than in the pre-program for all citizen groups. However, the significant three-way interaction (program by citizen by major) supersedes interpretation of any of the main effects or two-way interaction effects: Biophysical science students reported higher pre- and post-test program EPS scores than social science students; indeed, for all citizen types except non-citizens and personally responsible citizens, the pre-test EPS scores for biophysical science students were higher than either the pre- or post-test EPS scores for social science students. However, the significant interaction is most evident in the case of non-citizens. For non-citizens, participation in the study abroad program had a much greater impact on EPS scores for social science students than it did for biophysical science students; indeed biophysical science non-citizens reported a lower post-test than pre-test program EPS. The trend in overall EPS scores across citizen groups was consistent with other post-hoc analyses: Overall EPS scores for justice-oriented citizens (mean=14.71) were significantly higher than participatory citizens (mean=12.99) and non-citizens (mean=12.44). There was no significant difference between (a) personally responsible citizens (mean=14.01) and justice-oriented citizens and (b) participatory and non-citizens.

Null hypothesis 3: Gender (female versus male). Hypothesis 3, suggesting that gender will not significantly impact the extent to which the study abroad program influences support for environmental policies across citizen types, was rejected. Table 4 shows descriptive results that support a significant within-subjects (pre- and post-test program) effect (Pillai's = .065, F=42.04, p<.001) and significant between-subjects effects for citizen (F=9.68, p<.001) and for gender (F=27.07, p<.001), but non-significant interaction effects for program by citizen (Pillai's = .003, F=.66, p=.579), program by gender (Pillai's = .002, F=1.35, p=.245), citizen by gender (F=.445, p=.721), and program by citizen by gender (Pillai's = .003, F=.690, p=.559). Levene's Test barely supported equality of (i.e., non-significant differences in) error variances for the pre-program (F=2.003, p=.053) and post-program (F=1.94, p=.061) EPS scores. The strongly significant within-subjects effect suggests that EPS scores were higher in the post-test program than in the pre-test program for all citizen groups. As with other analyses, the post-hoc test demonstrates that overall EPS scores for justice-oriented citizens (mean=14.73) were significantly higher than participatory citizens (mean=13.00) and non-citizens (mean=12.37). There was no significant difference between (a) personally responsible citizens (mean=13.95) and justice-oriented citizens and (b) participatory and non-citizens. Females reported significantly higher EPS scores (mean=14.11) than males (mean=12.42).

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics (Mean, Standard Deviation, and Sample Size) for Pre- and Post-test Scores on Environmental Policy Support (EPS) by Citizen Type and Gender

	Citizen Type														
	Non-Citizen			Personally Responsible Citizen			Participatory Citizen			Justice-Oriented Citizen			Overall		
	Mean	S.D.	n	Mean	S.D.	n	Mean	S.D.	n	Mean	S.D.	n	Mean	S.D.	n
Male															
EPS pre-test	11.24	3.62	41	12.58	3.88	77	11.11	4.43	27	13.19	4.11	43	12.22	4.01	188
EPS post-test	11.95	4.26		12.99	4.02		12.56	3.68		13.72	4.34		12.87	4.12	
Female															
EPS pre-test	12.43	3.74	54	13.79	3.26	203	12.69	4.22	117	15.32	2.90	50	13.50	3.67	424
EPS post-test	13.50	3.12		14.99	3.38		13.84	3.95		16.34	2.99		14.64	3.57	
Overall															
EPS pre-test	11.92	3.72	95	13.46	3.48	280	12.40	4.29	144	14.33	3.65	93	13.10	3.82	612
EPS post-test	12.83	3.71		14.44	3.67		13.60	3.92		15.13	3.89		14.10	3.83	

Note: EPS consisted of three items measured on a "Strongly Disagree" (1) to "Strongly Agree" (7) response scale.

Discussion

Summary of Findings

All three null hypotheses were rejected and there were a number of consistent findings across all analyses: (1) participation in the educational travel program increased support for environmental policies across all citizen groups (i.e., as demonstrated by significantly higher post- versus pre-test scores), (2) justice-oriented citizens reported the highest support for environmental policies of all citizen groups, both before and after the program, while non-citizens demonstrated the lowest support (both pre- and post-test), and (3) significant interaction effects mean that these main effects cannot be interpreted without considering the effects of (a) the study abroad destination and (b) student major. Notably, participation in the educational travel program (i) led to significantly higher levels of environmental policy support for students in Australia (but not for students in New Zealand) and (ii) had no effect on environmental policy support for biophysical science, non-citizen, students. There was no main effect or interaction effect with year, suggesting that the results held consistent across both sampling periods (2008 and 2009). Support for environmental policies was significantly higher for females than males (both pre- and post-test).

Limitations

Our research design may have yielded different results had the pre- and post-tests been conducted at the home (not in-country/host) institution; i.e., students completed the pre-test instrument before departure and the post-test survey after returning home from the program. There is considerable evidence that study abroad generates a transformational effect (an epistemological shift in the way that students view themselves, the world they live in, and their role in that world) suggesting responses to the post-test instrument may have been different as students recalled their experiences over time (Kegan, 2000, Mezirow, 2000). However, the challenge in post-test surveys is ensuring a high response rate (almost 90% of respondents completed both surveys in our study) since many students either graduate and/or are less likely to return instruments after coursework is complete and grades submitted. Ideally, two post-test surveys would be administered, one immediately after the program and another two to six months later. An additional concern was that the pre-test may have conditioned responses to the post-test given the program duration was only four weeks.

The research design was further weakened by the lack of student random assignment, which would be extremely challenging to achieve in study abroad because of the inherent financial and time costs of travel; as well as by the failure to include a control group, although the absence of a similar course taught on campus (i.e., the same academic content but without the educational travel component) would potentially render the control group invalid. Differences in the content of the course material will influence the learning experience and therefore may have played a role in students' responses on the EPS. While the two programs (Australia and New Zealand) adopted an identical delivery mechanism, oriented around a series of field modules, and addressed similar academic themes (relating

to indigenous perspectives, conservation management, environmental values, and sustainable development) there was, of course, a difference in the content of the classroom and field lectures, field activities, and readings between the Australia and New Zealand programs. There is simply no practical way to standardize such academic material across the two countries and develop separate programs that address the unique bio-geographic, historical, and socio-cultural features of the environments.

Finally, the faculty and/or student peers in each of the educational travel groups were potential confounding variables that could not be explicitly addressed in the study (individual program groups that students participated in were not recorded). Given the influential role of faculty/instructors and/or student group dynamics in the programs, it is likely that these factors could have contributed as agents of change. Related to this, the extent to which some students engaged with locals more than others was unknown.

Conclusions

Study abroad has emerged as a national priority (Lewin, 2009) and is increasingly recognized as part of a cogent mission of most institutions of higher education (Hovland, 2009; Stearns, 2009). As universities and colleges seek to expand their international offerings, it is critical that those involved in preparing students for study abroad (administrators, faculty, and service providers) recognize that a one-size-fits-all approach may not be entirely appropriate. Our research showed that while study abroad can nurture a global citizenry, the effect was dependent on several factors. First, participation in the educational travel programs resulted in higher support for sustainable environmental policies across all citizen types, although justice-oriented citizens consistently exhibited the strongest (and non-citizens, the weakest) scores. Second, program destination and student characteristics (major of study and gender) clearly influenced the effect of educational travel programs on environmental policy support across citizen types suggesting that these variables need to be explicitly considered when institutions develop educational travel programs for their students. For example, biophysical and social science majors may require different coursework or perhaps separate educational travel programs if the goal is it nurture global citizenship. Similarly, Australia may be a more appropriate destination for students with low levels of pro-environmentalism as (a) student peers are more likely to exhibit similar support for environmental policies and (b) the effect of the study abroad program (on pro-environmentalism) is likely to be greater than if the same students studied in New Zealand. Finally, it is important to recognize that although participation in the educational travel programs will increase support for environmental policies, female students will continue to exhibit greater pro-environmentalism than male students (consistent with previous literature on this topic) and the travel program itself will have very little, if any, impact on this trend.

Consistent with the claims of Westheimer and Kahne that education programs should foster critical thinking as a prerequisite to nurturing justice-oriented citizenship, our results suggest that academic institutions have fallen short in ad-

vocating for, and delivering, international education that promotes global citizenship. Brown (2006), for example, suggested that "too little attention has been paid to identifying the kinds of skills and learning outcomes that are most likely to lead to college and university students who are well prepared to live and act as global citizens" (p. 1). Building on the work of Dobson (2003) and others, we also maintain that education for global citizenship should foster connections between humans and their environment utilizing a sustainable development perspective; requiring students to explore the links between society, economy, and the environment at both local and global levels. All too often, traditional study abroad programs simply transplant students from a U.S. campus to another campus abroad. Frequently, traditional disciplines/courses are taught without addressing either (a) the skill set required to understand the intricate relationships among the host peoples and their environment (Steinberg, 2002; Stephenson, 1999) and/or (b) the implications or behavioral outcomes associated with the new skill set (in terms of the values and behaviors required to make decisions and act as global citizens) (Stearns, 2009). As suggested in classical times, the promotion and discourse of new values, beliefs, and ideas is essential for nurturing meaningful citizenship and, in the study abroad context, this must be conducted in a highly structured, purposeful manner that advocates critical discourse on environmental policies and issues.

Galston (2001) argues that "good citizens are made, not born" (p. 217), implying that educational institutions do have a fundamental role to play in nurturing global citizenship. Consistent with Dobson's (2003) view of an "Earth Citizen," results suggest that if educational travel programs are to respond to calls to foster global citizenry, they should be academically and logistically structured to focus less on promoting personal responsible citizenry (e.g., recycling, volunteerism, and charity) and more on a critical assessment of the justice issues surrounding global environmental problems and actions to redress the injustices (associated with justice-oriented citizens). All too often, however, undergraduate university and college curricula fall short of the potential positive impacts they could have in the development of global citizenry. For example, in many leisure studies curricula that require practicum, work experience, internships, and/or service-learning projects, students receive credit for involvement in park and river clean-ups or volunteering for community environmental efforts; rarely, however, are these students encouraged or empowered to address social problems through a critical assessment and understanding of the key social, economic, and political agendas surrounding these environmental issues.

Implications

Understanding the role of citizenship in environmentalism can have important implications for academia in general as well as for leisure and tourism professionals in particular. As the number of U.S. public and private universities and colleges that either mandate study abroad as a degree requirement and/or seek to dramatically increase study abroad participation among their student body continues to rise, short-term, educational travel programs will be seen as a viable option to meeting these goals. However, in order to nurture levels of global citizenry

consistent with the goals of federal legislation and/or institutional missions, we maintain that considerable care must be taken to distinguish between educational travel programs that simply incorporate a field component in the delivery of its instruction, and programs with a delivery mechanism that actively engages students with the real world and challenges them to critically assess and form their own opinions about global issues. The former can be little more than a type of service tourism (Susnowitz, 2006) in which the greatest benefit is the economic impact of the student spending money in the local community, while it is in the latter that real social change and justice is likely to be nurtured (Shallcross & Robinson, 2006).

Study abroad experiences certainly provide students with numerous educational opportunities, but they also serve as a catalyst for social connectedness between and among students, faculty and field guides, as well as with members of the host community (Harrison, 2006). Educational travel programs are full of "leisure-like moments during work-like activities" which facilitate the production of social capital, particularly when those interactions are voluntarily chosen (Glover, Parry, & Shinew, 2005, p. 468). Study abroad programs also offer participants varied leisure opportunities during non-program periods and these leisure episodes found peppered throughout study abroad experiences serve to facilitate social capital. By its nature, social capital contributes to a sense of voluntary obligation, that duty is owed to those with whom social capital has been established. Likewise, educational travel programs have tremendous potential for building social capital among participants and between them and members of host communities as they study environmental issues, explore unfamiliar ecosystems, and engage in leisure episodes together. As a result, students, especially those with a justice-orientation, can develop and stronger sense of environmental responsibility and nurture a sense of global citizenship.

Future Studies

As Congress moves forward with the Senator Paul Simon Foundation Act, future studies should document the long-term impacts of educational travel programs on pro-environmental behaviors and investigate the extent to which graduates of such programs continue to recognize an obligation to reduce their ecological footprint years or decades after the experience. Further studies on the effect of destination, gender, and major of study on a range of study abroad learning outcomes are necessary with greater expansion to other countries (inside and outside of the South Pacific) and academic contexts.

There are, of course, a number of unanswered questions from this study: How do study abroad students differ to the general student population with respect to global citizenship (i.e., does study abroad attract a certain type of citizen)? How do short-term, educational travel programs (of the nature described here) differ to traditional study abroad programs (in which students remain at an overseas university for a semester or a year) and/or programs of a different academic focus (e.g., language acquisition, cultural immersion, etc) in terms of global citizenship —this is especially relevant given both the federal government's interest in (and institutional commitment to) promoting citizenship through study abroad and

that short-term programs now attract more students (at an increasing rate) than traditional programs.

References

Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1980). *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Attfield, R. (2002). Global citizenship and the global environment. In N. Dower & J. Williams (Eds.), *Global citizenship: A critical reader* (pp. 191-200). Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.

Brown, N. (2006). Embedding engagement in higher education: Preparing global citizens through international service-learning. In B. Holland & J. Meeropol (Eds.), *A more perfect vision: The future of campus engagement.* Providence, RI: Campus Compact. Retrieved from http://www.compact.org/20th/papers

Bryant, D. (2006). The everyone, everywhere: Global dimensions of citizenship. In B. Holland & J. Meeropol (Eds.), *A more perfect vision: The future of campus engagement.* Providence, RI: Campus Compact. Retrieved from http://www.compact.org/20th/papers

Carlson, J. S., & Widaman, K.F. (1988). The effects of study abroad during college on attitudes toward other cultures. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 12*, 1-17.

Chieffo, L., & Griffiths, L. (2004). Large-scale assessment of student attitudes after a short-term study abroad program, *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 65-177.

Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program. (2005). *Global competence and national needs.* Washington, DC: Lincoln Commission.

Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (1979). *Quasi-experimentation: Design and analysis for field settings*. Chicago, Illinois: Rand McNally.

Dobson, A. (2003). *Citizenship and the environment*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Dolby, N. (2007). Reflections on nation: American undergraduates and education abroad. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11*(2), 141-156.

Donnelly-Smith, L. (2009). Global learning through short-term study abroad. *Association of American Colleges and Universities Peer Review*, Fall, 12-15.

Dower, N., & Williams, J. (2002). *Global citizenship: A critical reader.* Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.

Galston, W. A. (2001). Political knowledge, political engagement, and civic education. *Annual Review of Political Science, 4*, 217-234.

Glover, T. D. (2004). The "Community" Center and the social construction of citizenship. *Leisure Sciences, 26*(1), 63-84.

Glover, T. D., Parry, D. C., & Shinew, K. J. (2005). Building relationships, accessing resources: Mobilizing social capital in community garden contexts. *Journal of Leisure Research, 37*, 450 – 474.

Gray, C. B. (1998). Paideia, Scole, Paidia: Then and Now. Paper presented at: *Twentieth World Congress of Philosophy* (August 10-15), Boston, MA. Retrieved from http://www.bu.edu/wcp/Papers/OApp/OAppGray.htm

Harrison, J. K. (2006). The relationship between international study tour effects and the personality variables of self-monitoring and core self-evaluations. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 1-22.

Hemingway, J. L. (1999). Leisure, social capital, and democratic citizenship. *Journal of Leisure Research, 31*(2), 150-165.

Hett, E. J. (1993). *The development of an instrument to measure global-mindedness*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of San Diego.

Hovland, K. (2009). Global learning: What is it? Who is responsible for it? *Association of American Colleges and Universities Peer Review*, Fall, 4-7.

Institute of International Education. (2009). *Open doors online: Report on International Educational Exchange*. Retrieved from http://opendoors.iienetwork.org/

Kehl, K., & Morris, J. (2007). Differences in global-mindedness between short-term and semester-long study abroad participants at selected private universities. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 67-79.

Kegan, R. (2000). What 'form' transforms? A constructive-developmental approach to transformational learning. In J. Mezirow (Ed.), *Learning as transformation: Critical perspectives on a theory in progress* (pp. 35-69). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Lee, B., & Shafer, C.S. (2002). The dynamic nature of leisure experience: An application of affect control theory. *Journal of Leisure Research, 34*, 290 – 310.

Lee, B., Shafer, C. S., & Kang, I. (2005). Examining relationships among perceptions of self, episode-specific evaluations, and overall satisfaction with a leisure activity. *Leisure Sciences, 27*, 93 – 109.

Lewin, R. (2009). Transforming the study abroad experience into a collective priority. *Association of American Colleges and Universities Peer Review*, Fall, 8-11.

Litvin, S. (2000). Revisiting Tourism and Understanding. *Annals of Tourism Research, 27*, 526–529.

Litvin, S. (2003). Tourism and Understanding: The MBA Study Mission. *Annals of Tourism Research, 30*, 77–93.

Martin, J. N., & Rohrlich, B. (1991). The relationship between study abroad student expectations and selected student characteristics. *Journal of College Student Development, 32*, 39-46.

McKeown, J. S. (2009). *The first time effect: The impact of study abroad on college student intellectual development*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

McLaughlin, J. S., & Johnson, D. K. (2006). Assessing the field course experiential learning model: Transforming collegiate short-term study abroad experiences into rich learning environments. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 65-85.

Mezirow, J. (Ed.). (2000). *Learning as transformation: Critical perspectives on a theory in progress*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mill, R. C., & Morrison, A. M. (1985). *The tourism system*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

National Survey of Student Engagement. (2007). *Experiences that matter: Enhancing student learning and success*. Bloomington, IN: Center for Postsecondary Research, School of Education, Indiana University.

Noddings, N. (2005). Global citizenship: promises and problems. In N. Noddings (Ed.), *Educating citizens for global awareness* (pp. 1-21). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Nyaupane, G. P., Teye, V., & Paris, C. (2008). Innocents abroad: Attitude change toward hosts. *Annals of Tourism Research, 35*(3), 650-667.

Pizam, A. (1996). Does tourism promote peace and understanding between unfriendly nations? In A. Pizam & Y. Manfield (Eds.), *Tourism, crime and international security issues* (pp. 203-213). London, UK: MacMillan.

Pizam, A. Jafari, J., & Milman, A. (1991). The impact of tourism on ethnic attitudes: US students visiting USSR. *Tourism Management, 12*(1), 47-54.

Rackham, H. (1932). *Aristotle's Politics: Translated by H. Rackham*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Rajecki, D. W. (1982). *Attitudes: Themes and advances*. Sunderland, MA: Sinauer.

Reid, P. (1966). *Art and Affection: A Life of Virginia Woolf*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Roberts, J. A., & Bacon, D. R. (1997). Exploring the subtle relationships between environmental concern and ecologically conscious consumer behavior. *Journal of Business Research, 40*, 79-89.

Shallcross, T., & Robinson, J. (2006). Education for sustainable development as applied global citizenship and environmental justice. In T. Shallcross and J. Robinson (Eds.), *Global citizenship and environmental justice* (pp. 175-194). New York, NY: Rodopi.

Skocpol, T. (2003). *Diminished democracy: From membership to management in American civil life*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

Sirakaya, E., Sasidharan, V., & Sonmez, S. (1999). Redefining Ecotourism: The Need for a Supply-Side View. *Journal of Travel Research, 38*(2): 168 - 172.

SPSS (2009). *SPSS Version 17.0*. Chicago, IL: SPSS, Inc.

Stearns, P. N. (2009). *Educating global citizens in colleges and universities: Challenges and opportunities*. Routledge: New York.

Steinberg, M. (2002). Involve me and I will understand: Academic quality in experiential programs. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad,* 207-229.

Stephenson, S. (1999). Study Abroad As a Transformational Experience and Its Effect upon Study Abroad Students and Host Nationals in Santiago, Chile. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 1-38.

Stern, P. C. (2000).Toward a coherent theory of environmentally significant behavior. *Journal of Social Issues, 56*, 407-424.

Stern, P. C., & Dietz, T. (1994). The value basis of environmental concern. *Journal of Social Issues, 50*(3), 65-84.

Stern, P. C., Dietz, T., Abel, T., Guagnano, G. A., & Kalof, L. (1999). A value-belief-norm theory of support for social movements: The case of environmentalism. *Human Ecology Review, 6*, 81-97.

Stern, P. C., Dietz, T., & Guagnano, G. A. (1995). The new ecological paradigm in social psychological context. *Environment and Behavior, 27*, 723-743.

Stern, P. C., Dietz, T., & Kalof, L. (1993). Value orientations, gender, and environmental concern. *Environment and Behavior, 25*, 322-348.

Susnowitz, S. (2006). Transforming students into global change agents. In B. Holland & J. Meeropol (Eds.), *A more perfect vision: The future of campus engagement*. Providence, RI: Campus Compact. Retrieved from http://www.compact.org/20th/papers

Talisse, R. (2006). Socratic Citizenship. *Philosophy in the Contemporary World, 13*(2), 4-10.

United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. (2007). *IPCC fourth assessment report.* Retrieved from http://www.ipcc.ch/ipccreports/ar4-syr.htm

Van 't Klooster, E., van Wijk, J., Go, F., & van Rekom, J. (2008). Educational travel: The overseas internship. *Annals of Tourism Research, 35*, 690-711.

Vande Berg, M.J., Balkcum, A., Scheid, M., & Whalen, B.J. (2004). The Georgetown University consortium project: A report at the halfway mark. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 101-116.

Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2004). Educating the "good" citizen: Political choices and pedagogical goals. *PSOnline*. Retrieved from www.apsanet.org

Winn, J. G. (2006). Techno-information literacy and global citizenship. *International Journal of Technology, Knowledge, and Society, 2*(3), 123-127.

Yonge, C.D. (1853). *The lives and opinions of eminent philosophers, by Diogenes Laertius, translated by C. D. Yonge*. London, UK: Henry G. Bohn.

Zanna, M. P., Olson, J. M., & Fazio, R.H. (1980). Attitude-behavior consistency: An individual difference perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38*, 432-440.

Zelenzy, L. C., Chua, P., & Aldrich, C. (2000). Elaborating on gender differences in environmentalism. *Journal of Social Issues, 56*(3), 443-457.