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ABSTRACT

Examining Students’ Perceptions of Study Abroad Programs Involving Sport Through Application of the Social Cognitive Career Theory. (August 2006)

Gregory C. Jones, B.S., Sam Houston State University

Chair of Advisory Committee: Dr. George B. Cunningham

With sport organizations venturing into the global realm, it is important to discover sport management students’ interest in studying abroad in sport. Previous research has attempted to discover career intentions using the social cognitive career theory (SCCT). SCCT focuses on the interaction of several factors which include personal behaviors such as self-efficacy, outcome expectations, choice goals, barriers, and supports. The purpose of this thesis was to identify barriers and supports to studying abroad, the relationship between the barriers and supports and one’s study abroad self-efficacy, and the relationship among study abroad self-efficacy, outcome expectations, interests, and choice goals (i.e., intent). Two different studies were administered with Study One taking a qualitative approach to better analyze supports and barriers, while Study Two incorporated the results from Study One, providing a quantitative aspect to the research. Data were collected from sport management undergraduate students from a southwestern Division I institution for Study One (n = 19), as well as for Study Two (n = 71). Questionnaires for both studies were developed using the basic tenets of SCCT to measure self-efficacy, interest, intent, supports, barriers, and outcome expectations to studying abroad in sport. Data analysis included coding data into themes and calculating
percentages for Study One, while items for Study Two were analyzed for reverse coding, and descriptive statistics for the study variables were performed. Means, standard deviations, and bivariate correlations were included with the statistics in Study Two. Likewise, linear regression and bivariate correlations were performed to evaluate the basic relationships between all the study variables within Study Two, while reliability estimates (Cronbach’s alpha) for each study variable were assessed. The results revealed that barriers (e.g., cultural differences) and supports (e.g., further education) were correlated with self-efficacy. Furthermore, there were correlations between interest and intent, self-efficacy and interest, self-efficacy and intent, and self-efficacy and outcome expectations. Recommendations and implications were provided for sport management academia followed by limitations and future directions of this study.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Chapter Organization

The purpose of this study sought to examine students’ perceptions of sport management study abroad programs through application of the social cognitive career theory (SCCT). This chapter discusses globalization and its effect throughout the corporate world as well as its reach and potential impact on sport. Additionally, a brief description of SCCT, the research questions, and the studies’ significance will be presented.

As organizations worldwide continue to expand, the subject of globalization persists. When barriers to trade decrease, so too do barriers to international migration, thereby leading to the search for skilled labor in the increasing integrated market (Bordo, 2002). As a result, organizations look for ways to move goods and services beyond domestic borders. While the term globalization encompasses many ideas, Bordo (2002) defined globalization as “the increasingly close international integration of markets for goods, services, and factors of production, labor, and capital” (p. 20). Some of the top global corporations include Citigroup, General Electric, American Intl Group, Bank of America, and HSBC Group. While the majority of the top global corporations are from the United States, several international corporations are extremely successful and

The style and format of this thesis follows that of the Journal of Sport Management.
competitive, such as ING Group from the Netherlands and Toyota Motor Company from Japan. Many of the top organizations in the world operate with a global perspective. As a result, organizations which operate globally do not limit their success to domestic boarders. Instead, these organizations look to build from the success that has already been achieved.

The impact of globalization is also seen in the sport industry, as sport organizations continue to examine ways in which their product can reach new markets. Several factors have contributed to this trend. Since the advent of the television age shortly after World War II, many sport and sporting cultures have gone through dramatic changes. In the last twenty five years, governments have contributed large sums of money towards sport succeeding on the international stage (Nauright, 2004). The International Olympic Committee and Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) have been the most successful promoters of a global adherence to positive aspects of sport (Cronin & Holt, 2003). Cronin and Holt (2003) added:

during the twentieth century, as formal imperialism went into decline, these two bodies became the most active advocates of globalised sport and became the new agents of an informal process of sporting imperialism. From small beginnings with limited memberships, both organisations have grown to the extent that there are few nations in the world which are not affiliated to both (p. 27)

Every two years, the Olympics showcase many of the world’s great athletes on a global stage. Soccer is the world’s most globalized sport, with over 200 countries involved with FIFA (Milanovic, 2005). Many other sports, including cycling (Cronin & Holt,
2003) and cricket (Kaufman & Patterson, 2005), continue to broaden their appeal internationally.

Many of the sport organizations domestically have established, or are beginning to establish, a presence internationally. The National Football League (NFL) has expanded into Europe, and often plays games in other countries such as Japan and Mexico with aspirations of future expansion (Howard & Crompton, 2004). The National Basketball Association (NBA) has developed into a transnational corporation (Jackson & Andrews, 1999). Amongst many of the NBA’s international endeavors, an overseas division known as NBA International has been formed. It has increased the Association’s visibility through television and licensed merchandising deals that were negotiated in regional offices in Geneva, Barcelona, Melbourne, Hong Kong, Mexico City, and Miami (Jackson & Andrews, 1999). In addition, the NBA has proposed intentions of expanding into Europe (Whittell, 2002). Along with the expansion has come a steady influx of international players making the NBA marketable in many countries throughout the world. Similarly, Major League Baseball (MLB) has made concerted efforts to promote the game internationally for the past 15 years (Maurer, Hyman, & Woellert, 2005). Retail sales abroad of MLB-licensed merchandise have increased by $200 million in the last ten years, and 112 nations now have baseball federations (Maurer et al., 2005). Despite being dropped as an Olympic sport, baseball countered with the inaugural World Baseball Classic in 2006, with 16 countries participating. Based on these factors, it is evident that many sport organizations are beginning to show their presence internationally.
Developing leaders who can cope with the increasing complexities of operating global organizations is a key human resource priority for many organizations (Dickmann & Harris, 2005). With the increase in globalization comes the need for sport managers with a global perspective. It is critical for managers to have an understanding of local customs and traditions, as well as the different norms of conducting business in countries around the world. Without such understanding, the ultimate success in seeking a global presence will not be realized.

One possible way to achieve this global understanding is through study abroad. Study abroad programs affiliated with colleges and universities all over the world work at developing cultural diversity in students as well as preparing them for unique opportunities such as considering a career internationally. Vaccaro (2002) found that employers considered important features such as language skills, intercultural competence, and a willingness to take the risk to study abroad. Ingraham (2003) found that studying abroad made students consider working internationally, as well as more marketable to employers. In addition, Cheney (2001) argued that business schools should look to incorporate intercultural communication into their curricula to prepare graduates with the necessary tools to communicate effectively with people from diverse cultural backgrounds.

This review illustrates that study abroad programs are capable of providing many skills for individuals that the traditional classroom approach to international business education does not deliver as effectively (Henthorne et al., 2001; Peppas, 2005). Despite the potential importance of study abroad, there is limited research that has focused
specifically on the concept in the area of sport. As such, the purpose of this thesis is to examine sport management students’ perceptions of studying abroad. Specifically, by incorporating social cognitive career theory, I will examine the influence of cognitive-person variables (i.e., self-efficacy and outcome expectations) and environmental factors (i.e., support and barriers) on students’ interest and intentions to study abroad. The theoretical framework and research plan for the study are presented below.

**Theoretical Framework**

Social cognitive career theory (SCCT; Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994) has been utilized extensively to understand how people develop career choice. SCCT has been used to investigate student interest in the sport and leisure industry (Cunningham, Bruening, Sartore, Sagas, & Fink, 2005), choice behavior in engineering majors (Lent et al., 2003b), academic and vocational interests (Diegelman & Subich, 2001), and career development (Flores & O’Brien, 2002; Lindley, 2005; Smith, 2001). SCCT employs the use of two cognitive-person constructs: self-efficacy and outcome expectations. In turn, these constructs guide and direct people through vocational interests, choice goals (i.e., intent), and ultimately a career decision (Lent & Brown, 1996). In addition, these constructs interact with other characteristics of persons (e.g., sex) and their environments (i.e., supports and barriers) while the process of career development occurs (Lent & Brown, 1996). Accordingly, Lent et al. (1994) proposed that person, environment, and behavioral variables have a reciprocal effect on one another.

Bandura (1986) defined self-efficacy as “people’s judgments of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of
performances” (p. 391). Self-efficacy was introduced into career development literature by Hackett and Betz (1981). Research has revealed that high self-efficacy beliefs are related to various outcomes including sport career choices (Cunningham et al., 2005), and academic success (Zajacova, Lynch, & Espenshade, 2005). Lent et al. (1994) alluded to the fact that self-efficacy beliefs relate to one’s response capabilities focusing on a specific task rather than self-efficacy in general. To relate this with the desire to work internationally in sport, one might ask the question, “can I do this?” Based on one’s judgment to this question, a response will be formed, thus developing one’s self-efficacy towards this subject.

Outcome expectations deal with the likely consequence an action will produce. Put another way, “an outcome is the consequence of an act, not the act itself” (Bandura, 1986, p. 391). Bandura (1986, p. 391) explicated that people are likely to act according to their judgments of what they can do, as well as on their confidence about the likely effects of assorted actions. Lent et al. (1994) examined outcome expectations in the context of vocational behavior and applied their effects on overall career development. They demonstrated that the effects of self-efficacy and outcome expectations on career behavior were influenced by the circumstance in which the behavior was done (Lent et al., 1994). As a result, these findings show that one is likely to choose a vocational path where a favorable outcome is foreseen as a result of that behavior (Lent et al., 1994).

Finally, choice goals play a significant role in the application of SCCT. Bandura (1986) characterized choice goals as one’s intention to pursue a specific activity or to produce a particular outcome. Goals help people organize, guide, and sustain their own
efforts, even over time without external reinforcement (Lent & Brown, 1994). In the vocational interest framework, SCCT speculates that self-efficacy and positive outcome expectations towards a particular activity are expected to arise interest in an activity. This interest is then expected to promote goals for further activity exposure (Lent et al., 1994). That is, people are likely to form goals and sustain in activities they find relevant and appealing and expect positive outcomes. For example, one may formulate goals to work internationally in sport as a result of positive outcome expectations based on previous international endeavors, and a high affinity, or self-efficacy, towards the international experience. Ultimately, these choice goals (i.e., intent) should give rise to actual behavior (Lent et al., 1994).

Most SCCT research has focused on the influence of person-cognitive variables on subsequent intentions and behaviors. Recently, however, Lent and his colleagues (e.g., Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 2000) have demonstrated the importance of also considering environmental factors. Career development is affected by objective (e.g., parental behaviors, economic conditions) and perceived environmental factors (Lent et al., 2000). The objective environmental factors depend on how one responds to them, while perceived environmental factors are dependent on one’s interpretation of events. Furthermore, distal and proximal factors can influence one’s environment. Distal factors can be described as aspects that affect the learning experiences such as role models, while proximal factors can moderate and directly affect the career choices of individuals such as discrimination (Lent et al., 2000). The impact these factors have on an individual can determine the action one takes in order to achieve goals.
To further simplify, environmental factors can be broken down into contextual supports and barriers (Lent et al., 1994). Recent studies have indicated that the effects of supports and barriers are likely to be seen through self-efficacy estimates (Cunningham et al., 2005; Lent et al., 2003b), thereby supporting Bandura’s (2000) framework. For example, one may have been a victim of discrimination while traveling, and as a result, a barrier is formed that could impact one’s efficacy related to working internationally. On the other hand, one could have had a successful experience studying abroad, and therefore a support is formed towards working internationally.

Together, this literature suggests that cognitive-person variables, environmental factors, interests, and choice goals should all ultimately predict one’s choice to study abroad. Based on the framework of this theory, research questions were formulated as follows:

*RQ1*: What barriers and supports do sport management students perceive to studying abroad?

*RQ2*: What is the relationship between the barriers and supports and one’s study abroad self-efficacy?

*RQ3*: What is the relationship among study abroad self-efficacy, outcome expectations, interests, and choice goals (i.e., intent)?

**Significance of the study**

Globalization continues to be a trend in many different aspects of the economy. As mentioned, sport and sport organizations share the same aspirations to expand globally that many businesses propose. With the expansion of sport into the global
realm, come new opportunities for people to work internationally in sport.
Consequently, it is important to understand one’s interest in working internationally in
sport, the relationship of one’s interest and personal goals, and the impact environmental
factors can have on one’s choice. Positive outcomes related to these results can consist
of plans which include sport management programs that focus on cultural diversity and
its importance in the global economy, and development of coursework preparing
individuals to work internationally in sport. In addition, it is important to develop study
abroad programs because of the potential positive impact they can have on students who
desire to work internationally in sport.

Contents of the Thesis

The thesis is categorized into five chapters. Chapter I consists of the introduction
and an explanation of the major and significant purposes of the study. Chapter II
discusses literature that is applicable to the subject. Chapter III reveals the research
methodologies utilized in the study. Chapter IV details the results of the data analyses,
hypotheses tests, and the research question. In conclusion, chapter V explains the
implications of the study, the conclusion, and directions for future research.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

Chapter Organization

The purpose of this study sought to examine students’ perceptions of sport management study abroad programs through application of the social cognitive career theory. This chapter consists of a literature review relating to the prominent topics of this study. First, this chapter explores literature pertaining to international sport. Second, an examination of studies and literature relevant to study abroad is analyzed. Finally, an evaluation of literature involving the social cognitive career theory and its application is examined.

International Sport

As the popularity of sport continues to grow around the world, so too will the need for sport managers. An examination of literature pertaining to sport in various regions across the world identified many opportunities for sport management students abroad. It is important to note that throughout the review sport was addressed from a North American perspective. Thus, only sport from outside that context was considered. Europe offers an abundance of sport opportunities, as do other regions such as South/Central America, Asia, Africa, and Australia.

Europe

Sport continues to be very popular across Europe. Whereas Western European sport is more lucrative, Eastern Europe continues to be a work in progress (Collins, 2004;
Davis, 2004). Sport in Western Europe has evolved into an industry employing more individuals than many manufacturing industries and providing more media and public attention than numerous political acts (Collins, 2004). Davies (2004) examined the state of Eastern European sport before and after the fall of communism, as well as the transition period that is currently taking place within these countries. Part of the progress reveals that within these newly formed democratic societies there comes a willingness or desire for participation in sport. The challenge comes from insufficient facilities and lack of economic surpluses (Davies, 2004). Davies (2004) suggested that despite the slow progress of sport in Eastern Europe, there is a need for improved management, trained volunteers, and professionals.

Collins (2004) discussed various models of sports governance/strategic management in Europe. Three different categories were developed and defined. One of the categories is centralized public sector-led which is more familiar in countries where reduction of local government’s ability to raise its own funds exists (Collins, 2004). An additional category is voluntary sector-led, where the country sees the way in providing support to allow voluntary bodies to lead, develop, and implement policies for communities and elite sport (Collins, 2004). The last category defined by Collins (2004) was a hybrid category were both state and national sports organizations form a strong financial partnership. While agreeing with many points that Davies (2004) made, Collins (2004, p. 842) further noted when referring to sport that it is important for each country “to develop something appropriate and ecologically sustainable in each culture.”
Along with the development of sport throughout European countries come employment opportunities. Madella (2003) utilized various methods to analyze sport employment in European countries. About one-third of jobs related to sport in Europe exist in England, while numerous opportunities exist in France, Germany, and Spain (Madella, 2003). Overall there was a 57% increase in sport employment between 1990 and 1998 (Madella, 2003). While Europe has enjoyed much success in recent years in the growth of sport employment, Madella (2003) warned of an end to this trend and the need for future analyses.

**South/ Central America**

While many opportunities exist in Europe relating to sport, fewer exist in South/Central America. Little research has examined sport in South/Central America despite countries such as Brazil having succeeded on the international stage. While various professional soccer leagues exist throughout South/Central America, few enjoy the financial success of those found throughout Europe (Madella, 2003). Most literature involving sport and South/Central America has examined the rich history soccer has offered. Mason (1995) discussed how soccer has generated passion among the people of South/Central America throughout the previous century. Sandoval-Garcia (2005) further exemplified this point when he examined the state of soccer in Costa Rica and its effect on forging nationhood and masculinities. Subsequently, Sandoval-Garcia (2005) noted how sponsors have begun to take notice and advantage of this effect.
Asia

In Asia, sport continues to grow in popularity. Professional baseball has been successful in Japan and on the international stage with the country’s win in the inaugural World Baseball Classic. In recent years, literature has focused on the growing popularity of soccer in Asia. Close and Askew (2004) discussed the globalization of soccer and its reach into East Asia. While many facets of globalization have been rejected by East Asia, soccer has received less resistance as evident in the success of the 2002 World Cup in Japan and South Korea (Close & Askew, 2004).

Africa

While many countries have established an international presence pertaining to sport, other countries are striving to get there. For example, Swart (2005) described how the need for strategic planning in South Africa is essential for major international events. Swart (2005) further described the need for integration of government, sport, and tourism for a more clear understanding of objectives and regular communication towards sport. Additionally, Swart (2005) stressed the need for coordinated bids as opposed to individual bids that will benefit the tourism industry for the entire country rather than just the individual cities.

Furthermore, South Africa faces many cultural challenges when referring to sport. Anderson, Bielert, and Jones (2004) described how in recent years sport has worked to unify a country once known for apartheid. Soccer was known by whites as a “black sport” in South Africa before the end of apartheid (Anderson et al., 2004). Recently,
more whites have been inclined to play soccer and the nation has embraced this idea despite numerous social conflicts in other areas (Anderson et al., 2004).

While Anderson et al. (2004) focused on cultural challenges, Pelak (2005) discussed constraints women athletes faced in South Africa. Drawing from various feminist sport literature as well as insights from Black feminists’ writings, Pelak (2005) described the inequalities women soccer players face compared to their male counterparts. Pelak (2005) further implicated the disparity between men’s and women’s soccer worldwide and the need for further investigations from diverse theoretical perspectives.

**Australia**

Australia has enjoyed success internationally in sport with the 2000 Sydney Olympics. In addition to the success Australia has enjoyed in sport, there has been an increase in numbers of people migrating to the country (Hanlon & Coleman, 2006). With these changes, Hanlon and Coleman (2006) examined the extent to which Australian sport managers catered to people of diverse backgrounds. Evidence revealed that despite recent changes and recommendations, sport managers were oblivious, unwilling, or not capable of providing for people of diverse backgrounds (Hanlon & Coleman, 2006). Thomas and Dyall (1999) suggested that sport in Australia and New Zealand could be more effective if sport managers understood the key aspects of cultural and ethnic differences among participants. Additionally, it is important for sport managers to have the skills that can develop an organizational culture that is coherent with ethnic diversity among participants (Thomas & Dyall, 1999).
Another challenge Australia is faced with in sport pertains to training. Carroll, Skinner, Arthur, and Booker (2003) found through focus groups of government officials in charge of sport, that there was a need and importance for training of volunteer sports administrators, and that it is was the local government’s role to identify those needs. In relation, Cuskelly (1998) found that sport organizations with open decision making, conflict resolution, and attention to group processes had higher commitment from volunteers than those of who did not. Additionally, lower turnover was found in sport organizations that experience positive and effective committee functioning (Cuskelly, 1998).

Murray and Howat (2002) studied value and its relation to satisfaction and intentions among customers at an Australian sports center. Findings revealed the importance of value and its relation to satisfaction, and the need for more comprehensive models to assist Australian sport managers in understanding the key facets of customer satisfaction and intentions (Murray & Howat, 2002).

**North American expansion to international markets**

In addition to the continued development of sport internationally, North American sport has sought to expand their operations globally. In recent years, the National Basketball Association (NBA) has enjoyed a steady influx of international players. With this influx, an overseas division known as NBA International has been formed increasing the NBA’s visibility through television and licensed merchandising deals (Jackson & Andrews, 1999). In addition, the NBA has proposed intentions of expanding into
Europe (Whittell, 2002). Furthermore, a global community outreach program known as NBA Cares has been developed to address important social issues (NBA Cares, 2006).

Despite being dropped as an Olympic sport, baseball countered with the inaugural World Baseball Classic in 2006. With the support of Major League Baseball (MLB), 16 countries participated with Japan winning the championship.

The National Football League (NFL) has expanded into Europe, and often plays games in other countries such as Japan and Mexico with aspirations of future expansion (Howard & Crompton, 2004).

In sum, an examination of literature pertaining to sport in various regions across the world identified many opportunities for sport management students abroad. Western Europe offers many opportunities in sport (Collins, 2004), whereas Eastern Europe continues to develop and overcome obstacles (Davies, 2004). Little research has examined sport in South/Central America, however; as noted by Mason (1995) and Sandoval-Garcia (2005), there appears to be a strong connection between culture and sport. Sport continues to grow in popularity in Asia with recent success on the international stage in baseball and soccer (Close & Askew, 2004). South Africa is striving to overcome cultural barriers and make a presence internationally (Swart, 2005), while Australia seeks to incorporate diversity initiatives (Hanlon & Coleman, 2006), training (Carroll et al., 2003), and satisfaction among customers (Murray & Howat, 2002). Additionally, North American sport leagues have garnered a more international focus and have sought expansion globally.
Study Abroad

Given the growth of sport internationally, it is imperative for future sport managers to gain expertise and awareness in the international arena. One way to accomplish this end is through study abroad. In this section, I provide an overview of the study abroad literature, including the benefits and potential drawbacks of such educational experiences for the students who participate in them.

Several studies have focused on the benefits associated with studying abroad. Carlson and Widaman (1988) studied the effects study abroad programs had on attitudes towards other cultures by comparing students who studied abroad against those who did not. The results found increases in cross-cultural interest, international political concern, and cultural cosmopolitanism from students who studied abroad versus those who did not (Carlson & Widaman, 1988).

While Carlson and Widaman (1988) focused more on behavioral dimensions, Drews, Meyer, and Peregrine (1996) used more of an affective dimension approach in examining the way in which other nationalities are conceptualized by people. The approach compared groups that have studied abroad, will study abroad, and will not study abroad through use of the free association task which required the individual to write down terms they associated with different national groups (Drews et al., 1996). Results revealed that those who studied abroad perceived national groups in terms correlated with the characteristics of individuals and not as likely to deem national groups in terms of food, geographical characteristics, and historical events (Drews et al.,
Drews et al. (1996) further suggested that a “personalized view” of other national groups is a main effect of studying abroad. (p. 452)

Additionally, Black and Duhon (2006) evaluated the impact business study abroad programs had on cultural awareness and personal development using an instrument known as the Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory (Kelly & Meyers, 1995). The results indicated that after studying abroad, students experienced enhancement in cultural awareness and personal development, as well as with self-confidence and independence (Black & Duhon, 2006).

McCabe (1994) utilized qualitative research methods such as observations, interviews, and student journals to analyze students’ change in global perspectives while participating in a Semester at Sea voyage. Global perspectives were categorized into five dimensions before and after the voyage. The results indicated that the students became more open and accommodating to new experiences throughout the voyage, while exhibiting differences in cultures that were not noticed before (McCabe, 1994). Additionally, students were able to develop a sense of cross-cultural awareness and view Americanism on a much broader basis including both positive and negative perspectives (McCabe, 1994). Furthermore, results indicated that students engendered lower levels of ethnocentrism and higher levels of globalcentrism (McCabe, 1994).

While McCabe (1994) adopted a qualitative approach, Kitsantas (2004) employed quantitative measures to examine the effect that study abroad programs have on global understanding and cross-cultural skills of students, as well as the role goals play on the development of these outcomes. Analysis through the use of the Study
Abroad Goals Scale revealed that students wanted to enhance their cross-cultural skills, become more proficient in the subject, and to socialize (Kitsantas, 2004). Results further indicated the enhancement of global understanding and cross-cultural skills, while cross-cultural competence had the most significant impact on these factors.

Recently, Hadis (2005) found that students who return from studying abroad are more aware of international affairs, read more about news, are more fluent in another language, and obtain more knowledge about their host countries’ society and culture. In addition, improvement of skills relating to personal development included independence, more outgoing, friendliness towards people from other countries, and an increase in confidence to travel to countries were English is not the preferred language (Hadis, 2005).

While most literature has focused on the positives associated with the study abroad experience, there are potential drawbacks that affect one’s experience as well. Bernstein (2006) described concerns universities had with study abroad programs. Several schools have apprehensions towards study abroad programs because of loss of money from tuition (Bernstein, 2006). Additionally, Bernstein (2006) reports that some universities are imposing more fees and requirements for students in hopes of luring them away.

Other concerns deal with issues such as race and gender. Talburt and Stewart (1999) discussed the need for study abroad curricula to consider students’ sociocultural differences as well as their study abroad experience. In understanding these differences,
faculty can look to increase minority participation, enable women’s learning, and to improve students’ cross-cultural awareness (Talburt & Stewart, 1999).

In summary, the literature related to study abroad points to several benefits (and some potential drawbacks) of such educational experiences. The review also indicates, however, that none of the research identified focused on study abroad programs relating to sport management. This is unfortunate for several reasons. It is unknown if such a program is a viable option for students. Further, the factors that would contribute to and/or inhibit such a decision among sport management students are also unknown. As such, the goal of this study was to understand what factors would result in students making the decision to study abroad in sport management, and what expectations they have for studying abroad. In order to do so, this study drew from the social cognitive career theory, which is outlined in the next section.

Social Cognitive Career Theory

Foundations

The social cognitive career theory (SCCT) was developed and introduced into the literature by Lent, Brown, and Hackett, (1994). The basic premise of the theory details three key aspects of career development, which include academic interest, choice, and performance (Lent et al., 1994). In turn, drawing from Bandura’s (1986) social cognitive theory, which was developed to explain human thought, motivation, and behavior, Lent et al. (1994) were able to develop a framework of how interest, choice, and behavior interact to shape one’s career development. Lent et al. (1994) further discussed how the three cognitive-person variables of self-efficacy, outcome
expectations, and choice goals associate with personal characteristic, contextual, and learning factors.

Self-efficacy is defined as “people’s judgments of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances” (Bandura, 1986, p. 391). When viewed from the perspective of SCCT, self-efficacy is seen as a dynamic set of beliefs in oneself that are concerned with specific tasks that interact with one’s behaviors and attitudes (Lent et al., 1994). Additionally, self-efficacy expectations associated with a specific activity produce outcomes such as career interests, choice goals, and behaviors (Lent et al., 1994). Research has exhibited that high self-efficacy beliefs are related to various outcomes including sport career choices (Cunningham, Bruening, Sartore, Sagas, & Fink, 2005) and academic success (Zajacova, Lynch, & Espenshade, 2005).

Another important cognitive-person variable of SCCT is outcome expectations, which can be defined as, “imagined consequences of performing particular behaviors” (Lent et al., 1994, p. 83). Whereas self-efficacy deals with the simple question of “can this be completed?”, outcome expectations deal with the question of “if this is completed, what will happen?” (p. 83). Lent et al. (1994) considered outcome expectations in the context of vocational behavior and applied their effects on overall career development. They revealed that the effects of self-efficacy and outcome expectations on career behavior were influenced by the circumstance in which the behavior was done (Lent et al., 1994). As a result of that behavior, one is likely to choose a vocational path where favorable outcomes are anticipated (Lent et al., 1994).
A final cognitive-person variable of SCCT is choice goals or “the intention to engage in a particular action or series of actions” (Lent et al., 1994, p. 94). Goals help people organize, guide, and sustain their own efforts, even over time without external reinforcement (Lent & Brown, 1994). SCCT considers that self-efficacy and positive outcome expectations towards a particular activity are expected to heighten one’s interest in that particular activity. In turn, this interest is then expected to promote goals for further activity exposure and eventually give rise to actual behavior (Lent et al., 1994).

When relating these variables to studying abroad in sport management, one who has a high self-efficacy towards studying abroad in sport management and positive outcome expectations is likely to be more interested in and intend to study abroad than one who would not.

Recently, Lent and his colleagues (e.g., Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 2000) demonstrated the importance of also considering environmental factors such as barriers and supports. Swanson and Woitke (1997) described barriers as variables surrounding an individual that make progress difficult. Supports can be portrayed as variables that can assist in the pursuit of one’s choices (Lent et al., 2000). Ultimately, the impact environmental factors have on an individual can determine the action one takes in order to achieve goals (Lent et al., 2003b). For instance, one may initially have a high self-efficacy, positive outcome expectations, and a strong interest in participating in a sport management study abroad program. However, barriers (i.e., financial concerns) can impact one’s self-efficacy and subsequently outcome expectations and ultimately choice goals or intentions to
participate. Recent studies have indicated that self-efficacy can be affected by supports and barriers (Cunningham et al., 2005; Lent et al., 2003b).

**Support for SCCT**

SCCT has been used quite extensively throughout the years in various fields and settings. Brown and Lent (1996) applied SCCT in a study on career choice counseling. Three major principles can be taken from individuals who are struggling with vocational choice. First, Brown and Lent (1996) suggested helping individuals identify possibilities that have been excluded and develop more exact perceptions of their occupational abilities and of potential outcomes. Second, the individual should identify barriers to choice, and evaluate just how ideal or realistic it is to overcome them. Third, changing negative self-efficacy beliefs entails the counselor to help the individual acquire new success experiences, review previous accomplishments, and subsequently learn from those accomplishments (Brown & Lent, 1996).

When identifying foreclosed occupational opportunities, Brown & Lent (1996) suggested analyzing the experiences and beliefs on which those low areas of interest are based. The incorporation of two strategies is suggested in the implementation of this practice. The first strategy involves evaluating discrepancies among scores acquired from standardized test of aptitude, vocational need, and occupational interest (Brown & Lent, 1996). The next approach would be to include a modified card sort procedure which allows the individual to break up occupational choices into three categories (Brown & Lent, 1996).
Brown and Lent (1996) suggested using the balance sheet approach (Janis & Mann, 1977) to analyzing perceived barriers which requires the individual to list and consider the likelihood of each barrier being encountered, and to develop strategies to avoid or handle the most likely barriers. Additionally, Lent and Brown (1996) discussed modifying self-efficacy beliefs by assisting individuals in developing areas of low self-efficacy.

SCCT can be viewed as a vantage point to the school-to-work transition process (Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1999). Within Lent’s et al. (1999) study, SCCT focused on six developmentally linked ideas (formation of self-efficacy and outcome beliefs, interest development, interest-goal linkages, translation of goals into action, performance skills, negotiation of transition supports and barriers) that progress throughout one’s school years. Several suggestions are recommended for the promotion of career development throughout one’s school years and after work entry.

SCCT reveals that the first three developmentally linked ideas are more prominent in the elementary and middle school age (Lent et al., 1999). In spite of this, these ideas are commonly revisited and refined throughout one’s high school years and beyond (Lent et al., 1999). Positive and negative self-efficacy and outcome expectations are developed throughout childhood and adolescence (Lent et al., 1999). For instance, one may take a liking to football, writing, or drawing thus developing positive self-efficacy and outcome expectations towards those areas. Consequently, one may experience a disliking towards baseball, math, or music resulting in the development of negative self-efficacy and outcome expectations. As a result, one may develop interest in areas were positive or
high self-efficacy and outcome expectations occur. Lent et al. (1999) suggested developing age-appropriate interventions which can help with the exploration of interests and various careers. Additionally, when looking to link goals to action, a counselor could encourage one to discuss how his or her capabilities match up with the occupational requirements or skills related to that particular career interest (Lent et al., 1999).

The final three areas, goal-action linkages, environmental support and barriers, and performance behavior, depend on the success of the initial three areas (Lent et al., 1999). Once one decides to act on a goal, supports and barriers to that choice will influence the course of action (Lent et al., 1999). Additionally, one’s self-efficacy towards performance outcomes of career related skills or requirements will influence further skill development (Lent et al., 1999). Lent et al. (1999) suggested further skill developing activities or interventions may be necessary for weak self-efficacy towards performance.

Up to this point, most SCCT research has focused on the cognitive-person variables that allow people to influence their own career development. However, Lent, Brown, and Hackett (2000) examined the role supports and barriers play in the further development of SCCT. Additionally, the role of coping efficacy, which is known as the belief or ability to overcome barriers is discussed in relation to SCCT (Lent et al., 2000).

The examination of perceived influences on college students’ selection and implementation of career choices was considered by Lent et al. (2002). The results indicated that the majority of the students examined still expected to enter the career field of their choice; however, barriers such as financial concerns and personal
difficulties were encountered while implementing those choices (Lent et al., 2002). Furthermore, students mentioned social support and encouragement as the main support variables to career choice (Lent et al., 2002). Several coping strategies towards barriers were discussed which included problem-focused methods (i.e., taking fewer credit cards) and seeking social support (Lent et al., 2002). Lent et al. (2002) suggested that the size and composition of the study should be taken into strong consideration because of cultural, educational, and economic features that impact one’s supports and barriers towards career choice.

Further analysis of SCCT included a test of alternative social cognitive models on engineering majors (Lent et al., 2003b). SCCT’s direct paths model, as well as Bandura’s (1999, 2000) mediated paths model were utilized to examine supports and barriers in the predication of goals and persistence. The results indicated that Bandura’s (1999, 2000) mediated paths model was a better predictor of environmental supports and barriers relating to choice behavior. However, as was found in this study and two others, one of which predicted math-related choice intentions in American college students (Lent et al., 2001), and the other which predicted the occupational consideration of Italian high school students (Lent, Brown, Nota, & Soresi, 2003a), self-efficacy was a major factor in the relationship of supports and barriers to choice goals. Furthermore, this study was consistent with previous research in that self-efficacy was predictive of outcome expectations and interests, and self-efficacy produced a direct path to goals, and an indirect path to goals through interest (Lent et al., 2003b).
An additional study involving engineering majors’ interest and choice goals was conducted by Lent et al. (2005). Differences between men and women, as well as students attending historically Black universities (HBU) and predominantly White universities were analyzed (Lent et al., 2005). The results revealed that students at HBU’s indicated a stronger self-efficacy, outcome expectations, technical interests, social support, and educational goals than students at the predominantly White institutions (Lent et al., 2005). There was no significant difference in their experience of social barriers concerning pursuit of engineering majors (Lent et al., 2005). Additionally, there was no significant difference between men and women across most of the SCCT variables. However, the results indicated that women did perceive more social support and fewer social barriers than did men (Lent et al., 2005).

Few studies have utilized SCCT to examine international career or educational experiences, however; Tharenou (2003) studied how receptivity to working abroad develops through use of SCCT. By comparison, young employees with high outcome expectations, fewer barriers, and more opportunities to work internationally, had a higher receptivity to working internationally than when they were students (Tharenou, 2003). The results further indicated that when students had a low self-efficacy for international work and a desire for country ease of work, their aspirations to work in developing countries decreased (Tharenou, 2003).

When examining sport career choice intentions through use of SCCT, Cunningham et al. (2005) found a relationship between self-efficacy, outcome expectations, vocational interests, and choice goals. Additionally, outcome expectations and
satisfaction were associated with vocational interests as were vocational interests and choice goals (Cunningham et al., 2005). Cunningham et al. (2005) found that expected satisfaction with the sport industry was a more influential force on choice goals whereas career power had no influence. Furthermore, environmental determinants’ influence on interests and goals are indirectly related through self-efficacy, and discrimination and outcome expectations affected one’s attitude towards the sport industry (Cunningham et al., 2005). The results further indicated that human capital investments were more important factors when deciding to enter into the sport industry (Cunningham et al., 2005).

**Summary**

In sum, the literature review was threefold. First, a review of literature pertaining to international sport explored various regions around the world including Europe, South/Central America, Asia, Africa, and Australia. Additionally, the review consisted of North American sport and its expansion into the global realm. Next, the literature review explored various studies relevant to study abroad programs and the impact they had on students who participated. Finally, the literature review examined the basic tenets of SCCT and how it has been previously applied.

**Research questions**

Research question one was designed to explore the barriers and supports sport management students perceive to studying abroad. This question was significant because ultimately, the impact supports and barriers have on an individual can determine the action one takes in order to achieve goals (Lent et al., 2003b). Research question
two sought to discover the relationship between the barriers and supports and one’s study abroad self-efficacy. When individuals are confronted with barriers or supports, those who have a high self-efficacy are more likely to pursue interests or goals than those who have a low self-efficacy (Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 2000). Research question three sought to find the relationship among study abroad self-efficacy, outcome expectations, interests, and choice goals. This is significant because self-efficacy has a direct impact on outcome expectations, and both have direct impacts on interests and intent (Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994).
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Chapter Organization

This chapter is organized into two studies. The first study was conducted to gain a better understanding of study abroad self-efficacy and interest, as well as the supports and barriers to studying abroad, which answered research question one. Subsequent outcomes to the questions in Study 1 were incorporated into Study 2. While open-ended responses were sought in Study 1, Study 2 attempted to quantify the relationships among the variables of SCCT and studying abroad which included self-efficacy, interest, intent, supports, barriers, and outcome expectations. Included in this chapter, information such as the participants, measures, procedures, and data analyses associated to the methodical part of the studies is provided.

Study 1

Participants

The subjects of this study were male (n = 14) and female (n = 5) sport management students from a southwestern Division I institution. The majority of the participants were Caucasian (n = 18), with one Hispanic (n = 1). The classification breakdown consisted of seniors (n = 8, 42.1%) and juniors (n = 11, 57.9%). The participants ranged from 20 years to 29 years of age with a mean age of 21.6 years (SD = 2.04).

Further descriptive information included the number of times the participants traveled internationally, which ranged from 0 to 20 with a mean of 2.79 times (SD =
Additionally, the longest amount of time spent internationally ranged from 0 to 2 months with a mean of 9.68 days ($SD = 15.7$). Two participants resided internationally at one time.

**Measures**

The instrument used to collect data was developed using the basic tenets of SCCT which included variables such as self-efficacy, interest, supports, and barriers. Furthermore, basic demographic information and questions relating to the participants’ international experience was included in the instrument. A copy of the questionnaire is found in Appendix A. Items for each of the variables are examined below. Appendix B lists items pertaining to each of the variables.

I developed and adapted the questions from the basic tenets of SCCT. The item corresponding to self-efficacy asked the participants, “Are you confident that you could participate in a sport management study abroad program?” The participants were asked to answer “yes” or “no.” Additionally, each participant was asked to “define the source of his or her confidence” in an open-ended manner. Likewise, there were two items pertaining to interest which included: “If an opportunity to participate in a sport management study abroad program became available, would you be interested in participating?” and “If an opportunity to work internationally became available, would you be interested?” Similarly, the participants were asked to respond “yes” or “no,” as well as “why” to the subsequent response.

Another item posed to the participants which was relevant to support construct read, “What are factors that would encourage you to participate in a sport management
study abroad program?” The participants were asked to list three factors. Furthermore, the item that related to barriers asked the participants, “What are barriers you see to participating in a sport management study abroad program?” Correspondingly, the participants were asked to list three factors.

**Procedure**

The questionnaire was developed to obtain an indication of factors that related to SCCT factors including self-efficacy, interest, supports, and barriers. The idea behind the study was to draw from the qualitative data to ultimately design quantitative items, which would be used in a subsequent study. The instrument was distributed to sport management students (n = 19) at a southwestern Division I institution. An attached cover letter (Appendix C) offered a general explanation of the study, the contents of the questionnaire, and an assurance of complete confidentiality and directions on completing the questionnaire. Additionally, contact information of the principal investigator was included for any necessary comments or concerns by the participants.

**Data analysis**

After receiving the completed questionnaires, data analysis was conducted. Two analysts met independently to code the data into themes. The analysts then met with one another to compare their findings. When differences emerged, the analysts discussed their reasoning until agreement was reached. Each questionnaire was coded and similar responses were broken down into specific categories. Barriers and supports were listed and broken down into like categories. Additionally, percentages were calculated for
each category developed. Statistical analysis on demographic variables, which included age, gender, race, and classification were administered.

Three different sources emerged from the item which asked for the identification of the “source of confidence” to participating in a sport management study abroad program, “self-confidence”, “previous experience”, and “support”. For the item which questioned “reason for interest” in participating in a study abroad program, “gain experience” and “travel opportunity” were listed as the two main sources. The additional item which inquired about “interest in working internationally in sport”, listed “experience”, “availability of other jobs”, and “consideration as sources”.

Research question one asked, “What barriers and supports do sport management students perceive to studying abroad?” To examine this question, categories for similar responses were formed and analyzed for percentages.

**Study 2**

*Participants*

The participants in this study were male (n = 43) and female (n = 28) sport management students from a southwestern Division I institution. The majority of participants were Caucasian (n = 66, 93.0%), while the remainder of the participants (n = 5, 7.0%) were combined into one category. The classification breakdown included a majority of sophomores (n = 32, 45.1%), followed by juniors (n = 18, 25.4%), freshman (n = 13, 18.3%), and seniors (n = 5, 7.0%). The ages of the participants ranged from 18-25 years with a mean age of 20.1 years ($SD = 1.26$).
Further descriptive information included the number of times the participants traveled internationally which ranged from 0 to 6 times with a mean of 1.66 ($SD = 1.49$). Additionally, the longest amount of time spent internationally ranged from 0 to 5 years with a mean of .156 years ($SD = .582$) or almost two months, while six participants resided internationally.

**Measures**

The instrument used to collect data was developed using the basic tenets of SCCT: self-efficacy, interest, intent, supports, barriers, and outcome expectations. The measures were adapted from Cunningham, Bruening, Sartore, Sagas, and Fink’s (2005) scale and from the data gathered in Study 1. Furthermore, basic demographic information and questions relating to the participants’ international experience was included in the instrument. A copy of the questionnaire is found in Appendix D. Items for each of the variables are examined below. Unless otherwise indicated, each study variable was anchored by a 7-point Likert-type scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

Four items were used to examine self-efficacy. Example items included: “I expect I would benefit by participating in a sport management study abroad program” and “I have the self-assurance that I could participate in a sport management study abroad program.” Likewise, the measure contained four items for interest. Example items included: “Participating in a sport management study abroad program is something that interests me” and “Participating in a sport management study abroad program would be an interesting option for me.” Furthermore, the measure for intent
contained four items. Example items for intent included: “If made available, I would intend to participate in a sport management study abroad program” and “If made available, I will try to participate in a sport management study abroad program.” The internal consistency of the scales (Cronbach’s alpha) were considerably high for interest ($\alpha = .94$) and intent ($\alpha = .92$), while somewhat lower for self-efficacy ($\alpha = .65$).

Additionally, supports and barriers were incorporated into the instrument based on results from Study 1. Supports were measured with a six item scale. Example items for support included: “Because of my capabilities, I expect I can participate in a sport management study abroad program” and “My educational background has prepared me to participate in a sport management study abroad program.” The measure for barriers contained eight items. Example items for barriers included: “I foresee having difficulty participating in a sport management study abroad program because of a possible language barrier” and “Based on cost, I will have a difficult time participating in a sport management study abroad program.” The internal consistency of the scales were adequate for supports ($\alpha = .68$) and barriers ($\alpha = .75$).

Finally, outcome expectations were measured on a nine item scale. The items were preceded by the phrase, “Participating in a study abroad program would mean….” Example items for outcome expectations include: “a more global perspective of sport” and “a job/career opportunity in sport.” The internal consistency for outcome expectations was considerably high ($\alpha = .87$).
Procedure

A questionnaire was developed to measure self-efficacy, interest, intent, supports, barriers, and outcome expectations, the basic tenets of SCCT. The instrument was distributed to sport management students (n = 71) at a southwestern Division I institution. An attached cover letter (Appendix C) offered a general explanation of the study, the contents of the questionnaire, and an assurance of complete confidentiality and directions on completing the questionnaire. Additionally, contact information of the principal investigator was included for any necessary comments or concerns by the participants.

Data analysis

After receiving the completed questionnaires, data analysis was conducted. Initially, items were analyzed for reverse coding, and descriptive statistics for the study variables were performed. Means, standard deviations, and bivariate correlations were included with the statistics. Linear regression and bivariate correlations were performed to evaluate the basic relationships between all the study variables. In addition, reliability estimates (Cronbach’s alpha) for each study variable were assessed.

Research question two asked “What is the relationship between the barriers and supports and one’s study abroad self-efficacy?” In examining this question, linear regression was performed with self-efficacy as the dependent variable, and supports and barriers as the independent variables.

Research question three asked “What is the relationship among study abroad self-efficacy, outcome expectations, interests, and intent? To examine this question,
Bivariate correlations were performed to examine the relationship among the variables. Additionally, linear regression was performed with intent as the dependant variable, and outcome expectations and self-efficacy as the independent variables to discover further relationships among the variables.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Chapter Organization

Similar to chapter III, this chapter is divided into two sections. The first section details the results from Study 1 which answered research question one. In the second section, the results from Study 2 are conveyed which answered research question two and three.

Study 1

Percentages

Results and a breakdown of percentages are analyzed within this chapter. There were 19 (n = 19) respondents to the questionnaire. The majority of the respondents answered “yes” (n = 14, 74%) to the item asking, “are you confident that you could participate in a sport management study abroad program?”, while fewer responded “no” (n = 5, 26%). Based on the response to the item, “what is the source of confidence?”, three categories of sources were formed. Because the source of confidence could only come from those who answered “yes”, those who answered “no” were excluded from the percentages. Overall, “self-confidence” (n = 7, 50%) was the most common response, followed by “previous experience” (n = 3, 21%), and “support” (n = 2, 14%). It is important to note that responses from two participants who answered “yes” were discarded, one for not giving a response, and the other for not indicating a clear source.
In addition, the majority of the respondents answered “yes” (n = 14, 78%) to the item asking, “if an opportunity to participate in a sport management study abroad program became available, would you be interested in participating?”, while fewer responded “no” (n = 4, 22%). Furthermore, one participant chose not to respond to this item. Based on the responses to those who answered “yes,” two categories of sources were formed. The most common response was, “to gain experience” (n = 7, 50%), followed by “opportunity to travel” (n = 6, 43%). One respondent who answered “no” indicated there were “more negatives than positives”, while another had “already met degree requirements”. One respondent who indicated “yes,” listed both “experience” and “travel” as reasons for interest; therefore, the response was not included in the percentages.

Similarly, the majority of the respondents answered “yes” (n = 13, 68%) to the item asking, “if an opportunity to work internationally in sport became available, would you be interested?”, while fewer answered “no” (n = 6, 32%). The participants were requested to respond “why” to the question. Based on reasons “why,” categories for those who responded “yes” and “no” were formed. Of those who answered “yes,” three categories of interest were formed. “Gain experience” (n = 9, 69%) was relatively high, followed by “would give strong consideration” (n = 2, 15%), and “availability of other jobs” (n = 1, 8%). Likewise, three categories were formed for those who gave reasons for responding “no.” “Love of the U.S.” (n = 3, 50%) was the most common, followed by both “away from family” (n = 1, 17%), and “no desire” (n = 1, 17%). Additionally, one who answered “yes”, and one who answered “no” did not indicate a reason.
**Research question one**

The initial purpose of this study was to discover what barriers and supports sport management students perceive to studying abroad, as well as study abroad self-efficacy and interest. Additionally, in answering these questions, subsequent outcome expectations were formed. According to Bandura (1999, 2000), supports and barriers directly influence self-efficacy, and therefore indirectly influence interest, choice goals, and intent.

Participants were requested to list factors of support to studying abroad in sport management. After analysis of the data, similar responses were grouped together. For the item which asked “what factors would encourage you to participate in a sport management study abroad program?”, several factors of support were discovered, including: “gain experience”, “further education”, “travel”, “learning outside of the classroom”, “increase job prospects”, and “affordability”. It is important to note that affordability can be seen both as a support or barrier depending on the availability of finances for the individual.

Additionally, participants were requested to list barriers to studying abroad in sport management. Likewise, similar responses were grouped together after analysis of the data. For the item that asked “what barriers do you see to participating in a sport management study abroad program,” several barriers were discovered, including: “language”, “cultural differences”, “apart from friends and family”, “job obligations”, and “affordability”.
Based on the data collected for supports and barriers, outcome expectations were formed with the purpose of incorporating their use into Study 2. Some of the outcome expectations included: “a more global perspective of sport”, “become more proficient in another language”, “unique traveling experience”, “enhancement of resume”, “satisfaction from taking risk”, “become more culturally tolerant”, “gain independence”, “a job in sport”, “a job internationally in sport”, “quicker promotion”, “gain more valuable knowledge”, “opportunity for career advancement”, “experience toward a career in sport”.

**Study 2**

*Descriptive statistics*

Descriptive statistics for the study variables are presented in Table 1. Overall, self-efficacy mean scores were relatively high ($M = 5.23$, $SD = .85$) while barrier means were somewhat low ($M = 3.45$, $SD = .99$). Furthermore, participants tended to agree more with the outcome expectations presented in this study, with the highest mean score ($M = 5.81$, $SD = .73$) of all the variables.
Table 1  Descriptive Statistics for Interest, Intent, Self-Efficacy, Support, Barriers, and Outcome Expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Interest</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Intent</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Self-efficacy</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Support</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Barriers</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Outcome expectations</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results for Research Questions Two and Three

Research question two asked “What is the relationship between the barriers and supports and one’s study abroad self-efficacy?”  Linear regression was performed with self-efficacy as the dependent variable, and supports and barriers as the independent variables. Preliminary analysis revealed that supports ($\beta = .67, p < 0.01$) were significantly and positively related to self-efficacy (see Table 2), and the results revealed that barriers ($\beta = -.10$) were negatively related to self-efficacy.
Table 2  Results of Linear Regression Analysis With Self-Efficacy as the Dependent Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$SE$</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adj. $R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.48**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriers</td>
<td>-.89</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. **$p < .01$**

Research question three asked “What is the relationship among study abroad self-efficacy, outcome expectations, interests, and choice goals (i.e., intent)? Bivariate correlations were performed to examine the relationship among the variables and are presented in Table 3. Additionally, linear regression was performed with intent as the dependant variable, and outcome expectations and self-efficacy as the independent variables to discover further relationships among variables. The results are presented in Table 4. Bivariate correlations revealed that interest and intent were closely interrelated ($r = .91, p < 0.01$). There was a significant correlation between self-efficacy and interest ($r = .44, p < 0.01$), as well as with self-efficacy and intent ($r = .45, p < 0.01$). Furthermore, there was a significant correlation between self-efficacy and outcome expectations ($r = .40, p < 0.01$), as well as a correlation between outcome expectations and interest ($r = .13$), and outcome expectations and intent ($r = .12$). Analysis of the relationship between outcome expectations, self-efficacy, and intent revealed that self-
efficacy ($\beta = .48, p < 0.01$) was significantly and positively related to intent, while outcome expectations ($\beta = -.74$) were negatively related to intent.

Table 3  Bivariate Correlations for Interest, Intent, Self-Efficacy, and Outcome Expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Interest</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Intent</td>
<td>.91**</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Outcome Expectations</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. **$p < .01$. 


Table 4  Results of Linear Regression Analysis With Intent as the Dependent Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Adj. R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Expectations</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. **p < .01
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION, SUMMARY, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter Organization

This chapter begins by discussing the results and implications related to Study 1 and 2. A brief summary of the discussion is provided, followed by limitations and recommendations for future research. In close, a concluding description of this thesis is provided.

Discussion

The primary purposes of this thesis were, through utilization of social cognitive career theory (SCCT), to examine what barriers and supports sport management students perceived to studying abroad, identify the relationship between the barriers and supports and one’s study abroad self-efficacy, and to discover the relationship between study abroad self-efficacy, outcome expectations, interests, and choice goals. The purposes of the thesis were substantiated through analysis of three research questions utilizing SCCT.

Study 1

In Study 1, the participants were requested to indicate whether or not they were confident they could participate in a sport management study abroad program, and describe the source of their confidence. In answering this question, the sources of the participants’ self-efficacy was determined. Additionally, participants were requested to
list factors of support and barriers to studying abroad as well as whether or not they were interested in participating in a sport management study abroad program.

Based on the results of Study 1, which answered the first research question, there were many barriers and supports mentioned that, according to previous research, can directly influence one’s self-efficacy and indirectly influence one’s interests (Bandura, 1999, 2000; Cunningham, Bruening, Sartore, Sagas, & Fink, 2005; Lent et al., 2003b). Several of the barriers discovered in Study 1 included: “language”, “cultural differences”, “apart from friends and family”, “job obligations”, and “affordability”. Though previous literature does not address the specific barriers described in Study 1, sport management academia can use research pertaining to study abroad to help students overcome barriers. For example, as a result of participating in study abroad programs, students have shown increases in cultural awareness (Black & Duhon, 2006; Carlson & Widaman, 1988; Kitsantas, 2004; McCabe, 1994), independence (Black & Duhon, 2006; Hadis, 2005), and proficiency in other languages (Hadis, 2005).

**Study 2**

Study 2 was constructed from the results from Study 1 and was adapted from Cunningham et al. (2005) scale. The results indicated that self-efficacy and supports were highly correlated, while there was a negative correlation between self-efficacy and barriers which answered research question two. According to SCCT, when one is confronted with barriers or supports, those who have a high self-efficacy are more likely to pursue interests or goals, than those who have a low self-efficacy (Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 2000). To clarify, the fewer barriers and more supports one envisions to
studying abroad the higher one’s self-efficacy will be. Consequently, the more barriers and fewer supports one envisions to studying abroad the lower one’s self-efficacy will be.

Furthermore, in answering research question three, the results indicated that self-efficacy, outcome expectations, interest, and intent were all interrelated with interest and intent sharing the strongest correlation, and self-efficacy being significantly correlated with each variable. Additionally, self-efficacy shared a positive relationship with intent, while outcome expectations shared a negative relationship with intent. According to SCCT, self-efficacy has a direct impact on outcome expectations, and both have direct impacts on interests, and intent (Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994). Therefore, based on the results, despite the slight negative relationship between outcome expectations and intent, there is a strong relationship between self-efficacy and intent to act which could ultimately supersede one’s negative outcome expectations towards studying abroad in sport management.

Implications

In drawing from the results, sport management academia should be cognizant of barriers and negative outcome expectations when planning or developing sport management study abroad programs and subsequently look for ways to help students overcome those barriers and negative outcome expectations. According to Brown and Lent (1996), three major principles can be taken from individuals who are struggling with choice or intent. First, some individuals may have already eliminated several choice options because of negative self-efficacy beliefs or outcome expectations (Brown
Brown and Lent (1996) suggested helping individuals identify possibilities that have been excluded and develop more exact perceptions of their occupational abilities and of potential outcomes. Second, persons may be less likely to act on their interests and convert them into choices if barriers are perceived to be considerably large (Brown & Lent, 1996). Brown and Lent (1996) recommend that in these cases, the individual should identify barriers to choice, and evaluate just how ideal or realistic it is to overcome them. Third, because self-efficacy beliefs and outcome expectations are developed primarily from one’s accomplishments, changing negative self-efficacy beliefs entails helping the individual acquire new success experiences, review previous accomplishments, and subsequently learn from those accomplishments (Brown & Lent, 1996).

Brown and Lent (1996) suggested using the balance sheet approach (Janis & Mann, 1977) to analyzing perceived barriers. In following this approach, after the individual lists his/her preferred options, anticipated negative consequences are focused on as they might serve as barriers to choice implementation (Brown & Lent, 1996). Then the individual is asked to consider the likelihood of each barrier being encountered, and to develop strategies to avoid or handle the most likely barriers (Brown & Lent, 1996).

The final approach discussed by Brown and Lent (1996) involved modification of self-efficacy beliefs. Assisting individuals in developing new performing experiences in areas of sufficient aptitude and low self-efficacy is recommended by Brown and Lent (1996). Developing pertinent coursework is suggested as a way in which this can be accomplished (Brown & Lent, 1996).
Furthermore, the benefits one can receive from studying abroad should be emphasized by sport management academia. For example, because of the global nature of sport, study abroad programs in sport management could prepare students for the cultural differences they may one day face while working in sport, and teach them to value and respect those differences, while valuing and respecting their own. The importance of this should not be underestimated because whether one works in sport from North America, or whether one decides to work internationally in sport, it is likely the global nature of sport will impact their career at one time or another.

**Summary**

In sum, supports and barriers were identified to studying abroad in sport management answering research question one. Additionally, in answering research question two it was found that there was a significant correlation between self-efficacy and supports and a significant negative correlation between self-efficacy and barriers. Research question three found that self-efficacy, outcome expectations, interests, and intent were all interrelated with significant correlations between self-efficacy and all the variables, as well as a positive relationship among self-efficacy and intent, and a negative relationship between outcome expectations and intent.

According to Brown and Lent (1996) minimizing or overcoming barriers and negative outcome expectations will help turn one’s interest into intent. Additionally, it is important to illustrate the benefits one can receive through positive outcome expectations and supports (Brown & Lent, 1996).
When applying Brown and Lent’s (1996) suggestions to sport management study abroad programs, several implications can be made. Despite the data revealing a strong interest in studying abroad, barriers could impact one’s choice to participate. For example, one may have a strong interest in participating, but ultimately come to the conclusion that he or she cannot afford the financial means necessary to participate. In this case, providing information about scholarships or financial aid may minimize the impact the barrier of cost has on the individual.

Additionally, the potential benefits one can receive from studying abroad should be emphasized. For instance, research has demonstrated that improvement in behaviors such as cultural awareness can be a positive effect of studying abroad. Stressing the benefits of such an effect could help one who desires to work internationally in sport.

Limitations and future directions

Though the results from this study can be very useful, there are some limitations to consider. First, only students from one university were surveyed. This makes it difficult to generalize the results. Additionally, an overwhelming majority of the participants were Caucasian in both studies. The results could be different if people from a more diverse background were included within this study because of different cultural experiences and circumstances.

Despite these limitations, there are several areas for future research. According to SCCT, high self-efficacy, support, and outcome expectations are related to intent to act, meaning it is possible that one who has a strong desire, the means necessary, and envisions benefits to studying abroad would be more likely to participate than one who
would not (Lent et al., 1994). However, future research should compare those who would study abroad versus those who would not, as well as students who have studied abroad compared to those who have not. Additionally, research can be extended to compare sport management students’ intentions versus non-sport management students’ intentions to study abroad in order to analyze similarities and/or differences between majors. Additionally, research should focus on intentions to work internationally in sport by comparing those who have and have not studied abroad in sport. Such research could produce results that would indicate whether one group is better prepared for an international career than the other. Furthermore, research should focus on the international sport managers’ perspective of Americans working and studying abroad in order to determine whether this is a viable option for international sport managers.

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, globalization has impacted many industries including sport. With the increase in globalization comes the need for sport managers with a global perspective. One possible way to achieve this global perspective is through study abroad. Study abroad programs are capable of providing many skills for individuals that the traditional classroom approach does not deliver as effectively (Henthorne et al., 2001; Peppas, 2005). As such, the purpose of this thesis was to examine sport management students’ perceptions of studying abroad. Specifically, by incorporating social cognitive career theory, the influence of cognitive-person variables (i.e., self-efficacy and outcome expectations) and environmental factors (i.e., support and barriers) on students’ interest and intentions to study abroad were examined.
A review of literature examined sport in various regions around the world, study abroad programs and their impact on students, and the theoretical tenets and supports of SCCT.

In examining the research questions, two studies were conducted. The first study was conducted to gain a better understanding of study abroad self-efficacy and interest, as well as the supports and barriers to studying abroad, which answered research question one. Several factors of support were discovered such as “gain experience” and “further education”. Participants listed factors such as “language” and “affordability” as barriers to studying abroad. Study 2 was constructed from the results from Study 1 and was adapted from the Cunningham et al. (2005) scale. The results indicated that self-efficacy and supports were highly correlated, while there was a negative correlation between self-efficacy and barriers which answered research question two. In answering research question three, the results indicated that self-efficacy, outcome expectations, interest, and intent were all interrelated with interest and intent sharing the strongest correlation, and self-efficacy being significantly correlated with each variable.

Several suggestions were given by Brown and Lent (1996) to help individuals overcome barriers and can be applied to students seeking to study abroad in sport management. According to Brown and Lent (1996) minimizing or overcoming barriers and negative outcome expectations will help turn one’s interest into intent.

In closing, sport management academia can use this study to help in the implementation of sport management study abroad programs that focus on cultural diversity and its importance in the global economy, and to develop coursework aimed at
preparing individuals to work internationally in sport. In addition, it is important to
develop study abroad programs because of the potential positive impact they can have on
students who desire to work internationally in sport.
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APPENDIX A

STUDY 1 QUESTIONNAIRE
Directions: This study is concerned with student interest in sport management study abroad programs. Listed below are several open-end questions pertaining to the subject. Your honest responses and complete participation are crucial to the ultimate success of the study. Thank you, in advance, for your participation.

How many times have you traveled internationally? __________

If so, what is the longest amount of time you have spent traveling?

Have you ever resided internationally? Yes _____ No _____

Are you confident that you could participate in a sport management study abroad program? Yes _____ No _____

If yes, what is the source of the confidence?

What are some of the factors that would encourage you to participate in a sport management study abroad program?

What are some of the barriers (if any) you see to participating in a sport management study abroad program?

If an opportunity to participate in a sport management study abroad program became available, would you be interested in participating? Yes ___ No ___

Why?

If an opportunity to work internationally in sport became available, would you be interested? Yes ___ No ___

Why?

Age _______ yrs

Gender: Male _____ Female _____

Race:
African-American___ Asian___ Caucasian___ Hispanic___ Other___

Class: Freshman___ Sophomore___ Junior___ Senior___ Other___
APPENDIX B

ITEMS CORRESPONDING TO STUDY 1
Are you confident that you could participate in a sport management study abroad program? If yes, what is the source of the confidence?

1. yes, ability to expand and adapt to different environments
2. yes, open to trying new things, and prefer to learn in a “hands on” environment
3. yes, my parents would be willing to pay for it
4. yes
5. no
6. no
7. no
8. yes, adapt well to the changing environment and learn from people from the host country
9. yes, I have a grasp of how to handle foreign cultures
10. yes, would do it as long as it’s affordable and provide experience toward my career
11. yes, confident in skills and abilities to interact and study internationally
12. yes, able to experience new culture and the courses should be no different
13. yes, adapt well to different cultural and social settings, dealt with international students and visitors a lot
14. yes, would love the opportunity and would grow a lot from it
15. no
16. yes, I know there would be support from people in the U.S. if necessary
17. yes, family is a military family and I have learned to adapt to my surroundings
18. no
19. yes, I am willing to broaden my horizons and gather as much culture as possible
What factors would encourage you to participate in a sport management study abroad program?

1. gain experience, learn from others, travel to a foreign country
2. getting school credit while not always being stuck in the classroom, travel to see new places
3. low cost and scholarships, interesting places I would want to go visit
4. international travel, do something besides sit in the classroom on campus, global perspective of sport
5. location, type of job
6. job opportunities, networking, experience
7. once in a life time experience, opportunity to further my education
8. an exciting place to study, a group of students who I like and feel comfortable with, an affordable and accommodating trip
9. Where it would be?, what I would be doing?, How much it would cost?
10. type of opportunity, location, financial aspect
11. beautiful places, a fun group going, getting a good amount of hours
12. location of study, cost, classes offered
13. low cost, visit a lot of different places, interesting work
14. meeting degree requirements, traveling, meeting new people
15. applicable course work for major, scholarship available, live sport organization facility tours to help learn international sport cultures
16. a fun place, the courses taught
17. good price, location, topics covered
18. Interest in the program, interest in the city or country, could I communicate with others?
19. location, time, professor leading the program
What barriers do you see to participating in a sport management study abroad program?

1. language, adjusting to the culture, being foreign
2. money, finding a semester where I could study abroad without delaying my graduation
3. high cost
4. cost, not very many credit hours for amount of time spent away, undesirable locations
5. being away from family, money, time
6. money, family/fiancé, job
7. money, comforts of home
8. price, lack of familiarity of people and country
9. time, money
10. cost
11. money, not knowing anyone, language
12. cost, time spent abroad, size of group
13. money, delay of graduation
14. cost, time away from work
15. work, time of year offered, price
16. money, time
17. money, time
18. not knowing enough about it, don’t know anyone who has done this, interest
19. cost, time
If an opportunity to participate in a sport management study abroad program became available, would you be interested in participating?

1. yes, great opportunity to gain experience
2. yes, it is a great opportunity to see different people’s views about concepts involved with sport management
3. yes, good opportunity to explore a different country
4. yes, I want to travel abroad and never had the chance, depends on cost, location and credit
5. no
6. no
7. no, my negatives outweigh my positives
8. yes, it would be a college experience that would be memorable
9. yes, because I enjoy visiting new places
10. yes, I think it would be a great opportunity to gain experience and travel as well
11. yes, I would be interested in getting information because I like to travel
12. yes, it sounds fun
13. yes, potentially could work internationally and to gain international experience would be good with how sports are globalizing
14. no, have already met degree requirements and can’t afford to take off
15.
16. yes, would be something new and exciting
17. yes, I find going to other cultures and learning is way more exciting than staying here
18. yes, it’s a chance to experience a different culture and see how things are run in other places
19. yes, anything outside the U.S. interests me
If an opportunity to work internationally in sport became available, would you be interested?

1. no, would just rather work close to home, it may be a good idea if I was single and didn’t have a family
2. yes, I think it would be a great experience and a definite resume booster
3. no, I don’t have the desire to work internationally, I would rather work in Texas
4. yes, because it is so difficult to get into the sporting industry, I’ll take what becomes available
5. no
6. no, I could not afford it and would not want to be that far away from my family
7. no, although a cool experience, I feel there are plenty of opportunities in the U.S.
8. yes, maybe
9. yes
10. yes, I would possibly be interested and it would be a great opportunity, it would depend on the other opportunities I had at the time
11. no, I love the U.S. too much, I wouldn’t mind occasional work overseas, but I’d rather live here
12. yes, get a different perspective on sports in other cultures
13. yes, now would be the best time in life because of how fluid life is at this age
14. yes, it would be an incredible experience and something different
15. yes, gain further knowledge about cultures and aspects that are associated with international sport
16. yes, a different experience
17. yes, I would find it challenging and a new opportunity
18. yes, a change of venue would be good
19. yes, the way of life, pace, health are all much more enticing to me than the rat race we live in
APPENDIX C

CONSENT LETTER
Dear Sport Management Student:

Your participation in a survey of career choice intentions is needed. As a sport management researchers at Texas A&M, we are conducting research to understand the factors that shape intentions to study abroad among students who wish to enter the sport industry. In total, some 150 students with sport-related majors will be asked to participate in this study.

Participation will require about 5 minutes to answer the questionnaire. You may refuse to answer any question on the survey if it makes you feel uncomfortable. All data will be dealt with in anonymous manner and no institution or individual taking part in the study will be identified. Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. Further, there are no risks associated with participation. You will benefit from indicating interest in working internationally in the sport industry by the possibility to set up curricula that can help service that desire. Finally, you can request results of the study, and such results may help to better understand the factors influencing academic choice intentions.

This research study has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board - Human Subjects in Research, Texas A&M University. For research related problems or questions regarding subjects’ rights, the Institutional Review Board may be contacted through Dr. Michael W. Buckley, Director of Research Compliance (979-458-4067; mbuckley@tamu.edu) or Dr. Sharon Alderete, IRB Coordinator, Office of the Vice President for Research (979-458-4067; s-alderete@tamu.edu).

Hopefully you will find time in your busy schedule to participate in this study. If you have any comments or concerns with the study, please contact me at the correspondence given below. Thank you for your time and participation; I look forward to your response.

Grace& Peace,

Greg Jones
Faculty Advisor
Graduate Student
George B. Cunningham, PhD
Dept. of Health and Kinesiology
Laboratory for Diversity in Sport
Texas A&M University
TAMU 4243
College Station, TX 77843-4243
Phone: (979) 458-0544
FAX: (979) 847 8987
Email: gregoryjones@tamu.edu

Greg Jones
Faculty Advisor
Graduate Student
George B. Cunningham, PhD
Dept. of Health and Kinesiology
Laboratory for Diversity in Sport
Texas A&M University
TAMU 4243
College Station, TX 77843-4243
Phone: (979) 458-0544
FAX: (979) 847 8987
Email: gregoryjones@tamu.edu
APPENDIX D

STUDY 2 QUESTIONNAIRE
**QUESTIONNAIRE**

**Directions:** This study is concerned with student interest in study abroad programs. Listed below are several items, each anchored by a 7-point Likert-type scale. In responding to the items, please circle the number that best characterizes your response. Your honest responses and complete participation are crucial to the ultimate success of the study. Thank you, in advance, for your participation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Participating in a study abroad program is something that interests me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I expect I would benefit by participating in a study abroad program.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. If made available, I would intend to participate in a study abroad program.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Based on my experiences internationally, or lack thereof, I will have a difficult time participating in a study abroad program.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I foresee having difficulty participating in a study abroad program because of a possible language barrier.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Participating in a study abroad program DOES NOT really interest me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I have the self-assurance that I could participate in a study abroad program.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I foresee having a difficult time adjusting to a different culture in a study abroad program.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I foresee my graduation being delayed from participating in a study abroad program.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I will have a difficult time being away from my friends and family while on a study abroad program.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I will have a difficult time participating in a study abroad program because of my job obligations.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Based on cost, I will have a difficult time participating in a study abroad program.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Because of my considerable experience internationally, I expect I can participate in a study abroad program.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Participating in a study abroad program would be an interesting option for me.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Because of my capabilities, I expect I can participate in a study abroad program.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>If made available, I will try to participate in a study abroad program.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>I will feel uncomfortable participating in a study abroad program because of a lack of culture skills.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Based on cost, I can afford to go on a study abroad program.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>I have no interest in participating in a study abroad program.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>I have the necessary skills to participate in a study abroad program.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>If made available, participating in a study abroad program is something I plan to do.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>My friends and family will support my decision to participate in a study abroad program.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>My educational background has prepared me to participate in a study abroad program.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>I am confident I could successfully participate in a study abroad program.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>If made available, I would not intend to participate in a study abroad program.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Participating in a study abroad program would be very difficult for me.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in a study abroad program would mean...</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. a more global perspective</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I will become more proficient in another language</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. a unique opportunity to travel internationally</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I will “boost” my resume</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. satisfaction from taking risk</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I would become more culturally tolerant</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I would become more independent</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. a job/career opportunity internationally</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As a result of studying abroad, I feel as if I would...</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36. be promoted quickly</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. gain more valuable knowledge</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. have several opportunities for career advancement</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. gain experience towards a career</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age _________yrs

Gender: Male _____ Female _____

Race: African-American____ Asian____ Caucasian____ Hispanic____ Other____

Class: Freshman____ Sophomore____ Junior____ Senior____ Other____

How would you describe the area in which you were raised as a child? Rural____ Urban____ Inner City____

PLEASE CONTINUE ON THE BACK
How many times have you traveled internationally? __________

If so, what is the longest amount of time you have spent traveling?
________________________________________________

Have you ever resided internationally? Yes _____    No _____

Are you confident that you could participate in a study abroad program? Yes _____    No_____  
   If yes, what is the source of the confidence?

What are some of the factors that would encourage you to participate in a study abroad program?

What are some of the barriers (if any) you see to participating in a study abroad program?

If an opportunity to participate in a study abroad program became available, would you be interested in participating? Yes ___ No ___
Why?

If an opportunity to work internationally became available, would you be interested? Yes ___ No ___
Why?

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION!!
VITA

Name: Gregory C. Jones

Address: Sport Management Program, c/o Dr. George B. Cunningham, Department of Health & Kinesiology, Texas A&M University, 4243 TAMU, College Station, TX 77843-4243

Email Address: gregoryjones@tamu.edu

Education: B.S., Kinesiology, Sam Houston State University, 2004
            M.S., Kinesiology, emphasis in Sport Management, Texas A&M University, 2006