

# **APPLIED PROJECT LEARNING OUTCOMES: DIFFERENCES BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS**

Robert D. Green, Lynn University  
Farideh A. Farazmand, Lynn University

## **ABSTRACT**

*The presence of international students on college campuses has been a significant source of cultural diversity and globalization of college campuses. Therefore, determining factors for successful learning experiences of international students on American campuses could result in better recruitment strategies. This paper investigates the learning experiences of students in applied project courses and compares learning outcomes of international and the U.S. students in applied courses. Results show positive impacts of applied project courses on students' learning outcomes with better results for international students.*

**JEL:** I21, M31, A22

**KEYWORDS:** Applied Projects, Learning Outcomes, Global Business Education

## **INTRODUCTION**

Globalization and student career preparation are major priorities for business schools, and are critical for hiring criteria by businesses. As an example of this importance, “The impact of both the marketplace and AACSB accreditation has resulted in a substantial interest in ‘internationalizing’ the business curriculum and encouraging student experiences in schools of business across North America and throughout the world” (Gordon, Heischmidt, Sterrett and McMillan, 2009, p. 133). Cultural competency of college students is an important factor for a success in global market place (Zhao, Kuh, Carini, 2005). International students on university campuses create culturally diverse environmental, not only exposes American culture to international students but also introduces other cultures to domestic students (Zhao, Kuh, Carini, 2005). Furthermore, with preparing students for successful careers, specific standards must be met, e.g., assurances of learning (AACSB International Accreditation Coordinating Committee, 2007). Applied teaching-learning strategies have been used to achieve such learning outcomes. For instance, “effective learning occurs when students are actively involved with an experience and then reflect on that experience” (Frontezak and Kelly, 2000, p. 3).

Moreover, active learning projects provide opportunities for culturally diverse students to work together outside of the classroom, e.g., requiring this as a team assignment. As universities provide diversity opportunities for student learning, e.g., recruiting and admitting international students, there is a pedagogical need to determine the impact on the diverse student populations learning outcomes (Geringer, Stratemeyer and Canton, 2009; Grayson, 2005). The purpose of this study is to examine the differences between United States and international students' experiences and the influences on their successful performance in courses that include applied learning projects. Therefore, are there differences between U.S. and international students' learning outcomes? What factors influence their successful applied project performance? This study includes applied projects literature review, the methodology and design, data analysis results, implications of the findings and the conclusions.

## APPLIED PROJECTS LITERATURE

Literature supports the positive impacts of applied projects teaching pedagogy in enhancing students' learning and personal growth (Dudderar and Stover, 2003; Easterling and Rudell, 1997; Mastrangelo and Tischio, 2005; Petkus, 2000; Soslau and Yost, 2007; Steinke and Fitch, 2007; Sternberger, Ford and Hale, 2005). Applied project strategies supplement explicit classroom learning objectives by an experiential service project and a reflection assignment for students to bridge theory and application (Dudderar and Stover, 2003). This integration of education, experiment and service not only enhances students' learning, but also provides each student with a sense of achievement, satisfaction and effectiveness as a community member, in addition to fulfilling degree requirements (Easterling and Rudell, 1997; Holland, 2001; Titus and Petroschius, 1993). The continuity of classroom learning to the real world opens up a broader perspective to the students with insights, awareness, involvement and positive change in attitude, behavior, self-esteem and personal growth, which all constitute solid foundation for future career success (Easterling and Rudell, 1997). High schools and colleges have adopted applied projects to their curricula for development of students' knowledge, skill and personality (Butin, 2003; Dudderar and Stover, 2003; Mastrangelo and Tischio, 2005; Steinke and Fitch, 2007; Sternberger, Ford and Hale, 2005; Zlotkowski, 1996). Business programs have also included live project learning pedagogy to their curricula (Geringer, Stratemeyer and Canton, 2009; Klink and Athaide, 2004) for development of the competency of business school graduates, especially for skills such as decision making, problem solving, team work and written and oral communication (Geringer, Stratemeyer and Canton 2009; Lamb, Shipp and Moncrief 1995).

Titus and Petroschius (1993) discuss the beneficial impacts of adding an experiential project to an undergraduate consumer behavior course. Both students and instructor's evaluations of the learning outcomes of the course and implications of the project reveal several benefits to students' learning, including hands-on experience, analytical skill in the market place, synthesizing theory and practice and relating marketing concepts to real world application, design and execution of a marketing project, and appreciation for marketing research. Klink and Athaide (2004) discuss the challenges of implementing service learning into the principles of marketing course because of limited marketing backgrounds of students. However, their assessment of learning and personal outcomes of the principle of marketing courses with a problem-based service learning project indicated positive outcomes. Assessment of the students' project reports and a short questionnaire with semantic differential and open-ended questions indicated enhancement in students' perception of learning, implementation of concepts to real world problems, teamwork and communication skills and social responsibility. Klink and Athaide (2004) recommend incorporating service-learning projects not only to the principles of marketing courses but also to other relevant marketing courses.

Geringer, Stratemeyer and Canton (2009) expand on Klink and Athaide (2004) recommendation by requiring, "the students to look beyond marketing related problems" (2009, p. 4) and allowing for individual work as well as teamwork in a service project. The learning objectives of the service-learning project included academics, skills, attitudes, career development and civic responsibilities. Geringer et al. state that assessment of the learning outcomes of the service learning project indicated that, "all objectives or student learning outcomes were achieved to some extent" (2009, p. 6). Awareness, civic responsibilities and commitment to volunteering of students were impacted the most and career development was impacted to some degree. Assessment results showed enhancement of students' knowledge and understanding of the principles of marketing and leadership and communication skills. However, Geringer et al. (2009) point to relatively large standard deviation of the enhanced learning item on the questionnaire indicating variation in the effectiveness of the service-learning method of teaching for different students. The authors recommend further research on, "how the diverse student populations perform in service learning assignment" (Geringer et al. 2009, p. 9).

Bobbitt, Inks, Kemp and Mayo (2000) describe integration of three courses, principles of marketing, personal selling and sales management with an experiential project. The authors explain that a trade show organized and presented by the students applied to all three courses, but different classes had to develop different projects based on the trade show, such as a new business-to-business product and a marketing strategy, sales training video, and sales calls. The assessment of the integrated experiential project indicated favorable responses of the students to the project, the positive motivational impacts of class rivalry and peer pressure and a more effective teaching and learning method.

Farazmand, Green and Miller (2010) measure the learning outcomes of four marketing courses (Marketing Communications, Global Marketing, Marketing Research, Business Marketing Management) in two different semesters. The courses were taught with a real live project in 2005 and without a real live project in the prior semester. The authors indicate that the students' average course grades were higher for the semester with the live project. In another study, Farazmand and Green (2012) measure and compare the impact of applied project teaching pedagogy between male and female students. The authors identify differences in teamwork and learning by gender. In addition, Green and Farazmand (2012) examine the learning outcomes of courses with live-case study projects for students who have had a prior internship experience and those who have not. They find that prior internship experience does improve applied project learning outcomes. Although, the positive impacts of applied project learning outcomes have been measured for the American students, but the impacts of such pedagogy on learning of the international students have not been examined. Considering significant presence of international students on college campuses, examining the learning experiences of international students in colleges will contribute to success of their recruitment strategies (Grayson, 2005). Grayson (2005) examines the learning differences of 477 international and 781 Canadian freshman students with pre-entry characteristics, formal institutional experience, informal experience as independent variables and GPA measuring the learning outcome as the dependent variable. Grayson (2005) finds no significant differences in the GPA and program success of Canadian and international students. However, he mentions the importance of examining the impact of different policies, teaching strategies and out-of-classroom student activities on international students' skills, retention and specific educational outcomes.

Green and Farazmand (2010) examine the differences in United States and international students' performances in courses with live project. While their study shows the positive effects of applied project on all students' learning outcomes, their results however indicated significantly higher learning outcomes for international students relative to the U.S. students. This study extends Green and Farazmand (2010) work to compare International and United States students' learning outcomes in applied learning courses and determine factors that influence students' success in applied project courses.

### The Applied Project Learning Outcomes Study

Lynn University in Boca Raton, Florida is a global university with students from 44 states and 78 nations, and is located in the international South Florida region of the United States. Lynn is an independent, coeducational, residential institution with 2,109 students (1,660 undergraduate and 449 graduates). Lynn University has a low 15:1 student-to-faculty ratio, and offers baccalaureate, master and doctoral degrees. The University has six colleges of which the College of Business and Management is the largest (Lynn University, 2012). Lynn University has been noted for the fifth-straight year for the highest percentage of international students among master's degree-granting institutions in the South (*U.S. News & World Report*, 2011). From the student population, 24% of Lynn University's are students from countries outside the United States (Lynn University, 2012). This research setting provides an opportunity to gain a better understanding of learning outcomes differences, such as for applied projects and between local and international students. The applied projects were conducted during two academic years (Fall 2009 thru Spring 2011), or four semesters in five upper-level Marketing courses. These courses are Consumer Behavior, Marketing Communications, Global Marketing, Marketing Research and Business Marketing

Management in the College of Business and Management. Each course was structured the same with the exception of the type of marketing project. Class sessions were on Tuesdays and Thursdays for 75 minutes. Depending on the semester, examinations were 30% of the course grade, course project ranged from 30% to 50%, and other assignments 20% to 40%. The courses allocated time of approximately 60% classroom meetings and 40% field research and project development.

The College of Business and Management (CBM) has had a long-term relationship with SCORE, a partner of the U.S. Small Business Administration, to provide “real world” learning opportunities for CBM students. Prior to each semester, the course instructor worked with a SCORE Counselor to develop a course project. During the semester, the same Counselor would be a co-instructor for the courses and in the classroom approximately 50% of the class sessions, primarily during the student teams’ project development period. However, the businessperson also would be in class the first week of the semester and a few sessions during the textbook learning period to discuss pre-project topics and answer any questions about the project. During this four-semester period, the same Score Counselor, a highly successful businessperson in manufacturing, provided the business project for and worked with 143 traditional undergraduate students.

## **METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN**

Courses were structured around two areas, or two approaches to learning – textbook (assignments and examinations) and project (field research and presentations). However, each area was integrated with content knowledge and skills development. The first part of the semester was focused on textbook assignments while the second part was only for developing the applied learning project. For instance, the textbook chapter assignments included instructor-developed discussion questions that linked the text to the project. Moreover, each course had instructor-developed project guidelines in which textbook concepts were to be applied to the project. During the project development period, there were no class sessions for one day of the week. The teams used the classroom for meetings with the instructor and/or team members. Business, or project meetings were held with the businessperson and the instructor during the second scheduled class day each week. These meetings were to report (project status) and for informational (ask questions) purposes. During the last week of the semester, teams made an oral presentation using PowerPoints and submitted a written plan to the instructor and businessperson. At the time of the written submission, each team individually rated or evaluated (based on a total of 100%) all team members as to their contribution to the project with no two members having the same rating (percentage). The projects were evaluated (graded) and returned to students during the scheduled Final Week class session. This provided an opportunity for students to ask questions and to make comments for timely feedback. This study includes 143 students who participated in the applied projects during the four semesters. The sample includes 89 U.S. students and 54 international students.

There were 80 males and 63 females. The vast majority was College of Business and Management students (95.1%), and only six students were from the College of International Communications (4.2%) and one for the College of Liberal Studies (0.7%). While there were no freshmen who participated, there were 12 sophomores (8.4%), 80 juniors (55.7%) and 51 seniors (35.7%). More than two-thirds of the students lived off-campus (67.8%) and the remaining students lived on-campus (32.2%). Most students (58.0%) had not taken a required internship course. About one-half of the students (53.8%) did not belong or were associated with a University organization, e.g., student government, fraternity/sorority, athletic team. About four out of ten students did not have a paying Summer job (42.6%) but most of those who did worked 30 or more hours (28.7%). During the semester of the course, most students did not work (73.4%) but most of those who did worked less than 20 hours (18.9%). See Table 1 for specific United States and international student characteristic details.

Table 1: Students' Characteristics: U.S and International Students

Student Characteristics	U.S. Students		International Students		Total Students	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	89	62.2	54	37.8	143	100.0
Gender						
Male	46	51.7	34	63.0	80	55.9
Female	43	48.3	20	37.0	63	44.1
Academic Major						
College of Business & Mgt.	82	92.2	54	100.0	136	95.1
College of Int'l. Comm.	6	6.7	0	0.0	6	4.2
College of Liberal Studies	1	1.1	0	0.0	1	0.7
Academic Year						
Freshman (29 or less credits)	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Sophomore (30 to 59 crs.)	9	10.1	3	5.6	12	8.4
Junior (60 to 89 credits)	53	59.6	27	50.0	80	55.9
Senior (90 or more credits)	27	30.3	24	44.4	51	35.7
Residence						
On-Campus	24	27.0	22	40.7	46	32.2
Off-Campus	65	73.0	32	59.3	97	67.8
University Internship						
Yes	36	40.4	24	44.4	60	42.0
No	53	59.6	30	55.6	83	58.0
University Organizations						
None	47	52.9	30	55.5	77	53.8
One	27	30.3	10	18.5	37	25.9
Two	6	6.7	13	24.1	19	13.3
Three	3	3.4	0	0.0	3	2.1
Four of More	6	6.7	1	1.9	7	4.9
Summer Employment (weekly)						
No Paying Job	27	30.3	34	62.9	61	42.6
Job Less than 10 Hours	3	3.4	5	9.3	8	5.6
Job 10 to 19 Hours	8	9.0	5	9.3	13	9.1
Job 20 to 29 Hours	18	20.2	2	3.7	20	14.0
Job 30 or More Hours	33	37.1	8	14.8	41	28.7
Semester Employment (weekly)						
No Paying Job	64	71.9	41	75.9	105	73.4
Job Less than 10 Hours	8	9.0	4	7.4	12	8.4
Job 10 to 19 Hours	8	9.0	7	13.0	15	10.5
Job 20 to 29 Hours	6	6.7	2	3.7	8	5.6
Job 30 or More Hours	3	3.4	0	0.0	3	2.1

*This table shows student sample demographic, educational and work experience information. This information is presented in detail (number and percentage) by United States students, international students and total students in the sample.*

Students were given three surveys during each semester. First was a pre-project survey (pre-test) at the beginning of the semester. The students provided self-reported demographic information (e.g., gender, citizenship), campus experiences (e.g., student activities), educational experiences (e.g., credits earned, internship completion), and their perception of examinations and applied projects with six 5-point Likert-type scale items. Second was a mid-project survey (mid-term test). This survey was completed after the textbook assignments and before beginning the project in which the six items (5-point Likert scale) was asked again. Third was a post-project survey (post-test) at the end of the semester. The six items were asked but the verb tense was changed from future tense to past tense. See Table 2, Panel A for the six post-test items. As shown in the table, these items were researchers' developed and measures students' applied project perceptions and experiences as (1) knowledge, (2) skills, (3) personal development, or (4)

both knowledge and skills. Additional data were included as to the teams' ranking of each member with no two students in the team having the same ranking and was used to compute the student's applied project score. Furthermore, other data provided for the study were from the instructor or the University, e.g., examination and applied project scores, cumulative grade point average.

## RESULTS

The data were analyzed and the results are reported by two methods. First is a comparison between United States students ( $n = 89$ ) and the international students ( $n = 54$ ) using t-Tests. Second determines what significant factors, or variables influence learning outcomes for all students, U.S. students and international students using multiple regression. Learning outcomes (dependent variable) are determined by two measures – the students and the instructor.

The post-project survey (post-test) is used to determine the students' learning outcomes. Students completed a six-item questionnaire that was measured by a 5-point scale (1 = strongly agree to 5 = strongly disagree). All mean scores were lower (more agreeable) for the international students than the U.S. students, as well as for the total mean score (unweighted) for the six items. Four of the six items were significantly different. Knowledge and two skills items were the least significant ( $p < 0.05$ ), and personal development item was the most significant ( $p < 0.001$ ). The total mean score for the six items was significant ( $p < 0.01$ ). Neither of the knowledge and skills items was significant. See Table 2, Panel A. To further examine the comparison between the two groups, an analysis of the project scores (1 = A to F = 5) was completed. The finding shows no significant difference. However, international students performed slightly better (higher grade) than the U.S. students. See Table 2, Panel B.

A bivariate analysis was performed to examine correlations (Pearson) and two-independent variable relationships. The results ranged from .000 (no correlation) for team ranking and learn more with project to 0.596 (moderate correlation) for pre-project survey and mid-project survey. Gender (1 = male, 2 = female) was inversely related to three of the four variables – pre- and mid-project survey (1 = strongly agree to 5 = strongly disagree) and team ranking (1 = highest to 3 = lowest). The other inverse relationship was mid-project survey and team ranking. The gender and team ranking was significant at 0.05 and pre-project survey and mid-project survey was significant at 0.01. See Table 3.

To determine the relationship of the independent variables and the dependent variable of total project score (unweighted mean score of post-project survey and project grade), multiple regression (forward stepwise) was performed for all students, United States students and international students. The independent variable was included in the equation only if it was significant at or less than 0.05. For all students, the explained variance (adjusted  $R^2$ ) was 21.9%. Three independent variables were included in the model. Mid-project response and team ranking have positive relationships to total project score. However, gender has an inverse relationship. Therefore, the regression equation 1 for all students' project score (Table 4, Panel A) is:

Table 2: Project Score Comparisons: U.S. and International Students

<b>Panel A: Student-Reported (Post-test)</b>				
Items	United States Students Mean	International Students Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean Difference
Learned more about Marketing in this course than a Marketing course without a service (applied) learning project. ( <i>Knowledge</i> )	1.82	1.54	0.605	0.28***
Developed better or new skills in this course than a Marketing course without a service (applied) learning project. ( <i>Skills</i> )	1.87	1.59	0.659	0.28***
Look forward to doing another service (applied) learning course project in the future. ( <i>Personal Development</i> )	2.42	1.59	0.813	0.83*
Look forward to working in a team in the future. ( <i>Skills</i> )	2.45	2.00	1.046	0.45***
Did better in this course that had <u>both</u> examinations and a service (applied) learning course project than without such as project. ( <i>Knowledge and Skills</i> )	2.17	1.89	0.816	0.28
A service (applied) learning project has benefited me more in meeting my career goals than a course without such a project. ( <i>Knowledge and Skills</i> )	1.93	1.74	0.701	0.19
Mean Score for the 6 student-reported items	2.11	1.74	0.528	0.37**
<b>Panel B: Instructor-Reported</b>				
Item	United States Students Mean	International Students Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean Difference
Project grade	2.21	1.94	1.089	0.27

*This table presents t-Test results by comparing United States students and international students. The significance levels are shown as \* p < 0.001, \*\* p < 0.01 and \*\*\* p < 0.05. In Panel A, the self-reported results are from the post-test with six 5-point Likert-type scale items (1 = strongly agree to 5 = strongly disagree). This panel also shows the mean score for the six items. In Panel B, the instructor's project score results (1 = A to 5 = F) are reported.*

Table 3: Select Bivariate Correlations

Variables	Gender	Pre-Project Test	Mid-Project Test	Team Ranking	Learn More with Project
Gender	1.000				
Pre-Project Test	-0.003	1.000			
Mid-Project Test	-0.027	0.596*	1.000		
Team Ranking	-0.206**	0.015	-0.077	1.000	
Learn More with Project	0.088	0.139	0.130	0.000	1.000

This table presents the bivariate correlations between the study variables relative degree of association (positive and negative). The significance levels are indicated as \* p < 0.01 and \*\* p < 0.05.

(1) All Students = 0.917 + 0.341 (mid-project test) + 0.295 (team ranking) – 0.160 (gender)

For United States students, the explained variance (adjusted R<sup>2</sup>) was 24.4%. Three independent variables were included in the equation. Team ranking and mid-project survey response have direct relationships to total project score. Gender again has an inverse relationship. Hence, the regression equation 2 for U.S. students' project score (Table 4, Panel B) is:

(2) U.S. Students = 1.313 + 0.299 (team ranking) + 0.317 (mid-project test) – 0.257 (gender)

For international students, the explained variance (adjusted R<sup>2</sup>) was 34.0%. Two independent variables were included in the equation. Pre-project survey response and learn more with a project have positive relationships to total project score. Hence, the regression equation 3 for international students' project score (Table 4, Panel C) is:

(3) International Students = – 0.245 + 0.388 (pre-project test) + 0.338 (learn more with a project)

Therefore, no independent variable was common (the same) for U.S. and international students in predicting applied projects success and their learning outcomes. However, while the mid-project

response was a significant influence for U.S. students' learning outcomes, the pre-project response was for international students.

## IMPLICATIONS

The research setting provided an opportunity to examine the differences as to “how the diverse student populations perform in service-learning assignments” (Geringer, Stratemeyer and Canton, 2009, p. 9), e.g., local (United States) and international students' learning outcomes. The results have several implications to learning differences between the two groups. First, there are clearly better international students' learning outcomes. The self-reported mean scores were all lower (better learning) by the international students as applicable to knowledge, skills, and knowledge and skills measures (see Table 2, Panel A). Furthermore, the instructor-evaluated project mean score was lower (better learning) for international students (see Table 2, Panel B). Generally, members were not assigned to teams, and teams were diverse. As a result, these members learn to perform in a diverse setting. Moreover, based on the scores learning might have improved because of this diversity, e.g., international students' commitment to learning and U.S. students becoming competitive by learning.

Second, the influences on the two group's learning outcomes are very different. For the U.S. students, team ranking and mid-project survey responses were positively related, e.g., higher team ranking and better mid-project response indicates a better project grade. In addition, gender was negatively related to the U.S. student learning outcomes, or females learning more than males (see Table 4, Panel B). Similar to international students (37.8% of the sample), females (44.1% of the sample) were a minority group. This could be attributed to having greater commitment and more competitive to learning than males.

Third, international students' learning outcomes were positively influenced by the pre-project survey response and to learn more with an applied course project (see Table 4, Panel C). The implications are that international students know at the beginning of the course that they will learn more and be more successful with an applied learning project. However, the U.S. students' success depends later on in the semester (mid-term response). While the implications may not be clear and with team diversity, the early realization of applied project learning opportunities by the international students (pre-project response) may positively influence U.S. students' learning (mid-project response).

## CONCLUSIONS

Globalization and student career preparation are major priorities for business schools, and are critical for hiring criteria by businesses. This study has examined and determined differences between two diverse student groups – United States and international – as to their applied projects' learning outcomes. The sample was from a university with a diverse student population that also encourages applied course



Table 4: Multiple Regression Models for Course Projects for All, United States, and International Students

<b>Panel A: All Students</b>					
$R^2 = 0.236$	Adjusted $R^2 = 0.219$	Std. Error = 0.64022	F = 14.293	Significant F = 0.000	
Variables	Regression Coefficient	Standard Error	Standardized Coefficient	T-Value	Significance
(Constant)	0.917	0.328			
Mid-Project Test	0.415	0.091	0.341	4.574	0.000***
Team Ranking	0.347	0.089	0.295	3.883	0.000***
Gender	-0.233	0.110	-0.160	-2.111	0.037*
<b>Panel B: United States Students</b>					
$R^2 = 0.270$	Adjusted $R^2 = 0.244$	Std. Error = 0.67908	F = 10.460	Significant F = 0.000	
Variables	Regression Coefficient	Standard Error	Standardized Coefficient	T-Value	Significance
(Constant)	1.313	0.424			
Team Ranking	0.361	0.114	0.299	3.156	0.002**
Mid-Project Test	0.380	0.112	0.317	3.405	0.001***
Gender	-0.400	0.147	-0.257	-2.723	0.008**
<b>Panel C: International Students</b>					
$R^2 = 0.365$	Adjusted $R^2 = 0.340$	Std. Error = 0.46602	F = 14.638	Significant F = 0.000	
Variables	Regression Coefficient	Standard Error	Standardized Coefficient	T-Value	Significance
(Constant)	-0.245	0.396			
Pre-Project Test	0.449	0.140	0.388	3.209	0.002**
Learn More with a Project	1.018	0.363	0.338	2.800	0.007**

*This table shows the regression estimates for all students, United States students and international students. The significance levels for each independent variable are indicated as \*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$  and \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$ . Panel A shows all students =  $0.917 + 0.341$  (mid-project test) +  $0.295$  (team ranking) -  $0.160$  (gender). Panel B presents United States students =  $1.313 + 0.299$  (team ranking) +  $0.317$  (mid-project test) -  $0.257$  (gender). Panel C shows international students =  $-0.245 + 0.388$  (pre-project test) +  $0.338$  (learn more with a project).*

projects and other “real world” learning experiences. The results found significant differences between the two groups (t-Test analysis) and relationships to their learning outcomes (multiple regression analysis). From the students’ self-report and the instructor’s results, international students had higher learning outcomes than U.S. students. However, having diverse teams (U.S. and international students) may have improved both groups’ learning. While this study has answered the call to determine “how the diverse student populations perform in service-learning assignments” (Geringer, Stratemeyer and Canton, 2009, p. 9), it does have certain limitations. This study included a sample from one academic unit at one university, and the results are not applicable or generalizable for other academic units and universities. Furthermore, the participants were undergraduate students, and different results might be found for graduate student learning. An international student was defined as a non-U.S. citizen, and no consideration, or analysis of specific comparisons between and for different global regions, e.g., Latin America, Europe, Middle East, Africa, Asia. However, these limitations offer future research opportunities. For example, “how the diverse student populations perform in service-learning assignments” (Geringer, Stratemeyer and Canton, 2009, p. 9) in non-business academic units? Are there differences in graduate courses? Are there differences between global regions? This study is the beginning, not a conclusion to better understand globalization and student career preparation, and student diversity and applied projects learning outcomes.

**REFERENCES**

AACSB International Accreditation Coordinating Committee (2007, November 20). AACSB assurance of learning standards: An interpretation, (accessed February 8, 2012), [available at <http://www.aacsb.edu/accreditation/papers/AOLPaper-final-11-20-07.pdf>]

- Bobbitt, M. L., Inks S. A., Kemp K. J. and Mayo D. T. (2000). Integrating marketing courses to enhance team based experiential learning, *Journal of Marketing Education*, 22(10), 15-24
- Butin, D. W. (2003). Of what use is it?: Multiple conceptualizations of service learning within education, *Teachers College Records*, 105(9), 1674-1692
- Dudderar, D. and Stover L. T. (2003). Putting service learning experiences at the heart of a teacher education curriculum, *Educational Research Quarterly*, 27(2), 18-32
- Easterling, D. and Rudell F. (1997). Rationale, benefits, and methods of service-learning in marketing education, *Journal of Education for Business*, 73(1), 58-61
- Farazmand, F. and Green, R.D. (2012). Differences between and influences on male and female students' applied project learning outcomes, *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, 16(2), 93-103
- Farazmand, F.A., Green, R.D. and Miller, P. (2010). Creating lifelong learning through service-learning, *Business Education & Accreditation*, 2(1), 1-14
- Frontezak, N.T. and Kelly, C.A. (2000). Experiential learning in marketing education, *Journal of Marketing Education*, 22(1), 3-4
- Geringer, S.D., Stratemeyer, A.W. and Canton, A. (2009). Assessing service-learning outcomes in a Principles of Marketing course: A team-based vs. individual-based approach, *Journal for Advancement of Marketing Education*, 14(Summer), 1-12
- Gordon, P.J., Heischmidt, K.A., Sterrett, J.L. and McMillan, H.S. (2009). Internationalization the business program: One college's approach. In P. Gordon and M. Kunz (Co-Eds.) *Marketing Management Association Educators' Conference Proceedings* (pp. 133-137). St. Louis: Marketing Management Association
- Grayson, P.J. (2005). The application of American models to the experiences and outcomes of Canadian and international students studying in Canada, *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, XI(August), 71-97
- Green, R.D. and Farazmand, F.A. (2010). Learning by doing: A comparative study of U.S. and international students. In B.A. Vander Schee (Ed.) *Marketing Management Association Fall Educators' Conference Proceedings* (pp. 1-6). Indianapolis, IN: Marketing Management Association
- Green, R.D. and Farazmand, F.A. (2012). Experiential learning: The internship and live-case study relationship. *Business Education & Accreditation*, 4(1), 13-23
- Holland, B. A. (2001). A comprehensive model for assessing service-learning and community-university partnerships, *New Directions For Higher Education*, 114(Summer), 51-60
- Klink, R. R. and Athaide G. A. (2004). Implementing service learning in the Principles of Marketing course, *Journal of Marketing Education*, 26(2), 145-53
- Lamb, C. W. Jr., Shipp S. H. and Moncrief W. C. III (1995). Integrating skills and content knowledge in the marketing curriculum, *Journal of Marketing Education*, 12(Summer), 10-19
- Lynn University (2012). Lynn facts, (accessed January, 28, 2012), [available at <http://www.lynn.edu/about-lynn/lynn-facts>]

Mastrangelo, L. S. and Tischio V. (2005). Integrating writing, academic discourses, and service learning: Project Renaissance and School/ College Literacy Collaborations, *Composition Studies*, 33(1), 32-53

Petkus, Ed, Jr. (2000). A theoretical and practical framework for service-learning in marketing: Kolb's Experiential Learning Cycle, *Journal of Marketing Education*, 22(1), 64-70

Soslau, E. G. and Yost D. S. (2007). Urban service-learning: An authentic teaching strategy to deliver a standards-driven curriculum, *Journal of Experiential Education*, 30(1), 36-53

Steinke, P. and Fitch, P. (2007). Assessing service-learning, *Research & Practice in Assessment*, 1(2), 1-8

Sternberger, L. G., Ford, K. A. and Hale, D. C. (2005). International service-learning: Integrating academics and active learning in the world, *Journal of Public Affairs*, 8, 75-96

Titus, P. A. and Petroschius S. M. (1993). Bringing consumer behavior to the workbench: An experiential approach, *Journal of Marketing Education*, 22(Spring), 20-30

*U.S. News and World Report* (2011). America's Best Colleges Issue

Zhao, C.M., Kuh, G.D. and Carni, R.M. (2005). A comparison of international student and American student engagement in effective educational practices, *Journal of Higher Education*, 76(2), 209-231

Zlotkowski, Edward (1996). Opportunity for all: Linking service-learning and business education, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 15(1), 5-19

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

The authors wish to express our appreciation for the very helpful comments and suggestions by the Editor and the reviewers for this manuscript.

## **BIOGRAPHY**

Robert D. Green, D.B.A., is Professor of Marketing in the College of Business and Management at Lynn University. He has held faculty positions in the U.S. and internationally. Dr. Green has had articles in *International Journal of Management and Marketing Research*, *Journal of Business & Entrepreneurship* and more than 60 other referred publications. He serves on the Editorial Board for the *International Journal of Management and Marketing Research* and *Business Education & Accreditation*. He can be contacted at: College of Business and Management, Lynn University, 3601 North Military Trail, Boca Raton, Florida 33431 USA. Email: rgreen@lynn.edu

Farideh A. Farazmand, Ph.D., is Professor of International Business in the College of Business and Management at Lynn University. She teaches graduate and undergraduate courses and serves as Coordinator of the Ph. D. Program in the College of Business and Management. Dr. Farazmand has published in several refereed journals, including *Journal of International Business Research*, *Business Education & Accreditation* and *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*. Her research and publications are in the areas of international business negotiation, culture, teaching pedagogy and public finance. She can be contacted by email at ffarazmand@lynn.edu.

