Despite shared philosophical roots (Dewey, 1963; Friere, 1970; Kayes, 2002; Kolb, 1981; 1984), service-learning (SL) and study abroad (SA) courses to date have developed primarily along parallel tracks. But evident growth in the numbers of international courses with an SL component (Annette, 2002; Crabtree, 1998; Kiely, 2004), and more SA short study tours and business school offerings (Gordon, 2003; Holland & Kedia, 2003; Szkely & Krane, 1997) create an opportunity to examine if SL and SA can complement one another. This opportunity is explored first by a literature review comparing SL and SA according to who learns, what they learn, the role of culture in learning, and typical teaching/learning activities. The second and third parts of the paper report results from studies of short- and longer-term student learning outcomes associated with a business school class that combined SL and SA activities. Despite limitations described later in the paper, results observed suggest that SL and SA can complement one another. Teaching that incorporates curriculum-based SL occurs worldwide (Annette, 2002; Dumas, 2002) and in many disciplines (McCarthy & Tucker, 1999; Stachowski & Visconti, 1998). SL outcomes have been explored with large and small samples in diverse disciplines and settings, but researchers infrequently examine the learning effects of international SL (Crabtree, 1998; Kiely, 2004; Kraft, 2002). Overall, SL research confirms Astin’s (1993) assertion that an important learning outcome for SL classes is cognitive learning (hereafter called content learning). Business disciplines have produced limited research on SL outcomes (Zlotkowski, 2000; Kenworthy-U’Ren & Peterson, 2005), but available research complements findings from other disciplines to show that SL produces course content learning (Astin, 1993; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Godfrey, 1999; Williams, 1990), and builds content-learning skills (Markus, Howard, & King, 1993) such as problem-solving and critical thinking (Astin, Vogelgesang, Ikeda, & Yee, 2000; National and Community Service Roles, 1994; Zlotkowski, 1996). Study abroad research on student learning outcomes is primarily descriptive, context-specific, and often unsystematic (Rust, 2002) but limited research based on short term business SA programs suggests they too stimulate content learning (Gmelch, 1997; Helms & Thibadoux, 1992) and enhance content-based skills such as problem solving and critical thinking (Carlson, Burn, Useem & Yachimowicz, 1990; Ingraham, 2003; Myers-Lipton, 1996; Thomlison, 1991).

Astin (1993) also argues that SL results in affective learning, and this too is supported by SL research on affective learning outcomes such as enhanced self-knowledge (Eyler & Giles, 1999) and personal growth (Eyler, 2002; Eyler, Giles, & Braxton, 1997; Godfrey, 1999; Roschelle, Turpin & Elias, 2000; Williams, 1990). Affective learning from SA also focuses on personal growth and development (Immelman & Schneider, 1998; Kuh & Kauffmann, 1985).

The SL literature also identifies two outcomes we think represent “connective” learning. In the SL literature, this type of learning is usually described either as feelings of personal connection to people...
Critical Differences Between Service-Learning And Study Abroad

Despite similarities, SL and SA differ in four ways that shape practice and are therefore likely to affect learning outcomes. First, students are principal beneficiaries from SA programs. For example, much SA research focuses on how international experience affects an individual’s personal growth (see Crabtree, 1998 for a review). SL, on the other hand, tends to emphasize reciprocal learning and growth for faculty and community members as well as for students (Calderon & Farrell, 1996; Jacoby, 1996; Porth, 1997).

A second important difference relates to longer term outcomes with SL research showing that civic participation or social responsibility—the action component of connective learning—is an important SL outcome (Eyler & Giles, 1999; Gray et al., 1996; Kolenko, Porter, Wheatley, & Colby, 1996; Newmann, 1990). The longer term objective for business SA programs focuses on instrumental and more personalized outcomes such as improved job skills or enhanced opportunities for graduate education, careers, or international travels (Fagan & Hart, 2002; Ingraham, 2003).

The focus of cultural learning acquired through SA and SL programs is a third difference. SA frequently emphasizes content learning about one’s own and other cultures whereas SL (see Kiely, 2004 for an international SL exception) concentrates less on cultures per se and more on results of cultural interactions such as reduced racism or greater tolerance for diversity (Astin, 1993; Boyle-Baise, 1999; Boyle-Baise & Sleeter, 2000; Eyler & Giles, 1999).

A fourth difference between SL and SA revolves around teaching methods at home and abroad where SA management programs typically feature visits to for-profit organizations. The implicit assumption is that business sector activities are important mechanisms for national growth and development. SL programs abroad tend to expose students to not-for-profit organizations (Annette, 2002; Crabtree, 1998; Grusky, 2000; Myers-Lipton, 1996), and they often focus on social justice (Crabtree; Kiely, 2004). Although both SA and SL courses typically assign case analyses, student projects, and library research, reflection exercises are more usual for SL courses (Dunlap, 1998; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Gray et al., 1996; Mabry, 1998; Parker, 1996). Another teaching difference relates to free-time activities when abroad. SA courses often require personal interactions outside class time such as interviews with host nationals (Archangeli, 1999), interactions with international students (Sharma & Jung, 1985), organizing a community activity (Stachowski & Visconti, 1998), or independent travel (Laubscher, 1994; Thomlison, 1991). Domestic SL courses usually emphasize course-driven interactions, but Kiely found that interacting with others outside the SL assignment enhanced learning for international SL students.

The complementary benefits from SL and SA activities were reasons to combine the two in a single course. The following sections describe the resulting course and report on content, affective, and connective learning outcomes at the end of the class and four years later.

The Study Abroad/Service-Learning Course: Sample and Procedures

Thirteen students studied at their home campus for ten weeks prior to a 12-day sojourn in Nicaragua. The average age for the six graduate students was 34 as compared to 21 for the seven undergraduates. All but two undergraduates were business students and all the students were white. Titled “Economic Development through a Cross-Cultural Filter,” the class examined how three economic development approaches (trade, microenterprise, and land redistribution) function in the United States and Nicaragua. The course syllabus stated that by “looking at alternative models of development in different cultures, we gain insight into managing each.” Consistent with the teaching
mission of home institution Seattle University—"empowering leaders for a just and humane world"—students were exposed to different perspectives on economic development and to alternative frameworks for cultural analysis.

Five learning activities occurred during the Nicaragua sojourn. First, students participated in typical SA activities with lectures from and visits to manufacturing facilities, Free Trade Zones, and large and small businesses (Helms & Thibadoux, 1993: Porth, 1997; Holland & Kedia, 2003). They also met with government officials at the Export/Import Bank and with trade officials. Second, students were exposed to not-for-profit activities; they met with civil society leaders at FAMA, Pro Mujer, and Nitlapam, and with borrowers from microenterprise lending programs. Third was an SL project that took us to Rivas in southern Nicaragua where we interacted with rural Nicaraguans for three eight-hour work days. The project was sponsored by the Agros Foundation whose stated mission is to break "the cycle of poverty for rural families in Central America and Mexico by enabling landless communities to achieve land ownership and economic stability" (http://www.agros.org). In this particular instance, Agros had purchased land and materials outright (http://www.agros.org). In this particular instance, Agros had purchased land and materials outright which community members were to repay over time.

Agros partnered us with 22 families to help build a new community of homes. Students and faculty worked with community members and Agros staff to dig foundations, mix and pour concrete, and tie rebar. Daily labor of this sort was punctuated by joint activities such as baseball games, singing, talking, and playing with children. Some invited us to their homes to meet babies or grandparents who were not worksite regulars, and we visited home-based businesses. As indicated above, the Agros Foundation actively facilitated reflection during the SL project by assigning a staff member from Guatemala to us. Further, an Agros director worked with the class for a half day prior to the Nicaragua sojourn to help students and faculty learn more about the organization, its mission, and the people with whom we were to work. A fourth planned learning activity was social interaction with student counterparts from two Nicaraguan universities. This was kicked off by a Managua reception we hosted that led to social interactions among U.S. and Nicaraguan students for about 12 hours. Finally, students traveled independently on a free weekend. Learning outcomes associated with these five activities were assessed according to content analyses of "critical incident" reports described below.

Written reports and research papers typical for both SA and SL classes were used. A third assignment called the "Cross-Cultural Journal" (see Appendix A) is the basis for the content analysis described in the next section of the paper. Consistent with Eyler, Giles, and Schmiede (1996), the journal required reflection and it was a continuous and ongoing part of the course. It encouraged students to explore links between their experiences and class content. Faculty led formal review and reflection sessions at home and in Nicaragua with the exception of five evenings prior to, during, and following the SL project when the lead facilitator was from the service organization. During the Nicaragua sojourn we traveled, worked, and ate together, slept together in two large rooms, and shared all facilities; this provided many informal opportunities for discussion and reflection.

Management educators frequently use Kolb’s (1980; 1984) continuous learning cycle in SL and SA teaching (Kayes, 2002; Montrose, 2002) because it is intuitive and provides a good platform for planning instruction (Eyler, 2002). Students used it here to develop critical incidents reports chosen from among their journal entries, submitting two such reports prior to the Nicaragua sojourn to practice observation, analysis, and reflection. Following course completion, all but one student submitted eight to nine critical incident reports to describe an event (observation), followed by analysis, reflection, and a report on learning. Each student also submitted a summary reflection paper on the overall course experience. The resulting 101 entries covered 138 single-spaced pages. These data were converted to electronic text and content analyzed using N6—one of several software programs available for systemic analysis and coding of text. As one of the fastest growing techniques in quantitative research, content analysis is increasingly used to systematically analyze written work such as journals and open-ended questions into objective categories (Neuendorf, 2002).

The authors jointly developed a coding scheme organized around the content, affective, and connective learning outcomes we hoped to observe. The second author took the lead with N6 by assigning entries to the learning categories each reflected best. An example of learning that we categorized as content learning of Hofstede’s (1994) cultural time dimension is:

Our readings also told us that punctuality is less observed in Latin America than in the U.S., but I found the exact opposite to be true in the Nicaraguan bus system; [where] punctuality is prized. However, I did see more a relaxed attitude toward time when the bus broke down when we were returning to Managua.
A follow-up review by the first author yielded an initial inter-rater reliability of 0.89. Discrepancies were resolved by mutual agreement.

Findings

Content Learning

The first column in Table 1 lists three types of content knowledge embedded in course objectives: (1) learning about business and economic development, (2) cultural learning of two types, and (3) content-based learning skills such as critical thinking and problem solving. The latter skills are consistent with Astin’s (1993) taxonomy. The second column records the total number of entries reflecting each type of content learning. Columns 3-6 provide a breakdown for entries associated with each learning activity (totals for service-learning activities and the service-learning project are combined), followed by column 7 which reports relevant entries from students’ summaries of the overall experience (OE). Final columns in Table 1 report the number of students who had entries in each category followed by mean scores and standard deviations for those entries.

Content learning about business and economic development. Table 1 shows that content learning about business and economic development resulted from all activities, but most that could be organized into a single category were associated with SA activities (n = 30) and service-learning activities (n = 20). This type of learning typically was a recital of facts such as:

- Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Debt Relief is implemented and monitored by the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (SA activity)
- [the manager] at the Free Trade Zone said that it will be harder to find employees once other work comes to the country (SA activity)
- FAMA provides loans to the poorest of the poor, with more than 35,000 clients served during an eight-year existence (SL activity)

Content learning about culture. Culture was defined as the learned, shared, interrelated set of symbols and patterned assumptions that help any group—i.e., family, community, organizational, national—cope with the challenges it faces. Scholars universally agree that culture is a complex

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Learning Category</th>
<th># of entries</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>SL</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>FT</th>
<th>OE</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>STD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Learning about business and economic development</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A. Cultural learning based on Hofstede</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualism/collectivism</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power distance</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty avoidance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B. Cultural learning based on Osland et al.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatalism</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpatia (personal dignity)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy and humor</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalism</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Content-based learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical thinking</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-solving</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.
SA = Study abroad activities such as business visits
SL = Service-learning activities such as NGO visits and the Agros service-learning project
SI = Social interactions with students
FT = Free time
OE = Overall experience
construct covering many dimensions, and that it is so well learned that people often are unaware of their own cultural values, much less those of others. Given this likelihood, our teaching objectives were to introduce students to their own and others’ cultural values. To this end, students participated in several cultural simulations, and they were exposed to multiple frameworks that analyze national cultures—e.g., Hall (1976), Hofstede (1980; 1994), Kluckhorn & Stodtbeck (1961), Schwartz (1992), Trompenaars (1994)—and to a framework specific to cultural values in Latin America (Osland, DeFranco, & Osland, 1999). Working independently, students also developed and distributed papers on cultural dimensions they chose to explore such as sex roles, corruption, and food preferences.

Lectures and assigned readings reviewed major advantages and disadvantages of using cultural frameworks such as: no cultural framework is comprehensive, all tend to focus on the dominant culture, national averages on cultural dimensions tend to obscure individual differences, and the relative parsimony of each cultural framework means they inadequately capture the complexity inherent for any nation’s culture. As shown in the Cross Cultural Journal assignment reproduced in Appendix A, students could use cultural dimensions from any source to interpret their own experiences. Each entry had to report on a different cultural dimension, producing a varied and rich array of analyses. In the interests of brevity, this paper reports on the two cultural frameworks students most frequently referred to in their submitted work: Hofstede’s (1980; 1994) well-known five-factor model of national cultures1, and the Osland et al. article (1999) which focused on cultural dimensions more frequent to Latin America such as simpatia or personal dignity, humor and joy, and fatalism.

Table 1 reports entries on cultural dimensions drawn from Hofstede (1980; 1994) and Osland et al. (1999). Missing is Hofstede’s masculinity/femininity dimension to which no one referred. Hofstede’s individualism/collectivism was a frequent source of cultural learning stimulated both by SA activities (n = 12) and SL activities (n = 19). Among entries that could be assigned to a single activity, free time generated most frequent analysis of power distance (n = 11) and time (n = 15). The Osland et al. framework was much more likely to be used to analyze SL activities for a total of 39 entries as compared to seven entries for SA activities. For example, SL activities stimulated awareness of both fatalism (n = 12) and joy and humor (n = 10) as compared to one each for SA activities. Examples of cultural applications appeared in entries such as the following:

- In some cases it may be advantageous to have a group cooperating collectively. In other cases, it may be better to promote individual action and thought. But, in all cases it pays to be aware of what is being emphasized so that the resulting behavior is not a surprise (individualism/collectivism, SA activity)
- Several of the speakers that talked to us in Managua mentioned the theory of lending groups or collective borrowing to help in the microenterprise lending arena. This is another example of the cultural emphasis on collectivism in Latin America in contrast to the United States’ individualistic nature—every man (or woman) for himself (individualism/collectivism, SL activity)
- Commenting on a student host’s behavior, Thomas observed “Luis was warm, respectful, humorous, and generally simpatia towards us. Simpatia is that warm, positive social behavior...” (simpatia, free time)

Content-based learning. Content-based learning, such as critical thinking, problem-solving, and decision-making are important outcomes for both SL and business school SA programs (Astin et al., 2000; Helms & Thibadoux, 1992; Ingraham, 2003; Zlotkowski, 1996). Table 1 shows 31 entries reflected critical thinking—which we defined as the ability to examine alternative ways of thinking—and 10 entries reflecting problem-solving skills. The single entry on decision-making skills is not reported on Table 1. Overall, content-based learning most often appeared in reflections on the overall experience (n = 21), and secondarily in SL project entries (n = 12). The following are examples of critical thinking assignable to a specific learning activity:

- I feel overwhelmed by what I have learned from scrutinizing the rhetorical context of a written document or the biases of a presenter. This has led me to become critical about how the mainstream of society (whose society?) pursues answers to their questions and statements of truth in general (SA activity)
- contradictions between observation and documented ‘fact’ have helped me to read between the lines and critically examine the argument a source presents (SA activity)
- can these principles work outside the U.S. when surrounded by a different culture? (SL project)

Affective Learning

Self-Knowledge. Affective learning was assigned
to one of two categories: self-knowledge (n = 238) or personal growth (n = 107). Most entries showing self-knowledge were found in summaries on the overall course experience, but when it could be associated with a single activity self-knowledge reported in Table 2 was most often associated with SA (n = 62) and free-time activities (n = 44) such as:

- following a long restaurant wait by himself, Ned commented “I sometimes tend to first list the negative aspects and connotations, in this case the relaxed atmosphere. Meanwhile, I could approach it from a positive atmosphere in that it promotes getting to know your environment and savoring the moment” (free time)
- It made me realize that work should accompany your priorities and satisfy those lifelong dream careers or vocations I’ve had in mind (SA activity)

**Personal growth.** This form of affective learning appeared in 107 entries, the vast majority of which were entries from the overall experience (n = 72) and to a lesser extent SL (n = 14) and free time activities (n = 13). This result may be an artifact of the summary assignment which specifically asked students to summarize and “reflect on your personal learning.” Examples from overall experience entries include:

- the most important things that I learned were about me as a person now, and about the person that I strive to be (overall experience)
- The lesson here is that it is important when traveling and trying to conform to the local cultures to not forget to simply be yourself (overall experience)
- I feel that I have probably learned the most about myself through this experience because in the U.S. I would probably never be able to feel this way (overall experience)
- [I gained] new criteria for looking at my life (overall experience)

**Connective Learning**

*Connective learning within the sojourner group.* Journal entries demonstrate that sojourners felt personally connected with one another. This is consistent with research that shows SL brings team members closer to one another (Crabtree, 1998) and can cast new light on what it means to be a group member (Godfrey, 1999). Feelings of connection to other sojourners appeared in 21 entries (shown in Table 2), expressed by statements like:

- I’m glad to be finally returning home soon, but still uneasy about adjusting to life and sad that I’ve left what was a temporary home for two weeks with a group of classmates who are now friends
- I concentrated on the welfare of the group and meeting the needs of the group over my own
- By the end of the two weeks, I had become more comfortable with my new traveling friends and found myself wanting and seeking their company

Many expressed desire or intention to remain connected with others from the sojourner group. For example, one wrote “I don’t want to lose touch with the friends I have made along the way...I hope

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affective Learning Category</th>
<th># of entries</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>SL</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>FT</th>
<th>OE</th>
<th>OE category</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>STD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self knowledge/personal understanding</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21.63</td>
<td>7.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal growth/values development</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>7.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Connective Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections within the sojourner group</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections beyond the sojourner group</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.*

SA = Study abroad activities such as business visits
SL = Service learning activities such as NGO visits and the Agros service-learning project
SI = social interactions with students
FT = free time
OE = overall experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of students with entries in the category</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>STD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self knowledge/personal understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal growth/values development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connective Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections within the sojourner group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections beyond the sojourner group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45
we have gained some true friends as well.”

Connective learning beyond the sojourner group.
Sojourner entries also reflected connections and commitments to Nicaraguans and others in similar economic situations (n = 16). Table 2 indicates that connective learning was not associated with SA activities, but did result from SL activities (n = 12). Examples of growing personal connections with Nicaraguans (all describing the SL project) include:

- close connection/relatin with local Nicaraguans, working side by side built a very close sense of “team;” communication was possible without knowing Spanish
- watching the people of the village work together and involve us in their lives was significant to me
- I learned about the warmness of the poor who give their hearts rather than materialism
- there is a true genuine warmth between others that knows no cultural boundaries

Some sojourners also expressed intent to act on newly forged connections in statements such as:

- I want to keep experiencing life other than how I know it, if only to be reminded of what the world needs (overall experience)
- I want to have a career with close contact to helping the poor (SL project)
- I know that people all over the world are dealing with forms of corruption and power and greed that override their ability for economic development, or at least sustainable living. This trip has only enhanced my interest in these types of project, and I just don’t want to stop being a part of learning and helping with such huge global problems (overall experience)

Longer-Term Learning

The impact of SL on student learning often is traced over a semester or with cross-sectional data (Giles & Eyler, 1998) such as that reported above; the same is true for most SA research (Rust, 2002). To examine how SL and SA affect learning over time, we contacted class participants four years after our class ended. Most had kept in touch, and we used this network to locate 10 of the original 13 students in seven states; all responded to an electronic survey. The survey included open-ended questions, and respondents also were asked to rate study abroad activities and the service-learning project according to how each contributed to content, affective, and connective learning.

Content and Affective Learning

Responses to the survey question “what do you think was the most important outcome for you of the course and your experiences in Nicaragua,” show that content and affective learning had persisted:

Table 3
Longer-Term Learning Outcomes (N=10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How strongly would you agree the study abroad activities:</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>STD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improved my knowledge of economic development SA=6; A=4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improved my knowledge of cultural issues SA=4; A=6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improved my critical thinking skills SA=3; A=3; N=3; D=1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improved my problem-solving skills SA=2; A=2; N=4; D=2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improved my knowledge of myself and what is important to me SA=5; A=3; N=2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connective knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increased my sense of connection to a wider world community SA=4; A=6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How strongly would you agree the service-learning project:</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>STD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improved my knowledge of economic development SA=2; A=7; N=1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improved my knowledge of cultural issues SA=6; A=4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improved my critical thinking skills SA=1; A=3; N=6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improved my problem-solving skills SA=1; A=5; N=3; D=1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improved my knowledge of myself and what is important to me SA=6; A=3; N=1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connective knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increased my sense of connection to a wider world community SA=8; A=1; N=1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.
SA(5) = strongly agree
A(4) = agree
N(3) = neutral
D(2) = disagree
SD(1) = strongly disagree
• Many times since my trip I have used the desperate economic situation faced by Nicaragua to explain issues in developing countries (content learning)
• Overall, the class/trip opened my eyes to what is really happening in the world (critical thinking)
• The most important outcome for me was my own personal learning and character development (affective learning)

The set of questions reported in Table 3 asked respondents to rate learning from SA and SL activities. Content learning about economic development was stronger for SA than for SL (six strongly agreed for SA, compared to two for SL), but cultural learning was stronger for the SL project (four strongly agreed for SA; six strongly agreed for SL). Few strongly agreed that critical thinking or problem-solving skills were stimulated by either SA or SL activities. Longer-term affective learning in the form of self-knowledge also was stimulated by both SA and the SL project.

Connective Learning

Connective learning also endured. Table 3 shows that in the longer term, eight strongly agreed the SL project “increased my sense of connection to a wider world community” as compared to four who rated SA activities as strongly. Responses to open-ended questions further illustrate connective learning had persisted:
• It personalized Central America for me
• Overall, the class/trip opened my eyes to what is really happening in the world
• It was my first-hand experience in Nicaragua that cemented my desire to be part of the solution to the problems that face Latin America and other former colonized countries

We also asked respondents to rate the extent to which each type of activity in the Nicaragua sojourn (SA activities; SL activities; the SL Project; social interactions; free time) helped each “feel a sense of connection with people in other nations.” As shown in Table 4, respondents indicated that their strongest sense of connection came from interacting with people from the Agros village during the service-learning project. Meetings with business leaders produced least strong connections to others.

The action component of connective learning is reflected in either intent or actual community action (Gray et al., 1996; Lamb et al., 1998). But this dimension is somewhat difficult to explore among SL students because many who select SL courses are socially responsible before enrolling (Eyler et al., 1997). Among this group of students, five were active volunteers before the course began. Our follow up survey indicated nine of the ten were volunteers after the class, and some continued work with the Agros Foundation. Prior research links SL participation and subsequent careers in service organizations (Astin et al., 2000; Roschelle et al., 2000), a result we also found. Two former students work for service organizations, and two are in graduate school preparing for careers in international service.

Implications for SL and SA Practice

Combining activities typical for SL and SA classes added both short- and long-term learning value for students. Visits to micro enterprises such as home-based pottery production as well as to large organizations exposed business students to a broader array of business activities than is typical for SA business programs that usually visit large or multinational firms. Further, representatives from governmental and civil society organizations often presented new perspectives on formal economic development for Nicaragua, and this helped students analyze and critique options. Social interactions, the service-learning project, and free-time activities provided opportunities to interact with and learn from people from many socioeconomic groups, serving growing needs for business leaders to examine and address social concerns such as social responsibility, justice, and community development (Dumas, 2002; Godfrey, 1999; Kolenko et
tions. We believe that free time activities and work-face interactions rather than formal presenta-

In particular, SL activities stimulated most personal dreams, and they provided opportunities for stu-

Several implications for practice emerge. One is that planning for SL international and/or SA courses might well begin with explicit decisions about if and how to stimulate content, affective, and connective learning. Results from this study suggest that content learning for SA and international SL classes occurs via exposure to representatives from all sectors: business, government, and civil society. Exposure to people in different walks of life also stimulated affective learning; the latter occurred in short study tours sponsored by business and other resource scarcity limited course enrollment, resulting in a small sample. Most study abroad tours observe caps such as these, and they doubtless contribute to limited empirical research on SA. However, the follow-up survey affirms that content, affective, and connective learning occurred and persisted. Second, although SL/SA activities were purposefully combined, the opportunity to compare them arose later. Thus, questions we might have asked in 2000 did not occur to us until 2004. Like most study abroad courses this one enrolled more women than men (Ingraham, 2003). About 67% of U.S. study abroad participants are women (Hayward, 2000); female enrollment in the Nicaragua course was 62%. The small sample size made it difficult to explore possible gender effects.

A third study limitation is associated with content analysis methodology. Although this form of analysis provides a way to aggregate results, a cost may be too much reduction of what student comments show to have been rich learning experiences.

A fourth limitation is associated with using cultural frameworks to interpret behaviors. While class members were exposed to different cultural frameworks and encouraged to choose different dimensions from them to analyze their experiences, both a benefit and a liability of cultural frameworks is they can oversimplify complex phenomena. At worst, students might use a cultural framework at a superficial level without learning how various dimensions of culture interact, or focus on a single cultural dimension to the exclusion of all others. Doing either could lead to undesirable forms of stereotyping.

Opportunities for Future Research

This study makes a timely contribution to the growing numbers of international SL courses (Annette, 2002; Crabtree, 1998; Kiely, 2004) and short study tours sponsored by business and other disciplines in the form of Alternative Spring Breaks, Mission Treks, and the like. These activities are credited with tripling U.S. student participation in international study programs from 1985-2000 (Gordon, 2003; Holland & Kedia, 2003;
Szekely & Krane, 1997). The study also breaks new ground by examining learning outcomes from a course that combined typical SL and SA activities. It expands on an existing taxonomy by introducing the concept of connectivity as a learning outcome that reflects feelings of personal connection and intent or action to connect with others. Results also reinforce Kiely’s (2005) argument to provide time abroad for both structured and unstructured interactions in international SL. These findings affirm SL research findings, but they extend SA research which is silent on either dimension of connective learning. Finally, having demonstrated where synergies occur, this study argues that SA and SL need not travel along parallel tracks in any discipline.

Given the small sample size, additional studies are needed to explore these results in other SA, SL, and combined programs. Pre- and post-tests in study abroad and/or international SL programs could better illustrate learning and its stimulants abroad. Longitudinal research also is needed, particularly to study how learning moves between students and community members during a service-learning project. The role of culture is underexplored in both SA and SL research, creating opportunities for future research in both. For example, although cultural learning is important to SA activities, only about 15% of study abroad programs assess cultural proficiency (Vande Berg, 2001). Because few SL projects are cross-cultural by design, little is known about how cultural learning enhances international understanding (Crabtree, 1998).

Systematic studies of short and longer SA or SL tours abroad may help answer questions this study surfaced but could not explore. For example, some researchers find that SL experiences spread over a longer period of time enhance learning (Jordan, 1994). Others argue for immersion as a benefit from international SL (Kiely, 2004, 2005). And still others report that learning occurred based on a single afternoon volunteer project embedded in a short SA tour (Allen & Young, 1997). This raises a question about duration of the study abroad opportunity that future research can answer. Additionally, while the body of research on longer-term study abroad options provides a basis for studying SA, much more research is needed to understand learning outcomes from SL international and from short study tours abroad. Given that there is growing educational interest in experiential learning as a way to link classroom theory with real world practice (Porter & McGibbon, 1988) and that students live in an increasingly interconnected world, future research may help us understand how international SL and SA can enhance students’ feelings of personal connections to others and promote actions reflective of global citizenship.

Notes

The authors gratefully acknowledge Cynthia Hardy and David Thomas for their insights, and thank anonymous reviewers for their comments and encouragement. The authors particularly thank students in the course for their participation and inspiration.

1 Hofstede’s individualism/collectivism scale ranges from high individualism, wherein the individual takes care primarily of self and family, to high collectivism which is in-group or clan responsibility where loyalty is owed to a group-be it nation, family, or organization. According to Hofstede, power distance is the extent to which society accepts (or rejects) that power is distributed unequally in institutions and organizations. Uncertainty avoidance is the extent to which society prefers or avoids formal rules and absolute truths. Hofstede further described a high masculinity culture as one that is foremost assertive, acquisitive, and values money and things, while a high femininity culture most emphasizes care for others and values the quality of life. Hofstede’s time dimension measures the extent to which a culture adopts a long-term or a short-term outlook on work and life.
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Your journal will contain no fewer than 10 entries with a 1-2 page self-reflection piece to summarize your learning. Follow this format:

1. Each entry should begin with a Heading describing one or more comparative management issues observed, e.g., individualism/collectivism; uncertainty avoidance; power distance; work/leisure; direction/supervision; preferences for theory/action; control/autonomy; staffing habits; expectations for personal and professional loyalty; attitude towards competition; training and development plans; attitudes towards time; attitudes towards personal space; planning preferences for short and long-term; creativity; etc. (The idea is to write journal entries on different comparative management issues)

2. In a few paragraphs, describe an event you observed that provides a window on cross-cultural management issues. This description will help your reader understand what happened/what you saw. Forums and guest speakers, teachers, and our own class will provide some of these opportunities. In particular, our speakers in Seattle and in Nicaragua will demonstrate particular ways of thinking and acting that are culturally grounded. These interactions need not be between U.S./Latin Americans.

3. Follow the description with your interpretation of the cross-cultural value and behavior you recorded in the Heading. Use cultural analysis (refer to our readings or to other readings) to explain what happened and why.

4. Explain how this observation can be useful to you as a manager. What can you learn from this analysis that you did not already know?

5. At the end of the 10 entries, review each to reflect on your personal learning from observing cross-cultural interactions—this final entry should be about 1-2 pages.