



Voices from around the World: International Undergraduate Student Experiences

Dawn Geronimo Terkla
Associate Provost of Institutional Research, Assessment
and Evaluation
Tufts University

Jane Elish-Andrews
Director of the International Center
Tufts University

Heather S. Roscoe
Assistant Director of Institutional Research and Evaluation
Tufts University

Abstract

This paper explores how students adjust to life at universities outside their home countries. Much of the current research was conducted prior to the 9/11 tragedy and focuses primarily on studies within a single U.S. institution. This project expands the boundaries by including multiple institutions from around the globe post-9/11. The authors also describe international undergraduates' educational experiences. Further analyses examine whether differences exist among the following: 1) students attending U.S. or non-U.S. institutions, 2) students who hail from different regions of the world, 3) native or non-native speakers, 4) the sexes, 5) students who lived in the host country prior to enrolling or who did not, and 6) students living on- or off-campus.

There is substantive literature addressing issues surrounding the success of international students at American universities. When attending U.S. institutions, international students can face a number of challenges and a great deal of stress, particularly in academic situations, (Wan, Chapman, & Biggs, 1992; Al-Sharideh & Goe, 1998). Wan et al. (1992) question whether institutions in the United States effectively assist their international students in making the cross-cultural adjustment. They found that students whose home educational system was perceived as unlike that of the U.S. experienced more stress than students whose home educational system was perceived as more similar. Having good English language skills seems to play a role in lessening the stress felt by international students (Wan et

al., 1992), as comprehension of lectures can be especially difficult for students from non-English speaking countries (Tompson & Tompson, 1996).

Two additional sources of stress involve the creation of new social networks and the adjustment to a different set of societal values and expectations. American universities may foster a culture that is very different from what international students would experience in their home countries, such as American students addressing their professors in a less formal manner and sometimes even speaking without having been called upon (Tompson & Tompson, 1996). Having a strong social support network seems to improve international students' abilities to cope with this stressful situation (Wan et al., 1992). Students see this as critical, but they tend to find developing those networks especially difficult (Tompson & Tompson, 1996). Al-Sharideh and Goe (1998) found that the number of strong network bonds that international students had with other students from their culture or similar cultures was positively related to a high self-esteem. In addition, "the establishment of strong ties with Americans has an independent, positive effect in promoting (an international) student's self-esteem, regardless of the number of strong ties developed with other coculturals" (Al-Sharideh & Goe, 1998).

Many of the problems that international students experience may stem from their attempts to adjust to university life using strategies that would be effective in their own country but prove to be ineffective in the United States (Tompson & Tompson, 1996). Furthermore, international students from different cultures/countries

experience different problems, and students from cultures that are dissimilar to American culture tend to experience more problems than do students from more similar cultures. All of these factors make it very difficult to address all international students' needs (Sheehan & Pearson, 1995).

The current body of literature surrounding the success of international students consists primarily of studies within a single institution, rarely examines the experiences of international students at non-U.S. institutions, and tends to refer to studies conducted prior to September 11, 2001. This paper aims to shed light on how students adjust to life at universities outside of their home countries and expands the boundaries by including multiple institutions from around the globe post-9/11.

Method

In the spring of 2001, the International Board of Overseers at Tufts University commissioned a survey of the international students enrolled at Tufts University. The purpose of the survey was to determine areas in which international students had difficulty adjusting to American college life, ways in which Tufts University was a good place for international students, and how the institution could improve its programs and services for international students. Developing the paper survey was a collaborative effort between the Office of Institutional Research, the International Center, and several Board members. The survey was administered during the spring 2002 semester. Based on the survey results and a desire to better serve the international student population, Tufts implemented several changes (Terkla, Roscoe, & Elish-Andrews, 2002).

In the fall of 2003, the International Center and the Office of Institutional Research determined that an updated version of the survey should be administered to the current international student population. The 2002 survey was the basis for the current survey, but the 2004 version featured a number of changes. Questions no longer relevant were removed, some questions were reformatted to yield more usable and more robust results, and new questions were added to explore current issues of interest as well as to evaluate the impact of the changes made by the University after the 2002 administration. The resulting Web-based instrument contained 137 closed-ended items, 27 open-ended survey items, and 16 "if other, please specify" fill ins, and was administered to the Tufts University international student population during the spring 2004 semester.¹

In order to most effectively interpret the survey results, it was hoped that a variety of comparisons could be drawn beyond the simple contrast of the 2004 Tufts results to the 2002 results. In this vein, a number of institutional research professionals from institutions around the world were invited to participate in this project. Boston College, George Washington University, the National University of Ireland, Galway, Northeastern University, RMIT University

(Australia), and the Universiteit van Amsterdam (The Netherlands) all chose to participate. Each of the participating institutions was given a copy of the Tufts' 2004 instrument. They were asked to retain a certain set of questions that were universally relevant (a total of 75 closed-ended items, 16 open-ended items, and 6 "if other, please specify" fill ins). They were then allowed to delete any other questions that were not relevant to the international student population on their campuses, to add questions that captured information of particular interest to their campuses, and to a very limited extent amend the pre-existing required questions. All surveys were administered in English, but in the case of surveys administered outside of the United States, the spellings and phrasing were adjusted to reflect the English conventions used by the country in which the institution was located. All efforts were made to maintain comparability of the data while satisfying each institution's needs for questions relevant and meaningful to their campuses. One staff member in the Tufts Office of Institutional Research developed all of the institutions' surveys using the same Web-survey software package, with the exception of Northeastern University's.² All of the Web surveys had the same formatting in order to maintain a consistent look and feel and to avoid opportunities for bias that would hinder the comparability of responses between institutions.³ The only differences in appearance between the surveys were in the logos/university seals at the top of each instrument and the introductory text, which were institution-specific. The five additional surveys that were administered via the web (Boston College, George Washington University, the National University of Ireland, Galway, RMIT University, and Universiteit van Amsterdam) contained, on average, 115 closed-ended questions, 24 open-ended questions and 14 "if other, please specify" fill-ins for an average total of 153 survey items.⁴ Northeastern University's telephone survey contained 49 closed-ended questions and 4 open-ended items, for a total of 53 survey items.⁵

When each institution was ready to administer their instrument, an administrator from that institution sent an email to their international students inviting them to respond to the survey. The email explained the reason for the survey and/or how the results would be used, provided a hotlink to access the survey, and gave information about how to contact someone in case of technical difficulties or general questions.⁶ In all cases, at least one email reminder was sent and data were collected until responses dropped off so much that it was obvious that students had stopped responding. The surveys were active for varying lengths of time (a mean of 46 days, with a range of 30-72 days). Overall, data collection was conducted during a 24-week/four-and-a-half-month period because of the variations in academic calendars between the institutions.⁷

Northeastern used NUPULSE, a telephone-based student opinion survey service, to collect data from

international students. Through the use of computer-assisted telephone interviewing software (CATI), the interviewers would call a group of students from a designated list. If after three attempts they failed to contact an individual on their list, they would drop down to the next eligible name on the list and try contacting that person. Typically, there were eight student interviewers administering the CATI each evening for four evenings.

Participants

A combined total of 2,558 international students responded to the surveys, yielding an overall response rate of 22.1%. The response rates for individual institutions varied substantially, from 11% at the National University of Ireland, Galway to 43% at Northeastern University. The definition of "international" used by each institution varied slightly. For analysis purposes, "international students" are defined as individuals who do not hold sole citizenship in the country in which their institution is located.⁸ When employing this definition, the population base was reduced slightly to 2,225 cases.

The international students in our sample hailed from 128 different countries. More men (57%) than women elected to respond to the surveys.⁹ For most respondents (76%), the language of their academic program was not their first language, and this proportion was approximately equal for students attending U.S. and non-U.S. institutions. The majority of respondents (53%) reported being fluent in two languages, while an additional 43% were fluent in three or more languages. The average number of languages in which the respondents were fluent was 2.6, with the maximum being eight languages.

Approximately 27% of the students indicated they had lived, prior to matriculation, in the country where their institution was located. Of these, approximately 42% indicated they attended high school in the country where the university was located. Significantly fewer international students who attended non-U.S. institutions had lived and/or attended high school in the country where their institution was located than had those attending U.S. institutions. Twenty-four percent of international students who attended non-U.S. institutions indicated that they had lived, prior to matriculation, in the county where their institution was located, compared to 46% of those attending U.S. institutions. Non-native speakers were more likely to indicate that they had lived in the country where their institution was located or had attended high school in that country. Eastern Europeans were the most likely to indicate that they had lived or studied in the country where their institution was located, while those from Africa were the least likely to have had this experience.

Results¹⁰

Overall, respondents were positive about the various educational experiences they had at their university.

Approximately 65% of the international students indicated they liked or were enthusiastic about the institution they were attending.¹¹ A somewhat higher percentage of students attending U.S. institutions indicated they were "enthusiastic" about their institutions than were students at non-U.S. institutions. Ninety percent of all respondents were satisfied with the undergraduate education they were receiving. Of these, 88% said they would select that institution again if given the opportunity. Moreover, the vast majority of satisfied individuals (92%) would recommend the institution to other international students. Students attending non-U.S. institutions were somewhat more critical of the quality of education they were receiving than were students at schools in the U.S. A slightly higher percentage of students attending non-U.S. institutions than those attending U.S. institutions indicated that they were dissatisfied with their undergraduate education or that they would not recommend the institution to other international students. Despite this however, a similar proportion of students at U.S. and non-U.S. institutions said that if given the opportunity to begin again, they would

Table 1

Item	Experiencing Difficulty
Cost of living near the institution ^a	87.3%
Dating host country students	64.7%
Being away from friends ^a	62.9%
Being away from family ^a	57.2%
Writing papers ^a	54.1%
Getting used to college food	49.6%
Getting involved with club sports/teams	48.7%
Dating someone not from your culture	48.5%
Making host country friends ^a	47.9%
Understanding slang	42.1%
Meeting host country students	41.0%
Gaining access to faculty or staff members ^a	34.2%
Speaking in class ^a	33.2%
Becoming familiar with host country culture ^a	29.7%
Living with a roommate	26.5%
Becoming familiar with college life	24.1%
Speaking with faculty or staff members	22.5%
Getting used to host country food ^a	20.7%
Making international friends ^a	9.7%
Meeting international students	7.9%

^a Indicates items that were included on the Northeastern University CATI.

select the same institution (81.0% vs. 78.1%, respectively). There were no significant differences between native and non-native speakers with regard to levels of satisfaction with their institutions, or their desire to attend again. However, non-native speakers were somewhat more willing to recommend the institution as a good place for other international students, although this result was only significant at the $p < .05$ level. Moreover, there were no significant differences between students from various regions of the world¹² with regard to levels of satisfaction with their institutions, desire to attend again, or recommending the institutions as a good place for other international students.

Item	Experiencing Difficulty	
	U.S. Institutions	Non-U.S. Institutions
Cost of living near the institution*	79.6%	88.5%
Being away from friends*	55.1%	66.0%
Dating host country students*	48.4%	68.0%
Writing papers*	44.3%	58.2%
Living with a roommate*	44.2%	23.3%
Getting used to host country food*	35.9%	15.2%
Dating someone not from your culture*	33.1%	51.3%
Making host country friends*	30.0%	54.5%
Getting involved with club sports/teams*	24.3%	53.8%
Becoming familiar with host country culture*	22.0%	32.7%
Meeting host country students*	21.6%	44.4%
Understanding slang*	18.5%	47.1%
Gaining access to faculty or staff members*	18.2%	40.2%

* Significant $p < .001$

International students were asked to identify factors that made their adjustment to college life problematic (See Table 1, pg. 3). Students experienced varying degrees of difficulty with various tasks (i.e. writing papers, speaking in class, or understanding slang) as well as with interactions with different groups of individuals (i.e. faculty,

students from the host country, or other international students). For many, the cost of living near the institution, dating host country students, and being far away from friends and family were very difficult. For others, writing papers, getting used to college food, and getting involved in club sports/teams presented difficulties. Respondents reported the least difficulty with meeting and making friends with other international students.

Students at U.S. and non-U.S. institutions showed different patterns of difficulty in adjusting to life at their institutions (See Table 2). The items for which international students attending non-U.S. institutions experienced much more difficulty than did those attending U.S. institutions were with respect to getting involved with club sports/teams, understanding slang, and making host country friends. Conversely, a higher proportion of international students attending U.S. institutions experienced difficulty with living with a roommate, getting used to American food, and getting used to college food. Overall, very little difference was seen with respect to speaking in class or becoming familiar with college life.

Respondents whose language of instruction was not their native language were far more likely than native speakers to experience difficulty with a variety of language related issues, such as understanding slang, writing papers, becoming familiar with the host country culture, and making non-international friends (See Table 3). Getting used to college food was also significantly more difficult for non-native speakers. On the other hand, native speakers experienced more difficulty meeting international students, gaining access to faculty and staff members, being away from family, speaking with faculty or staff members, and making international friends. However, relatively little difference existed between the responses of native and non-native speakers relating to being away from friends and living with a roommate.

Regarding the difficulty of making various adjustments, nine of the 20 items showed statistically significant differences between students from the eight world regions. One of the interesting findings was that students whose home countries were in Africa or Oceania indicated they experienced significantly more difficulty being away from their family than did those from Western Europe (See Table 4). International students whose home countries were in Africa or Oceania reported experiencing the most difficulty living with a roommate as compared to students from the other regions of the world, whereas respondents who were originally from Asia reported relatively little difficulty. However, the respondents from Asia tended to experience significantly more difficulty understanding slang

Item	Experiencing Difficulty	
	Native	Non-Native
Dating host country students*	55.1%	67.9%
Writing papers*	39.1%	58.3%
Understanding slang*	19.5%	51.2%
Making host country friends*	37.9%	51.0%
Becoming familiar with host country culture*	18.8%	33.2%
Getting used to host country food*	13.5%	23.1%
Meeting international students*	12.2%	6.3%

* Significant $p < .001$

Experiencing Difficulty	Percentages							
	Africa	Asia	Eastern Europe	Middle East	North America	Oceania	South & Central America	Western Europe
Writing papers*	30.4%	60.5%	60.5%	72.7%	50.5%	25.0%	49.2%	52.6%
Understanding slang*	33.9%	49.1%	23.5%	35.8%	15.6%	0.0%	37.5%	26.3%
Getting used to host country food*	13.5%	14.4%	36.7%	41.1%	15.2%	33.3%	32.0%	32.1%
Getting used to college food*	50.0%	42.4%	66.7%	63.6%	24.1%	50.0%	68.8%	62.5%
Living with roommate*	46.2%	23.0%	24.2%	44.4%	24.1%	60.0%	43.8%	26.0%
Dating host country students*	64.1%	76.4%	45.5%	61.4%	36.2%	66.7%	58.8%	35.1%
Dating someone not from your culture*	42.9%	59.5%	15.2%	34.1%	32.7%	100.0%	28.0%	23.1%
Being away from family*	78.3%	56.5%	59.5%	75.8%	61.2%	83.3%	69.3%	43.0%
Cost of living near your institution*	92.1%	89.4%	87.0%	84.4%	78.0%	100.0%	91.2%	77.1%

* Significant $p < .001$

Item	Experiencing Difficulty	
	Male	Female
Being away from friends*	59.0%	68.0%
Being away from family*	52.2%	63.5%
Making host country friends*	42.9%	54.3%
Meeting host country students*	35.5%	47.9%
Speaking in class*	27.3%	41.0%

* Significant $p < .001$

Item	Experiencing Difficulty	
	Lived in Host Country Prior to Enrolling	Had Not Lived in Host Country Prior to Enrolling
Dating host country students*	56.3%	68.5%
Being away from family*	48.9%	61.5%
Understanding slang*	33.3%	45.4%
Meeting international students*	11.8%	6.4%

* Significant $p < .001$

Item	Experiencing Difficulty	
	On-campus	Off-campus
Meeting host country students*	20.5%	44.1%
Making host country friends*	20.4%	53.6%

* Significant $p < .001$

than their counterparts from other regions, while international students whose home country was in North America reported the least amount of difficulty. The cost of living near their institution was significantly more difficult for international students from Africa and Oceania than it was for those from North America and Western Europe. It appears that a students' region of origin may be a better

indicator of adaptability to their new college environment than being a native speaker of the language of instruction. This being said it is important to note that some items seemed to receive fairly consistent ratings between regions, such as the difficulty of speaking in class, speaking with faculty or staff members, meeting international students, and making international friends.

When the data was analyzed by gender, five out of the 20 items (25.0%) revealed significant differences in responses between the sexes. It was found that female international students reported experiencing somewhat more difficulty with being away from family and friends, meeting host country students, making host country friends, and speaking in class (See Table 5). In general, females reported more difficulty on nearly all of the items than did their male counterparts. However, males did report somewhat more difficulty than females with dating someone not from their culture, dating host country students, and getting used to college food, although these trends did not reach a statistically significant level. Making international friends, gaining access to faculty or staff members, getting involved with club sports/teams, and understanding slang tended to be about equally as difficult for males and females.

As might be expected, those who had lived in the host country before enrolling at their institution tended to report less difficulty adjusting to being an international student at their institution. (See Table 6). This trend was significant for three of the 20 items (dating host country students, being away from family, and understanding slang). However, there was another item for which responses differed significantly. Those who had lived in the host country before enrolling at their institution reported significantly more difficulty with meeting international students than those who had not lived in the host country prior to matriculation.

Students living on-campus reported less difficulty in adjustment on 16 of the 20 items, and this trend reached a statistically significant level for meeting host country students and making host country friends. (See Table 7).

Another goal of the study was to determine how international students spend their time. Students were presented with a series of 32 activities and were asked

Activity	Mean	N
Use a computer for pleasure (internet, chat, online, games)	3.30	1,939
Spend time with friends	3.10	1,937
Study	2.99	1,938
Watch television/movies	2.95	1,937
Made friends with students from a country different from yours	2.84	2,173
Made friends with students whose religion was different from yours	2.80	1,928
Discussions with students about "academic topics"	2.71	1,932
Made friends with students whose race was different from yours	2.68	2,154
Made friends with students whose family background was very different from yours	2.64	2,164
Group project assignments	2.63	2,167
Made friends with students whose academic interests were very different from yours	2.47	1,939
Read for pleasure	2.46	2,167
Made a class presentation	2.43	2,169
Made friends with students whose non-academic interests were very different from yours	2.41	2,169
Discussions with students whose beliefs differ from yours	2.23	2,161
Travel	2.22	1,930
Exercise/go to the gym	2.18	2,172
Work	2.13	1,937
Cultural events/locations in the institution's city (museums, theater, concerts)	2.11	2,161
Play sports	2.07	2,164
Made multimedia presentations	2.07	2,163
Visited informally with an instructor after class	2.05	2,178
Extracurricular activities	2.05	1,917
Made an appointment to meet with a faculty member	2.04	2,178
Go to clubs	1.94	2,123
Cultural events, concerts, or art exhibitions	1.83	2,164
Talked with staff in the International Center	1.50	1,789
Participated in a community service project	1.47	1,927
Talked with staff at Career Services	1.43	2,020
Religious services	1.42	2,164
Talked with an academic dean	1.36	2,019
Participated in a community service project with a faculty member	1.22	1,926

Scale: 1 = Never, 2 = Occasionally, 3 = Often, 4 = Very Often

how often they had participated in each during the 2003-2004 academic year (See Table 8). The activities in which respondents tended to spend a considerable amount of time were using the computer for pleasure, spending time with friends, and studying. Students tended to spend much less time participating in community service projects, talking with an academic dean, attending religious services, talking with Career Services, talking with someone from the International Center, or attending cultural events.

The location of the international students' institutions (U.S. vs. non-U.S.) seemed to have more of an impact on the types of activities in which they participated than did whether the students were native or non-native speakers. Participation levels in 25 of the 32 activities were significantly different between students who attended U.S. and non-U.S. institutions, while only eight activities showed differences in participation between native and non-native speakers. International students attending U.S. institutions tended to be more likely to engage in social interaction, spend more time making and hanging out with friends,

participate in extra-curricular activities and community service projects, attend cultural events/concerts/art exhibitions, and go to clubs (See Table 9). International students at non-U.S. institutions spent more time with activities that might provide somewhat less social interaction such as reading for pleasure, working, making multimedia presentations, and watching television/movies. However, the location of the institution did not seem to have an impact on responses relating to making a class presentation, playing sports, or participating in a community service project with a faculty member.

Native speakers were more likely than non-native speakers to travel, participate in extracurricular activities, exercise/go to the gym, and go to clubs (See Table 10). In addition, native speakers tended to report making friends more frequently with students who were different on a variety of dimensions (including academic interests, non-academic interests, family background, and religion) than did non-native speakers. Non-native speakers were more likely than native speakers to speak with Career Services, work, participate in a community service project with a faculty member, speak with staff in the International Center, and play sports. The respondents' primary language seemed to have very little impact on participation in other academic or social activities such as reading for pleasure, attending cultural events, visiting informally with an instructor making an appointment to meet with a faculty member, participating in a

community service project, attending religious services, or talking with an academic dean.

Twenty-four of the 32 items regarding the frequency of engaging in various activities revealed statistically significant differences between groups when analyzed by the students' regions of origin. In general, students who were originally from Asia were significantly less likely than students from most other regions to talk with various staff at their institution, make friends of various types, engage in cultural activities, discussions with others, or recreational activities such as exercising/going to the gym, extracurricular activities, going to clubs, or traveling (See Table 11). However, Asian students studying abroad were significantly more likely than most other groups to have been involved in group project assignments, made multimedia presentations, attended religious services, used a computer for pleasure, and watched television/movies. Students from South and Central America were significantly more likely than other groups to engage in the majority of activities listed such as talking with various staff at the

Activity	Mean	
	U.S. Institution	Non-U.S. Institution
Use a computer for pleasure (internet, chat, online, games)*	3.50	3.27
Spend time with friends*	3.46	3.04
Made friends with students whose religion was different from yours*	3.25	2.73
Made friends with students whose academic interests were very different from yours*	3.23	2.35
Study*	3.21	2.96
Made friends with students from a country different from yours*	3.03	2.78
Made friends with students whose family background was very different from yours*	2.97	2.54
Made friends with students whose race was different from yours*	2.96	2.60
Discussions with students about "academic topics"*	2.87	2.68
Made friends with students whose non-academic interests were very different from yours*	2.81	2.29
Extracurricular activities*	2.64	1.95
Discussions with students whose beliefs differ from yours*	2.54	2.14
Exercise/go to the gym*	2.49	2.09
Travel*	2.43	2.19
Go to clubs*	2.34	1.83
Cultural events/locations in the institution's city (museums, theater, concerts)*	2.23	2.08
Cultural events, concerts, or art exhibitions*	2.23	1.71
Read for pleasure*	2.22	2.53
Visited informally with an instructor after class*	2.15	2.02
Made an appointment to meet with a faculty member*	2.14	2.01
Participated in a community service project*	2.00	1.39
Talked with staff in the International Center*	1.90	1.43
Religious services*	1.60	1.37
Talked with staff at Career Services*	1.54	1.40
Talked with an academic dean*	1.50	1.31

Scale: 1 = Never, 2 = Occasionally, 3 = Often, 4 = Very Often

* Significant p < .001

institution, making friends of various types, attending religious services and cultural events, clubbing, and using a computer for pleasure. North American students studying abroad were less likely to have talked with staff at Career Services, completed group project assignments, or made multimedia presentations than were those from other regions of the world.

When analyzed by gender, it was found that females were somewhat more involved in 20 out of the 32 activities (See Table 12). Statistically significant differences between males and females were revealed for 10 of the 32 items. Males were significantly more likely than females to play

Activity	Mean	
	Native	Non-Native
Made friends with students whose family background was very different from yours*	2.76	2.61
Made friends with students whose non-academic interests were very different from yours*	2.53	2.38
Discussions with students whose beliefs differ from yours	2.30	2.21
Travel*	2.36	2.18
Exercise/go to the gym*	2.30	2.14
Extracurricular activities*	2.18	2.01
Go to clubs*	2.07	1.90
Talked with staff at Career Services*	1.33	1.47
Participated in a community service project with a faculty member*	1.15	1.25

Scale: 1 = Never, 2 = Occasionally, 3 = Often, 4 = Very Often

* Significant p < .001

sports, make multimedia presentations, and visit informally with an instructor after class. Females were significantly more likely than males to spend time with friends, study, read for pleasure, have discussions with students having different beliefs, travel, and attend cultural events. Males and females tended to report similar activity levels with respect to using a computer for pleasure, making friends with students whose country, religion, or race was different from their own, having discussions with students about "academic topics," working, exercising/going to the gym, making an appointment to meet with a faculty member, going to clubs, attending religious services, participating in a community service project with or without a faculty member, and talking with either an academic dean or student services staff.

Students who had lived in the host country prior to enrolling were somewhat more involved in 23 out of the 32 activities than those who had not lived in the host country prior to enrolling at their institution. (See Table 13). However, this trend was only statistically significant for five out of the 32 items regarding activities (talked with an academic dean, talked with staff at Career Services, participated in a community service project, exercise/go to the gym, extracurricular activities). The items with the greatest difference in responses between those who had and had not lived in the host country prior to enrolling were exercise/go to gym, participated in a community service project, and extracurricular activities.

As might be expected, students living on-campus tended to be more involved than those living off-campus (See Table 14). Twelve items received significantly different responses based on students' residential location. Students who lived on-campus were more likely to indicate that they had made friends with individuals with dissimilar family and religious backgrounds, as well as, different academic interests. Conversely, students who lived off-campus were more likely to indicate that they participated in group

Activity	Mean							
	Africa	Asia	Eastern Europe	Middle East	North America	Oceania	South & Central America	Western Europe
Talked with an academic dean*	1.51	1.32	1.30	1.34	1.36	1.33	1.69	1.33
Talked with staff at Career Services*	1.48	1.43	1.70	1.57	1.24	1.50	1.59	1.28
Talked with staff in the International Center*	1.66	1.44	1.59	1.72	1.58	1.17	1.74	1.57
Made friends with students from a country different from yours*	3.08	2.77	3.05	3.09	2.83	2.86	3.30	2.93
Made friends with students whose academic interests were very different from yours*	2.73	2.35	2.57	2.67	2.71	2.29	3.07	2.59
Made friends with students whose non-academic interests were very different from yours*	2.51	2.30	2.44	2.57	2.47	2.29	2.79	2.53
Made friends with students whose family background was very different from yours*	2.90	2.53	2.95	2.87	2.74	2.71	3.17	2.67
Made friends with students whose race was different from yours*	3.02	2.61	2.53	3.01	2.61	2.86	3.21	2.61
Made friends with students whose religion was different from yours*	3.00	2.76	2.88	3.12	2.77	2.86	3.20	2.68
Group project assignments*	2.78	2.70	2.44	2.64	2.17	2.14	2.62	2.42
Made multimedia presentations*	2.27	2.16	2.00	1.99	1.69	1.57	2.02	1.84
Religious services*	1.39	1.43	1.10	1.49	1.61	1.43	1.68	1.17
Cultural events, concerts, or art exhibitions*	1.97	1.61	2.30	2.01	2.30	2.14	2.30	2.23
Discussions with students whose beliefs differ from yours*	2.36	2.10	2.50	2.34	2.58	2.00	2.54	2.39
Participated in a community service project with a faculty member*	1.14	1.27	1.08	1.24	1.11	1.29	1.20	1.08
Cultural events/locations in the institution's city (museums, theater, concerts)*	1.97	1.97	2.49	2.18	2.39	2.43	2.64	2.42
Exercise/go to the gym*	2.24	2.01	2.49	2.58	2.34	3.14	2.48	2.45
Extracurricular activities*	2.18	1.93	2.19	2.30	2.44	2.57	2.43	2.16
Go to clubs*	2.09	1.72	2.25	2.03	2.16	2.17	2.44	2.17
Spend time with friends*	3.01	3.04	3.21	3.19	3.30	2.86	3.25	3.21
Study*	3.14	2.93	3.25	3.10	2.95	2.86	3.27	3.08
Travel*	2.03	2.17	2.08	2.27	2.64	2.14	2.43	2.30
Use a computer for pleasure (internet, chat, online, games)*	3.34	3.36	2.84	3.21	3.30	2.57	3.41	3.09
Watch television/movies*	3.09	2.99	2.67	2.99	2.95	2.29	2.96	2.69

Scale: 1 = Never, 2 = Occasionally, 3 = Often, 4 = Very Often

* Significant $p < .001$

projects, made class presentations, and read for pleasure.

Discussion

The findings presented in this report are similar to those reported in the literature. Overall, international students attending the participating seven institutions tended to like their institution, were satisfied with their education, and would recommend their institution as a good place for international students. However, international students did experience difficulty adjusting to the cost of living near their institution, dating host country students, being away from family and friends, and writing papers. Various factors such as gender, prior experience living in the host country, whether the language of instruction was the students' native language, the location of the school, the student's

Activity	Mean	
	Male	Female
Spend time with friends*	3.03	3.18
Study*	2.91	3.10
Read for pleasure*	2.35	2.61
Play sports*	2.27	1.81
Discussions with students whose beliefs differ from yours*	2.18	2.30
Travel*	2.15	2.32
Made multimedia presentations*	2.14	1.98
Visited informally with an instructor after class*	2.09	1.99
Cultural events/locations in the institution's city (museums, theater, concerts)*	2.06	2.19
Cultural events, concerts, or art exhibitions*	1.74	1.96

Scale: 1 = Never, 2 = Occasionally, 3 = Often, 4 = Very Often

* Significant $p < .001$

region of citizenship, and the location of the college residence had a significant impact on the responses to some items.

Our findings suggest that the experiences of international students differ somewhat across continents. Respondents attending non-U.S. institutions reported more difficulty getting involved with club sports/teams, understanding slang, and making host country friends, while those attending U.S. institutions reported that living with a roommate, getting used to American food, and getting used to college food were

somewhat more difficult. Those attending a U.S. institution tended to engage in more social interaction such as

Activity	Mean	
	Lived in Host Country Prior to Enrolling	Had Not Lived in Host Country Prior to Enrolling
Exercise/go to the gym*	2.35	2.08
Extracurricular activities*	2.16	2.01
Participated in a community service project*	1.62	1.42
Talked with staff at Career Services*	1.51	1.39
Talked with an academic dean*	1.45	1.32

Scale: 1 = Never, 2 = Occasionally, 3 = Often, 4 = Very Often

* Significant $p < .001$

spending time making and hanging out with friends, participating in extracurricular activities and community service projects, attending cultural events, and going to clubs. Those attending non-U.S. institutions tended to engage in less social activities such as reading for pleasure, working, making multimedia presentations, and watching television/movies.

In addition to the location of the institution, it was found that the students' region of origin impacted their experiences while studying abroad. Students from Africa and Oceania reported the most difficulty adjusting to being away from their family, living with a roommate, and the cost of living near their institution. Respondents originally coming from Asia tended to have the most difficulty understanding slang. Students from Asia were

Table 14

Activity	Mean	
	On-campus	Off-campus
Spend time with friends*	3.46	3.21
Use a computer for pleasure (internet, chat, online, games)*	3.46	3.13
Made friends with students from a country different from yours*	3.27	2.92
Made friends with students whose religion was different from yours*	3.25	2.81
Made friends with students whose family background was very different from yours*	3.24	2.75
Made friends with students whose academic interests were very different from yours*	3.24	2.60
Made friends with students whose race was different from yours*	3.19	2.68
Made friends with students whose non-academic interests were very different from yours*	3.00	2.45
Group project assignments*	2.23	2.69
Made a class presentation*	2.17	2.64
Read for pleasure*	2.15	2.53
Made multimedia presentations*	1.72	2.09

Scale: 1 = Never, 2 = Occasionally, 3 = Often, 4 = Very Often

* Significant $p < .001$

less likely to talk with staff members at their institution, make friends of various types, engage in cultural activities, have discussions with others, or engage in recreational activities such as exercising/going to the gym, or extracurricular activities. Students from South or Central America tended to be the most active in activities, such as talking with various staff members at their institutions, making various types of friends, attending religious services and cultural events, and clubbing.

As might be expected, non-native speakers were likely to experience difficulty with language related tasks such as understanding slang, writing papers, and making non-international friends. Interestingly enough, native speakers found meeting and making friends with international students, speaking with faculty or staff, and being away from family more difficult than did their non-native speaker counterparts. Native speakers had a greater tendency to travel, participate in extracurricular activities, exercise/go to the gym, and make more friends of various types.

The respondents' sex seemed to have a minor impact in select areas. Females tended to report more social network difficulties than did males. That is, females found being away from family and friends, meeting host country students, and speaking in class significantly more difficult than did males. Interestingly, males found dating someone not from their culture, dating host country students, and getting used to college food somewhat more difficult than did females, but these trends were only nearly significant. Females were more likely than males to spend time with friends, read for pleasure, have discussions with students having different beliefs, travel, attend cultural events, and study. Males were more likely to play sports, make multimedia presentations, and visit informally with an instructor after class.

Those who had lived in the host country prior to enrolling at their current institution reported significantly less difficulty

with understanding slang, dating host country students, being away from their families and meeting other international students. Moreover, they were significantly more likely to engage in exercising, extracurricular activities, participating in community service projects, and talking with staff at Career Services or an academic dean than their counterparts who had not lived in the host country prior to matriculation.

Where international students were living while attending their current

institution also played a small role in their responses. Students living off-campus reported somewhat more difficulty meeting and making friends with host country students than did those living on-campus. In addition, they were less likely to report spending time with friends, making friends with a wide variety of other types of students, and using a computer for pleasure. Therefore, it seems that this factor plays a small, but nonetheless, consistent role in the international undergraduate experience.

Overall, the location of the respondents' institution (U.S. vs. non-U.S.) tended to have the most impact on the responses (78% of the items regarding involvement in activities and 65% of the items related to difficulty in adjusting being significant between the two groups), while region of citizenship also had a powerful impact (75% of the items regarding involvement in activities and 45% of items related to difficulty in adjusting being significant between groups).

Certain items tended to elicit similar responses regardless of the students' gender, region of citizenship, native language, whether they attended a U.S. or non-U.S. institution, whether they had lived in the host country prior to enrolling, or were living on or off campus. These factors related to the difficulty of speaking with faculty or staff members, becoming familiar with college life, making international friends, and frequency of spending time at work. Therefore, it appears that some aspects of the international student experience are universal.

Hopefully this paper has moved the study of international students' experiences forward by expanding the analyses to include a larger heterogeneous population — international students from several U.S. and non-U.S. institutions. This paper describes how international students adjust to life at universities outside of their home countries. It appears that international students' experiences are fairly similar across the continents and that many of the differences

can be attributed to the regions of the world from which the students hail. Thus, it seems that it might be beneficial for institutions to consider developing targeted strategies to address the needs of specific sub-groups of international students. Furthermore, it is quite plausible that newly developed strategies based on these findings could be easily applied at another institution with reasonable success.

References

Al-Sharideh, K. & Goe, W. R. (1998). Ethnic communities within the university: An examination of factors influencing the personal adjustments of international students. *Research in Higher Education*, 39(6), 699-725.

Sheehan, O. T. O. & Pearson, F. (1995). Asian international and American students' psychosocial development. *Journal of College Student Development*, 36(6), 522-530.

Terkla, D. G., Roscoe, H. S. & Elish-Andrews, J. (2003). The International Undergraduate Student Experience. Paper presented at the 30th Annual Conference of the North East Association for Institutional Research, November, 2003 and in *Proceedings*.

Tompson, H.B. & Tompson, G.H (1996). Confronting Diversity Issues in the Classroom with Strategies to Improve Satisfaction and Retention of International Students. *Journal of Education for Business*, 72(1), 53-57.

Van Hoof, H.B. (2005). An invaluable perspective, *International Educator*, 14(1), 26-33.

Wan, T., Chapman, D.W. & Biggs, D.A. (1992). Academic stress of international students attending US universities, *Research in Higher Education*, 33(5), 607-623.

Endnotes

¹ A copy of the 2004 Tufts International Undergraduate Student Experience survey is available upon request.

² Northeastern University determined that their population was not a good match for using a web-based survey format. Therefore, the Web-based International Student instrument was revised for telephone survey purposes.

³ Copies of surveys are available upon request.

⁴ Individual respondents often did not see a number of these items, as branching logic skipped them over questions that were deemed not relevant to them as determined by responses to prior questions.

⁵ Northeastern University's telephone interviewers also recorded the respondents' gender and class year; however, these were not counted as question items as the interviewers recorded them without posing the item to the respondent.

⁶ At Tufts, a link to the survey was also posted on TuftsLife.com, a popular campus informational Web site frequented by students.

⁷ Northeastern University is not included in these numbers as the participants were contacted by telephone and were not able to go to a Web site to access the survey at their convenience.

⁸ If individuals hold dual citizenship in the country in which the institution is located as well as another country, they are included in this analysis.

⁹ There were no differences between U.S. and non-U.S. institutions or between native and non-native speakers with respect to the proportions of males and females responding to the surveys.

¹⁰ Unless otherwise specified, tests of statistical significance were assessed at the $p < .001$ level.

¹¹ Students were presented with four response options: 1) I don't like it, 2) I am more or less neutral about it, 3) I like it, and 4) I'm enthusiastic about it.

¹² Respondents were grouped by home country into eight regions of the world: Africa (N=88), Asia (N=1,289), Eastern Europe (N=62), Middle East (N=81), North America (N=130), Oceania (N=8), South & Central America (N=94), and Western Europe (N=225) (See Appendix A for region groupings). Grouping respondents in this way enabled analyses to determine whether the students' region of the world had an impact on their experiences as an international student elsewhere.

¹³ There are many ways in which one could group countries, and each could cause controversy for its own reason. To our knowledge, there is no single accepted way for American institutions to do so. These categories were developed utilizing established categories by our colleagues in Australia and the Netherlands, between which there was substantial amount of agreement in categorization.

Appendix A
Number of Respondents by Country/Region of the World

Africa	N
Algeria	1
Angola	2
Botswana	12
Comoros	1
Egypt	2
Ethiopia	2
Ghana	2
Kenya	5
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	1
Mauritius	38
Morocco	2
Nigeria	5
Somalia	1
South Africa	3
Sudan	1
Togo	1
Tunisia	1
Uganda	2
United Republic of Tanzania	1
Zambia	1
Zimbabwe	4
TOTAL	88

Asia	N
Bangladesh	24
Bhutan	1
Brunei Darussalam	3
Cambodia	1
China	224
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	1
Hong Kong	58
India	218
Indonesia	187
Japan	31
Lao People's Democratic Republic	1
Macau	4
Malaysia	196
Maldives	1
Mongolia	1
Myanmar	6
Nauru	1
Nepal	3
Pakistan	10
Philippines	5
Republic of Korea	41
Samoa	1
Singapore	122
Sri Lanka	32
Taiwan	30
Tajikistan	1
Thailand	50
Viet Nam	36
TOTAL	1,289

Eastern Europe	N
Albania	3
Belarus	1
Bosnia & Herzegovina	1
Bulgaria	11
Croatia	3
Georgia	2
Hungary	2
Kazakhstan	1
Latvia	2
Lithuania	1
Poland	9
Republic of Moldova	1
Romania	2
Russian Federation	9
Slovakia	3
Slovenia	2
Ukraine	3
Yugoslavia	2
Macedonia	4
TOTAL	62

Middle East	N
Afghanistan	1
Armenia	1
Bahrain	2
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	7
Iraq	1
Israel	10
Jordan	7
Kuwait	3
Lebanon	5
Oman	8
Saudi Arabia	5
Syrian Arab Republic	1
Turkey	22
Turkmenistan	1
United Arab Emirates	6
Uzbekistan	1
TOTAL	81

North America	N
Barbados	1
Bermuda	1
Canada	36
Dominican Republic	1
Haiti	4
Jamaica	2
Trinidad and Tobago	4
United States of America	81
TOTAL	130

Oceania	N
Australia	7
Fiji	1
TOTAL	8

continued on next page

South & Central America	N
Argentina	3
Belize	1
Bolivia	1
Brazil	14
Colombia	22
Costa Rica	1
Ecuador	2
El Salvador	5
Guatemala	1
Honduras	2
Mexico	19
Panama	3
Paraguay	1
Peru	1
Suriname	7
Venezuela	11
TOTAL	94

Western Europe	N
Austria	2
Belgium	9
Denmark	2
Finland	2
France	23
Germany	54
Greece	7
Ireland	6
Italy	14
Luxembourg	1
Malta	1
Netherlands	6
Norway	23
Portugal	2
Spain	6
Sweden	20
Switzerland	5
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	42
TOTAL	225

THE AIR PROFESSIONAL FILE—1978-2007

A list of titles for the issues printed to date follows. Most issues are "out of print," but microfiche or photocopies are available through ERIC. Photocopies are also available from the AIR Executive Office, 222 Stone Building, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL 32306-4462, \$3.00 each, prepaid, which covers the costs of postage and handling. Please do not contact the editor for reprints of previously published Professional File issues.

- Organizing for Institutional Research* (J.W. Ridge; 6 pp; No. 1)
Dealing with Information Systems: The Institutional Researcher's Problems and Prospects (L.E. Saunders; 4 pp; No. 2)
Formula Budgeting and the Financing of Public Higher Education: Panacea or Nemesis for the 1980s? (F.M. Gross; 6 pp; No. 3)
Methodology and Limitations of Ohio Enrollment Projections (G.A. Kraetsch; 8 pp; No. 4)
Conducting Data Exchange Programs (A.M. Bloom & J.A. Montgomery; 4 pp; No. 5)
Choosing a Computer Language for Institutional Research (D. Strenglein; 4 pp; No. 6)
Cost Studies in Higher Education (S.R. Hample; 4 pp; No. 7)
Institutional Research and External Agency Reporting Responsibility (G. Davis; 4 pp; No. 8)
Coping with Curricular Change in Academe (G.S. Melchiori; 4 pp; No. 9)
Computing and Office Automation—Changing Variables (E.M. Staman; 6 pp; No. 10)
Resource Allocation in U.K. Universities (B.J.R. Taylor; 8 pp; No. 11)
Career Development in Institutional Research (M.D. Johnson; 5 pp; No. 12)
The Institutional Research Director: Professional Development and Career Path (W.P. Fenstermacher; 6pp; No. 13)
A Methodological Approach to Selective Cutbacks (C.A. Belanger & L. Tremblay; 7 pp; No. 14)
Effective Use of Models in the Decision Process: Theory Grounded in Three Case Studies (M. Mayo & R.E. Kallio; 8 pp; No. 15)
Triage and the Art of Institutional Research (D.M. Norris; 6 pp; No. 16)
The Use of Computational Diagrams and Nomograms in Higher Education (R.K. Brandenburg & W.A. Simpson; 8 pp; No. 17)
Decision Support Systems for Academic Administration (L.J. Moore & A.G. Greenwood; 9 pp; No. 18)
The Cost Basis for Resource Allocation for Sandwich Courses (B.J.R. Taylor; 7 pp; No. 19)
Assessing Faculty Salary Equity (C.A. Allard; 7 pp; No. 20)
Effective Writing: Go Tell It on the Mountain (C.W. Ruggiero, C.F. Elton, C.J. Mullins & J.G. Smoot; 7 pp; No. 21)
Preparing for Self-Study (F.C. Johnson & M.E. Christal; 7 pp; No. 22)
Concepts of Cost and Cost Analysis for Higher Education (P.T. Brinkman & R.H. Allen; 8 pp; No. 23)
The Calculation and Presentation of Management Information from Comparative Budget Analysis (B.J.R. Taylor; 10 pp; No. 24)
The Anatomy of an Academic Program Review (R.L. Harpel; 6 pp; No. 25)
The Role of Program Review in Strategic Planning (R.J. Barak; 7 pp; No. 26)
The Adult Learner: Four Aspects (Ed. J.A. Lucas; 7 pp; No. 27)
Building a Student Flow Model (W.A. Simpson; 7 pp; No. 28)
Evaluating Remedial Education Programs (T.H. Bers; 8 pp; No. 29)
Developing a Faculty Information System at Carnegie Mellon University (D.L. Gibson & C. Golden; 7 pp; No. 30)
Designing an Information Center: An Analysis of Markets and Delivery Systems (R. Matross; 7 pp; No. 31)
Linking Learning Style Theory with Retention Research: The TRAILS Project (D.H. Kalsbeek; 7 pp; No. 32)
Data Integrity: Why Aren't the Data Accurate? (F.J. Gose; 7 pp; No. 33)
Electronic Mail and Networks: New Tools for Institutional Research and University Planning (D.A. Updegrave, J.A. Muffo & J.A. Dunn, Jr.; 7pp; No. 34)
Case Studies as a Supplement to Quantitative Research: Evaluation of an Intervention Program for High Risk Students (M. Peglow-Hoch & R.D. Walleri; 8 pp; No. 35)
Interpreting and Presenting Data to Management (C.A. Clagett; 5 pp; No. 36)
The Role of Institutional Research in Implementing Institutional Effectiveness or Outcomes Assessment (J.O. Nichols; 6 pp; No. 37)
Phenomenological Interviewing in the Conduct of Institutional Research: An Argument and an Illustration (L.C. Attinasi, Jr.; 8pp; No. 38)
Beginning to Understand Why Older Students Drop Out of College (C. Farabaugh-Dorkins; 12 pp; No. 39)
A Responsive High School Feedback System (P.B. Duby; 8 pp; No. 40)
Listening to Your Alumni: One Way to Assess Academic Outcomes (J. Pettit; 12 pp; No. 41)
Accountability in Continuing Education Measuring Noncredit Student Outcomes (C.A. Clagett & D.D. McConochie; 6pp; No. 42)
Focus Group Interviews: Applications for Institutional Research (D.L. Brodigan; 6 pp; No. 43)
An Interactive Model for Studying Student Retention (R.H. Glover & J. Wilcox; 12 pp; No. 44)
Increasing Admitted Student Yield Using a Political Targeting Model and Discriminant Analysis: An Institutional Research Admissions Partnership (R.F. Urban; 6 pp; No. 45)
Using Total Quality to Better Manage an Institutional Research Office (M.A. Heverly; 6 pp; No. 46)
Critique of a Method For Surveying Employers (T. Banta, R.H. Phillippi & W. Lyons; 8 pp; No. 47)
Plan-Do-Check-Act and the Management of Institutional Research (G.W. McLaughlin & J.K. Snyder; 10 pp; No. 48)
Strategic Planning and Organizational Change: Implications for Institutional Researchers (K.A. Corak & D.P. Wharton; 10 pp; No. 49)
Academic and Librarian Faculty: Birds of a Different Feather in Compensation Policy? (M.E. Zeglen & E.J. Schmidt; 10 pp; No. 50)
Setting Up a Key Success Index Report: A How-To Manual (M.M. Sapp; 8 pp; No. 51)
Involving Faculty in the Assessment of General Education: A Case Study (D.G. Underwood & R.H. Nowaczyk; 6 pp; No. 52)
Using a Total Quality Management Team to Improve Student Information Publications (J.L. Frost & G.L. Beach; 8 pp; No. 53)
Evaluating the College Mission through Assessing Institutional Outcomes (C.J. Myers & P.J. Silvers; 9 pp; No. 54)

THE AIR PROFESSIONAL FILE—1978-2007

- Community College Students' Persistence and Goal Attainment: A Five-year Longitudinal Study (K.A. Conklin; 9 pp; No. 55)
- What Does an Academic Department Chairperson Need to Know Anyway? (M.K. Kinnick; 11 pp; No. 56)
- Cost of Living and Taxation Adjustments in Salary Comparisons (M.E. Zeglen & G. Tesfagiorgis; 14 pp; No. 57)
- The Virtual Office: An Organizational Paradigm for Institutional Research in the 90's (R. Matross; 8 pp; No. 58)
- Student Satisfaction Surveys: Measurement and Utilization Issues (L. Sanders & S. Chan; 9 pp; No. 59)
- The Error Of Our Ways; Using TQM Tactics to Combat Institutional Issues Research Bloopers (M.E. Zeglin; 18 pp; No. 60)
- How Enrollment Ends; Analyzing the Correlates of Student Graduation, Transfer, and Dropout with a Competing Risks Model (S.L. Ronco; 14 pp; No. 61)
- Setting a Census Date to Optimize Enrollment, Retention, and Tuition Revenue Projects (V. Borden, K. Burton, S. Keucher, F. Vossburg-Conaway; 12 pp; No. 62)
- Alternative Methods For Validating Admissions and Course Placement Criteria (J. Noble & R. Sawyer; 12 pp; No. 63)
- Admissions Standards for Undergraduate Transfer Students: A Policy Analysis (J. Saupe & S. Long; 12 pp; No. 64)
- IR for IR—Indispensable Resources for Institutional Researchers: An Analysis of AIR Publications Topics Since 1974 (J. Volkwein & V. Volkwein; 12 pp; No. 65)
- Progress Made on a Plan to Integrate Planning, Budgeting, Assessment and Quality Principles to Achieve Institutional Improvement (S. Griffith, S. Day, J. Scott, R. Smallwood; 12 pp; No. 66)
- The Local Economic Impact of Higher Education: An Overview of Methods and Practice (K. Stokes & P. Coomes; 16 pp; No. 67)
- Developmental Education Outcomes at Minnesota Community Colleges (C. Schoenecker, J. Evens & L. Bollman; 16 pp; No. 68)
- Studying Faculty Flows Using an Interactive Spreadsheet Model (W. Kelly; 16 pp; No. 69)
- Using the National Datasets for Faculty Studies (J. Milam; 20 pp; No. 70)
- Tracking Institutional leavers: An Application (S. DesJardins, H. Pontiff; 14 pp; No. 71)
- Predicting Freshman Success Based on High School Record and Other Measures (D. Eno, G. W. McLaughlin, P. Sheldon & P. Brozovsky; 12 pp; No. 72)
- A New Focus for Institutional Researchers: Developing and Using a Student Decision Support System (J. Frost, M. Wang & M. Dalrymple; 12 pp; No. 73)
- The Role of Academic Process in Student Achievement: An Application of Structural Equations Modeling and Cluster Analysis to Community College Longitudinal Data¹ (K. Boughan, 21 pp; No. 74)
- A Collaborative Role for Industry Assessing Student Learning (F. McMartin; 12 pp; No. 75)
- Efficiency and Effectiveness in Graduate Education: A Case Analysis (M. Kehrhahn, N.L. Travers & B.G. Sheckley; No.76)
- ABCs of Higher Education-Getting Back to the Basics: An Activity-Based Costing Approach to Planning and Financial Decision Making (K. S. Cox, L. G. Smith & R.G. Downey; 12 pp; No. 77)
- Using Predictive Modeling to Target Student Recruitment: Theory and Practice (E. Thomas, G. Reznik & W. Dawes; 12 pp; No. 78)
- Assessing the Impact of Curricular and Instructional Reform - A Model for Examining Gateway Courses¹ (S.J. Andrade; 16 pp; No. 79)
- Surviving and Benefitting from an Institutional Research Program Review (W.E. Knight; 7 pp; No. 80)
- A Comment on Interpreting Odds-Ratios when Logistic Regression Coefficients are Negative (S.L. DesJardins; 7 pp; No. 81)
- Including Transfer-Out Behavior in Retention Models: Using NSC Enrollment Search Data (S.R. Porter; 16 pp; No. 82)
- Assessing the Performance of Public Research Universities Using NSF/NCES Data and Data Envelopment Analysis Technique (H. Zheng & A. Stewart; 24 pp; No. 83)
- Finding the 'Start Line' with an Institutional Effectiveness Inventory¹ (S. Ronco & S. Brown; 12 pp; No. 84)
- Toward a Comprehensive Model of Influences Upon Time to Bachelor's Degree Attainment (W. Knight; 18 pp; No. 85)
- Using Logistic Regression to Guide Enrollment Management at a Public Regional University (D. Berge & D. Hendel; 14 pp; No. 86)
- A Micro Economic Model to Assess the Economic Impact of Universities: A Case Example (R. Parsons & A. Griffiths; 24 pp; No. 87)
- Methodology for Developing an Institutional Data Warehouse (D. Wierschem, R. McBroom & J. McMillen; 12 pp; No. 88)
- The Role of Institutional Research in Space Planning (C.E. Watt, B.A. Johnston, R.E. Chrestman & T.B. Higerd; 10 pp; No. 89)
- What Works Best? Collecting Alumni Data with Multiple Technologies (S. R. Porter & P.D. Umback; 10 pp; No. 90)
- Caveat Emptor: Is There a Relationship between Part-Time Faculty Utilization and Student Learning Outcomes and Retention? (T. Schibik & C. Harrington; 10 pp; No. 91)
- Ridge Regression as an Alternative to Ordinary Least Squares: Improving Prediction Accuracy and the Interpretation of Beta Weights (D. A. Walker; 12 pp; No. 92)
- Cross-Validation of Persistence Models for Incoming Freshmen (M. T. Harmston; 14 pp; No. 93)
- Tracking Community College Transfers Using National Student Clearinghouse Data (R.M. Romano and M. Wisniewski; 14 pp; No. 94)
- Assessing Students' Perceptions of Campus Community: A Focus Group Approach (D.X. Cheng; 11 pp; No. 95)
- Expanding Students' Voice in Assessment through Senior Survey Research (A.M. Delaney; 20 pp; No. 96)
- Making Measurement Meaningful (Carpenter-Hubin, J. & Hornsby, E.E., 14 pp; No. 97)
- Strategies and Tools Used to Collect and Report Strategic Plan Data (Blankert, J., Lucas, C. & Frost, J.; 14 pp; No. 98)
- Factors Related to Persistence of Freshmen, Freshman Transfers, and Nonfreshman Transfer Students (Perkhounkova, Y, Noble, J & McLaughlin, G.; 12 pp; No. 99)
- Does it Matter Who's in the Classroom? Effect of Instructor Type on Student Retention, Achievement and Satisfaction (Ronco, S. & Cahill, J.; 16 pp; No. 100)
- Weighting Omissions and Best Practices When Using Large-Scale Data in Educational Research (Hahs-Vaughn, D.L.; 12 pp; No. 101)
- Essential Steps for Web Surveys: A Guide to Designing, Administering and Utilizing Web Surveys for University Decision-Making (Cheskis-Gold,, R., Shepard-Rabadam, E., Loescher, R., & Carroll, B.; 16 pp.; No. 102)
- Using a Market Ratio Factor in Faculty Salary Equity Studies (Luna, A. L.; 16 pp.; No. 103)

The *AIR Professional File* is intended as a presentation of papers which synthesize and interpret issues, operations, and research of interest in the field of institutional research. Authors are responsible for material presented. The *AIR Professional File* is published by the Association for Institutional Research.

Editor:
Dr. Gerald W. McLaughlin
Director of Planning and
Institutional Research
DePaul University
1 East Jackson, Suite 1501
Chicago, IL 60604-2216
Phone: 312/362-8403
Fax: 312/362-5918
gmclaugh@depaul.edu

Associate Editor:
Ms. Debbie Dailey
Associate Director of Planning and
Institutional Research
Georgetown University
303 Maguire Hall, 37th & O St NW
Washington, DC 20057
Phone: 202/687-7717
Fax: 202/687-3935
daileyd@georgetown.edu

Managing Editor:
Dr. Terrence R. Russell
Executive Director
Association for Institutional Research
1435 E. Piedmont Drive
Suite 211
Tallahassee, FL 32308
Phone: 850/385-4155
Fax: 850/385-5180
air@airweb2.org

AIR Professional File Editorial Board

Dr. Trudy H. Bers
Senior Director of
Research, Curriculum
and Planning
Oakton Community College
Des Plaines, IL

Ms. Rebecca H. Brodigan
Director of
Institutional Research and Analysis
Middlebury College
Middlebury, VT

Dr. Harriott D. Calhoun
Director of
Institutional Research
Jefferson State Community College
Birmingham, AL

Dr. Stephen L. Chambers
Director of Institutional Research
and Assessment
Coconino Community College
Flagstaff, AZ

Dr. Anne Marie Delaney
Director of
Institutional Research
Babson College
Babson Park, MA

Dr. Paul B. DUBY
Associate Vice President of
Institutional Research
Northern Michigan University
Marquette, MI

Dr. Philip Garcia
Director of
Analytical Studies
California State University-Long Beach
Long Beach, CA

Dr. Glenn W. James
Director of
Institutional Research
Tennessee Technological University
Cookeville, TN

Dr. David Jamieson-Drake
Director of
Institutional Research
Duke University
Durham, NC
Dr. Anne Machung
Principal Policy Analyst
University of California
Oakland, CA

Dr. Jeffrey A. Seybert
Director of
Institutional Research
Johnson County Community College
Overland Park, KS

Dr. Bruce Szelest
Associate Director of
Institutional Research
SUNY-Albany
Albany, NY

Authors interested in having their manuscripts considered for the *Professional File* are encouraged to send four copies of each manuscript to the editor, Dr. Gerald McLaughlin. Manuscripts are accepted any time of the year as long as they are not under consideration at another journal or similar publication. The suggested maximum length of a manuscript is 5,000 words (approximately 20 double-spaced pages), including tables, charts and references. Please follow the style guidelines of the *Publications Manual of the American Psychological Association, 4th Edition*.
