

**Study and Learning Abroad:
Integration with and Support for
Internationalizing Curriculum and Learning**

**John K. Hudzik
Michigan State University**

**David Larsen
Arcadia University**

January 2003

Starting Views and Assumptions

The inattention given to study and learning abroad as a key component to internationalizing curriculum and learning profoundly limits higher education's ability to produce the gains that it intends in student language acquisition and in international knowledge and understanding.

The U.S. falls far short on virtually all indicators of such competence and awareness. In a National Geographic-Roper (2002) poll of geographic knowledge among young adults in nine countries, Americans finished next to last. American 18- to 24-year-olds averaged 3.1 correct responses when asked to locate 11 countries on a numbered outline map of Asia. Less than 25% of the Americans surveyed could name the four countries that acknowledge having nuclear weapons. Not only in this poll, but in dozens of other reports and studies, Americans reveal a woeful lack of basic knowledge about world affairs and skills in cultural exchange, mobility and languages.

The reasons for inattention to study abroad are many and varied, but they all point to a common problem: study abroad is rarely integrated as a fundamental component of the undergraduate curriculum. Rather, many see it as a frill. For example, faculty, parents and students themselves may refer to an upcoming study abroad experience as a *Atrip*.[@] They may treat it as an enjoyable reward (or entitlement), an interlude during the rigors of an undergraduate program. The reality, though, is usually something quite different. Rather than being a substitute for REAL academic work, study abroad credit can easily comprise 10 to 25% of an undergraduate degree, be intellectually challenging and broadening, and help the traditional curriculum come alive. Faculty and administrators need to take this activity seriously, learn what happens to students when they are overseas, and agree on ways, both before and after the experience, to make it integral to the academic degree program on the home campus. Some home institutions have begun to take serious interest in the content and the quality of courses and credits their students earn abroad. Regional accrediting organizations, the American Council on Education, the College Board and others have published extensively on this topic. Similarly, assessment of the outcomes of study abroad is an important topic that is beginning to be seriously addressed

Other stereotypes of study and learning abroad also contribute to its marginalization. One being that study abroad is a finishing program for privileged young females who want to travel Western Europe and toss three coins in a Roman fountain.¹ There is also a more sinister impediment bubbling up through the smugness of the American higher education system. In a recent national conference on study and learning abroad (Hudzik, Ingraham & Peterson, 2003), Madeleine Green (2003) of ACE hit the issue squarely when she opined that we have done such

¹Nearly two-thirds of undergraduate participants in study abroad are women. This figure has remained relatively steady since the Institute of International Education (IIE) began collecting this information in 1985-86. Similarly, since data collection in the area began in 1993-94, participation by Caucasian students has generally been just over four-fifths (Davis, 1996, 2002).

a great job of convincing ourselves that the American higher education system is the best in the world, that, as a result, we cannot imagine how our students could possibly learn anything valuable abroad. Perhaps we should add the A Ugly American@ higher education system?

Study Abroad, Internationalizing Undergraduate Education and the National Interest

Engberg and Green (2002), in a report for American Council on Education showcasing internationalization at eight very different institutions of higher learning, suggest:

Colleges and universities have an enormous task ahead of them if they are to internationalize their curricula and student experiences. Financial constraints, competing reform agendas, the absence of public and student insistence, and the paucity of government funding make the work all the more difficult. No wonder that progress has been slow. The data on campus internationalization are not encouraging:

Foreign-language enrollments as a percentage of higher education enrollments have declined from 16 percent in the 1960s to a current average of less than 8 percent.

Only 6 percent of all language enrollments are in Asian languages, with less than 2 percent in Arabic and Hebrew combined.

Only 3 percent of U.S. students study abroad before they graduate. The 143,590 who did in 1999-2000 constituted less than 1 percent of postsecondary enrollments.

In the 1980s only 14 percent of students took at least four credits of internationally focused coursework.

The percentage of four-year institutions with language degree requirements for some students declined from 89 percent in 1965 to 68 percent in 1995. (p. 13)

The underlying premise of our paper is that study and learning abroad can and should be an integral and pervasive component of all undergraduate curricula and of efforts to internationalize undergraduate education. Our paper has policy objectives, among them that the Federal government should give thorough attention and support to mainstreaming study and learning abroad throughout undergraduate curricula, including professional programs as well as liberal arts majors. We seek democratization of access to and participation in high quality study abroad. At the same time, we recognize that education abroad should not be an isolated exercise. Home institutions= faculty and their courses need to plan for it, anticipate it, and prepare students for it. This means that home school faculty and advisors must know about the programs offered abroadBtheir content, their standards, the ways that they are taught, and learning outcomes that

can be expected from students who have those experiences. Further, home institutions must be prepared to incorporate the learning that takes place overseas into their expectations for students in the courses they take upon returning home.

We seek the creation of a Federal program that will provide significant support to study and learning abroad as a core element of area and language learning. We argue for support of study and learning abroad not as a substitute for internationalizing the on-campus curriculum and learning, but as an essential component of and partner to that effort. Study and learning abroad that is disconnected from the on-campus curriculum provides no means for preparing students to study abroad, fails to re-integrate the learning abroad into the on-campus curriculum, and runs the risk of contributing to an intellectually vacuous, or at least disconnected, undergraduate educational experience.

The relationship between internationalizing the on-campus curriculum and study abroad needs strengthening. Richard Brecht (2003), for example, has put it succinctly: "The key to study abroad is foreign language and the key to foreign language is study abroad" (p. 57). By extension, Brecht's point, and ours, is: internationalizing the curriculum requires the experiential component of study abroad, and study abroad requires the support of an internationalized curriculum on campus. Either one without the other is a significant impediment to the development of language and area expertise as well as to developing a broadly informed and experienced citizenry. Among the most effective methods for teaching students new cultures and languages is to have them learn, live, and work in another country and culture. Such international experiences not only provide students with an effective international and cross-cultural education, they are life changing experiences for many. Students returning to campus help further internationalize the on-campus learning environment.

Internationalization of the on-campus curriculum provides the intellectual foundation for study abroad. Study abroad provides the experiential and reflective component of international education. We cannot pretend to be graduating educated persons if their curricula have not effectively exposed them to international and comparative perspectives, which in turn enhance their abilities to extrapolate materials from one culture or region to another, to collaborate with colleagues abroad, and to operate successfully (both personally and professionally) in a global environment. This was true before September 11, 2001, and is more so since.

Students and their families are aware of this. In September 2002, the Institute of International Education (IIE) reported substantial growth (over the previous September) in student interest in study abroad. Applications for federally-funded educational exchange programs increased by 10% for Fulbrights, by 40% for Gilmans, and by 50% for NSEPs. Ninety-eight percent of the 530 respondents to IIE's 2002 survey said that international educational exchange, including study abroad, was regarded as "as important" or "equally important" on their campuses in the aftermath of the events of September 11, 2001. ACE-sponsored surveys conducted in the spring of 2000 and 2002 found strong public support for study abroad on both surveys and agreement that students should have a study abroad experience sometime during college. (see Siaya, Porcelli & Green, 2002) Similarly, both before and after September 11, 2001, state-wide random

surveys in Michigan (Riedinger, Silver & Brook, 2002; Riedinger, Silver & Wallmo, 1999) found that nearly 70% of the general public thought students should have a study abroad experience.

Study abroad serves both national security and economic competitiveness goals. It supports the development of a more cross-culturally capable workforce and a citizenry better informed about the dynamics of globalization and working and living in a global environment. Study abroad can also be the catalyst for a much broader vision of internationalizing the institution. Increased student, faculty and academic unit involvement in study abroad expands direct contacts with colleagues and institutions abroad, and provides venues for initiating collaborative activities. Study abroad prompts re-examination of foreign language instruction, including decisions about which languages are taught as well as the options for expanding instruction. Because large-scale expansion of study abroad opportunities requires more innovative forms of collaboration across curricula and academic departments, as well as greater attention to effective cost control, it offers a model for institutional change beyond study abroad. David Maxwell, president of Drake University and former director of the National Foreign Language Center, has described a crisis in foreign language instruction in the United States@ (Schneider, 2001). According to the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, in 2003 Drake=s traditional language department will have been closed. Maxwell=s institution will support students= efforts to acquire communicative competence in languages other than English through directed independent language study, language across the curriculum, and language immersion in study abroad programs.

The impacts of globalization are widespread and strengthening; they attract both strong critics and proponents. An educated citizenry needs to be aware of the issues involved, understand their complexities and consequences, and be able to function humanely and effectively within them. Globalization challenges higher education to make international education a component of every student=s program, expanding it beyond the purview of the few students who happen to choose majors in it. The challenge for study abroad is to democratize access to international education beyond the few majors that easily accommodate it and beyond the students who come from families where international travel is common. Study abroad should be an expected part of every student=s program, particularly including majors in professional programs such as business, engineering, and education to name a few.

The Federal government has a key leadership role to play and has the capacity and resources to leverage a nationwide partnership of education systems, state and local governments, the private sector, and non-governmental organizations to achieve our objectives. Federal funding and programming should take into consideration the full range of Federal agencies, programs and relevant legislative authorizations related to the Departments of State, Education, Commerce, Defense, and the Agency for International Development.

In 1988 the Advisory Council for International Educational Exchange of the Council for International Educational Exchange offered a compelling argument for providing American students with international knowledge:

The role of the United States as a leader among nations is changing rapidly. Despite our position of international leadership for almost fifty years, we are ill-prepared to face changes in business, manufacturing, diplomacy, science and technology that have come with an intensely inter-dependent world....Other countries have had to recognize the educational implications of interdependence sooner than we, and are ahead of us in the international education of their students....The Advisory Council on International Educational Exchange believes that if we fail to internationalize sufficiently our educational institutions, including expansion of student opportunities for study and work abroad, we will irreversibly diminish the world status of the United States. (p. 1)

It is time that the connection realized in 1988 by the Advisory Council between internationalizing educational institutions and study abroad be given serious attention. We also believe that we cannot claim to be committed to internationalizing our curriculum unless it is done throughout the curriculum. In addition to building true area and language expertise, we should be concerned additionally with spreading international content and experience throughout the curriculum so that virtually every student regardless of department or major has the opportunity to extrapolate materials from one culture or region to another, to collaborate with colleagues not only at home but also abroad, and to gain experience in living and working successfully in a global environment. Study abroad provides the best means for incorporating the experiential component into international education and for infusing international education with a reflective dimension.

Pre-College Building Blocks

Attention has been paid to the content and methods and outcomes of elementary and secondary education in the United States for more than two centuries. Only during the past two decades, however, have serious questions about area studies and foreign languages been raised. Even today very little objective information about curricular emphasis on these topics is available. Also difficult to find is reliable data about elementary and secondary school participation in study (or travel) abroad. Anecdotal reports from university-based international educators throughout the country point toward some trends. Information from the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages indicates others.

Foreign Language Standards. The brochure, *A Standards for Foreign Language Learning: Preparing for the 21st Century*, published by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Inc., begins with the following statement of philosophy:

Language and communication are at the heart of the human experience. The United States must educate students who are linguistically and culturally equipped to communicate successfully in a pluralistic American society and abroad. This imperative envisions a future in which ALL students will develop and maintain proficiency in English and at least one other language, modern or classical. Children who come to

school from non-English backgrounds should also have opportunities to develop further proficiencies in their first language.

Foreign language was the seventh and final subject area funded for the development of national standards under the America 2000 initiative. Standards in five competency areas (communication, cultures, connections, comparisons and communities) have been established by a coalition of language organizations. In addition, the work of the coalition included the setting of goals and articulation of progress indicators for grades four, eight and twelve. These standards are presently being reviewed (for adoption) by Departments of Education in each state. It is hoped that they will become the national norm by the end of the present decade.

To meet these standards will require, among other things, a sharply increased number of better prepared language teachers and language-competent teachers in other disciplines than are presently available in the United States. This requirement is expected to impact university enrollments in foreign language programs during the next five years.

Promoting Foreign Language Study. At the same time that these efforts are going forward, the Modern Language Association and other professional bodies have begun a serious effort to convince young students to study languages in high school and beyond. They list Againing a competitive edge, Ajob advantage in a global economy, Alearning other cultures and Aexcitement among the advantages that await students who make the effort. High among the inter-cultural and excitement arguments is the chance to study abroad particularly as an undergraduate.

Travel and Study Abroad for Pre-college Students. How much study abroad activity takes place before college? We do not know. Students travel a lot. They go abroad with family as tourists and visitors. They are sent abroad in programs² and are taken overseas by their junior high and high school language teachers, social studies teachers, athletic coaches, and band directors. American-accredited secondary schools throughout the world serve steadily increasing numbers of dependent children of military personnel, diplomats and businessmen living abroad. Many of these schools have Asister relationships with schools in the United States which provide opportunities for high school student exchanges. Other overseas schools have begun to follow suit.

One of the immediate reactions to the terrorist attacks in September 2001 was the cancellation of many secondary school Christmas vacation, spring break and summer 2002 international trips.

²For example, for more than 50 years the youth exchange organization, Children's International Summer Villages, has conducted month-long international, intercultural living programs for eleven-year-olds.

In November 2001 it was estimated that some 70% of such excursions that had been planned for the coming nine months were called off. This involved thousands of schools and hundreds of thousands of students across the country.

In the early 1980s, college and university study abroad advisors spent a measurable portion of their time talking students through the procedure for obtaining a passport. In recent years, a significantly larger proportion of American undergraduates have valid passports when they come to campus. They have been abroad before.

Some colleges and universities have begun admitting high school seniors on a deferred basis. Those students, who will begin their on-campus programs in January or February rather than in the fall, are encouraged to fill the semester between high school graduation and their admission date by doing something interesting. For several hundred each fall, this takes the form of travel or study abroad.

Summer courses, internships, intensive language and culture experiences, service projects and adventure vacations are on regular offer to 15- to 18-year-olds. The result is that a growing number of increasingly experienced travelers, many with a "been there, done that, and I want to go back" attitude toward study abroad, now appear in college and university classrooms. These students and their parents comprise another group that is exerting pressure on American higher education to meet their needs and expectations with a larger and more diverse set of overseas learning opportunities.

Rather than presenting a discussion of these activities and examining their actual or potential influence on post-secondary education, this paper will focus on the next educational level. Its attention now turns to undergraduate education in the United States, identifying present involvement of students in study abroad and language learning, then discussing outcomes assessment and curricular integration and finally turning to an identification of what more is needed and suggesting how that need could be met.

College-Level Trends in Study Abroad and Demographics of Participants.

Study Abroad Participation: According to Davis (2002), since 1985, the number of American students reported to have studied abroad for academic credit grew by 320% (from 48,483 to 154,168). While part of this increase may be attributable to more conscientious data reporting by home institutions to the Institute of International Education in response to its annual survey, it is clear that today's American students participate in credit-bearing study abroad in rapidly increasing numbers.

Students from a broad range of disciplines participate. The 154,168 participants in 2000-01 reported their major fields of study as:

Social Sciences	20.3% (of the total)
-----------------	----------------------

Business and Management	18.1
Humanities	14.5
Fine or Applied Arts	8.5
Foreign Languages	8.2
Physical Sciences	7.1
Other	4.9
Undeclared	4.5
Education	4.4
Health Sciences	3.2
Engineering	2.7
Mathematics and Computer Science	2.0
Agriculture	1.6

This is a very different disciplinary spread from 15 years earlier. In 1985-86, 10.9% of study abroad enrollments were in business and management. Foreign language enrollments were 16.7% of the total--double their proportion today. Over this time period, participation by engineering majors grew from 1.6 to 2.7% and health science majors from 1.7 to 3.2%.

Although a preponderance of those participating still come from the Atraditional@ study abroad disciplines (social science, languages, humanities and fine arts), the proportion of those coming from professional disciplines has grown substantially. There is every reason to believe that this trend will continue also because this is where significant growth potential in study abroad resides and where educational need is important.

International educators are hard at work to identify ways to increase the participation of students in majors believed to be Aunderrepresented@ (those below 8% in the table above). The November 2002 annual conference of the Council on International Educational Exchange involved nearly 500 participants from around the world in three days of discussions and workshops about underrepresented peoples and disciplines in study abroad. Conference sessions focused on destinations (Africa, Asia, Latin America), populations (students of color, minority populations, students with disabilities, non-traditional learners), disciplines (sciences, engineering, education) and approaches (internships, students in two-year programs). The need to forge new alliances, to think creatively, to involve faculty and to work more closely with government and with overseas resources was underscored. The absence of adequate sources of funding was repeatedly identified as a significant impediment to progress on many of these fronts. While consideration of these topics is nothing new, the development of plans and programs designed to address them is encouraging progress toward a broadly-accepted objective indeed. The fact that an entire conference focused on these underrepresented groups is significant in itself.

Not only are students going abroad in growing numbers, they are going to a wider variety of destinations (Davis, 2002). Further, larger proportions of the population are studying in Anon-traditional@ world regions. In 1985-86, 79.6% of reported study abroad students were in Europe. Fifteen years later, that percentage had fallen to 63.1%. Although this is a substantial

realignment of proportions, we can expect further adjustments as other world regions and their economies and geopolitical prominence increase.

The raw numbers that these percentages reflect are more dramatic. Fifteen years ago, 38,593 students were in Europe and 9,890 students studied elsewhere in the world. By 2000-01, the European-bound market had increased by 250% to 97,280, while the number of American students studying in non-European counties grew by 575% to 56,888.

The second most popular world region destination for American study abroad students, Latin America, saw its percentage more than double over the 15 years (and head count increase 600%) from 7.0 (3,394 students) to 14.5 (22,354). Other changes include:

<u>Region</u>	<u>Percentages of total</u>	
	<u>1985-86</u>	<u>2000-01</u>
Africa	1.1	2.9
Asia	5.4	6.0
Middle East	4.0	1.1
North America	0.9	0.7
Oceania	0.9	6.0
Multiple regions	1.0	5.6

While world events may account for some of these shifts in participation (the decline of the Middle East, for example, seems to correspond to American perceptions about safety and security in that region of the world), other shifts reflect changes in host country policies (as in Oceania countries, Australia and New Zealand, which, unlike 15 years ago, now encourage the enrollment of international students in their national universities).

Kinds of Programs: During the two decades on either side of World War II, most study abroad participants went on faculty-led summer trips or spent an academic year immersed in language study at a European university. Today, students can choose from a plethora of overseas study opportunities which provide exposure to (and learning about) nearly every country and culture in the world.

Study abroad programs can be characterized by type:

- A. faculty-led course components
- B. faculty-led course (or set of courses)
- C. enrollment in an overseas program or university that does not involve home school faculty,

and by duration:

- D. an academic year (or longer)
- E. a single semester (or academic quarter)

F. a number of weeks (one to eight).

The available data related to duration indicate some changes over time. In 1985-86, 18.8% of study abroad participants enrolled abroad for a full year. That percentage fell to 8.6% in 1999-00. Enrollment in programs lasting a single semester or academic quarter remained fairly constant (45.2% in 1985-86; 42.8% in 1999-00). Enrollments in shorter term (summer sessions, January terms and other programs of less than eight weeks= duration) grew from about 35% to about 47% during the same period. A number of factors drive students toward shorter study abroad programs. An important one is cost. Another is curricular expectations in certain majors. Older students find that family and/or employment considerations prevent them from committing to longer overseas options. And, it may be that learning objectives behind study abroad program design are becoming more varied and, in turn, linked to different programs styles and lengths.

In response to these changes, a broad array of program options has emerged. Study abroad advisors= libraries abound with materials describing short, focused study experiences that take place in summer, between semesters and even during spring break. Many of these are intensive, faculty-led learning experiences designed only for students in a longer, campus-based course. Others are open to participants from other institutions.

Colleges and universities abroad themselves offer attractive program options both through faculty members or advisors= offices on American campuses and directly (via the internet) to students. The number of options available to would-be study abroad participants has grown exponentially since the early 1980s. So have the types of programs offered. Internships, service learning, independent learning, tutorials, learning communities, direct enrollment, language immersion, co-ops and other approaches abound. Students and faculty members have a broad array of choices available to them now and the list is growing, as it must, to meet the demands of an expanding and increasingly diverse population.

Language Study at American Institutions: Because the study of languages other than English is fundamental to these considerations, the 2000 report of the Modern Language Association (MLA) on enrollments in post-secondary language courses is of particular interest. MLA's fall 1998 report (Broad & Welles, 2000) contained information about registrations at 2,467 institutions that teach foreign languagesC37% of the responses came from two-year institutions and the remainder came from schools offering baccalaureate and graduate degrees.

Total enrollment in language classes in the fall semester of 1998 was 1,193,830Cthe highest number recorded since the survey was first conducted in 1958. Of this number, 656,590 (55%) were enrolled in Spanish; 199,064 (17%) were taking French; and 89,020 (7.5%) were enrolled in German. Less commonly taught languages continued to attract small numbers, but enrollment growth in some of them is noteworthy.

<u>Enrollments in</u>	<u>1990</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>Change (1990-1998)</u>
-----------------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	---------------------------

Italian	49,739	43,760	49,287	- 0.9 %
Japanese	45,717	44,723	43,141	- 5.6 %
Chinese	19,490	26,471	28,456	+ 46.0 %
Russian	44,626	24,729	23,791	- 46.7 %
Portuguese	6,212	6,531	6,926	+ 11.5 %
Arabic	3,475	4,444	5,505	+ 58.4 %
Korean	2,286	3,343	4,479	+ 95.9 %

During the past 25 years there has been practically no change in the raw number of language enrollments in American institutions. Over this time, however, enrollments in Spanish have increased from about 45% to about 55% of total enrollments. The growth in Spanish language instruction has led to fear that even some of the more commonly taught languages such as French and German may begin a slide toward being among the less commonly taught. Thus, it is more important than ever to encourage the study of both the more commonly taught and the lesser taught languages, not only in traditional classrooms, but also through intensive individual study, language across the curriculum programs, and study abroad.

While these numbers may indicate some success in efforts to encourage enrollments in some languages, international educators are concerned about the falling importance of language study in postsecondary curricula today generally. As seen below, the percentages of students taking language has dropped steadily over the last 40 years.

<u>Registrations Year</u>	<u>Total Postsecondary Enrollment</u>	<u>Foreign Language Per 100 Enrollments</u>
1960	3,789,000	16.1
1968	7,513,091	14.3
1977	11,285,787	7.8
1986	12,503,511	7.7
1998	14,590,000	7.9

The Larger Picture: It should be noted that despite strong growth in recent years the percentage of American students who study abroad remains extremely low. The 154,168 figure (Davis, 2002) for total study abroad enrollments in is just a little more than 1% of all postsecondary enrollments in the same year and only just above 3% of all students enrolled in four-year programs during that year. However, if one takes into consideration that study abroad usually happens only once in a student's four-year-long undergraduate experience (with exceptions to that, of course), we can estimate that as many as 10 to 12% of graduating seniors have had a study abroad experience sometime during their baccalaureate education. While this is an important step in the right direction, it falls far short of the goals of 25 to 40% study abroad participation articulated by a number of college and university presidents during the past two years. The challenges going forward are to find ways to triple present participation percentages and to reinvigorate the study of foreign languages among American students.

Outcomes Assessment of Study and Learning Abroad: A Data Soft Spot.

Most study abroad programs are evaluated in some manner, but these assessments typically focus on subjective student or faculty evaluations of program logistics, organization and objectives of the academic program, quality of instruction and appropriateness of field trips—to name a few criteria. Tests and written assignments provide a basis for grading, but there is a paucity of data collection and analysis that measures the impacts of study abroad per se (e.g., improved skills and abilities, such as in language and cross cultural relations; enhanced abilities to cope in new environments or tolerate differences and ambiguity; knowledge gain related to general internationalization objectives; social/personal development and widened perspective; attitude changes, such as appreciation for diversity and tolerance of differences; changes in career aspirations, life styles, employability; and many more).

Although study abroad outcome assessment is neither pervasive nor systematic, there is considerable anecdotal data about study abroad's value and impact on students, and by inference its importance to national needs. Much of this data comes from small N (subject populations), often program-specific studies that rely heavily on student self reports. The use of standardized and non-standardized checklists for self assessment of outcomes is popular, as are case studies of particular study abroad programs. Only a few studies attempt to assess the longer-range impacts of study abroad. However, the available anecdotal data are fairly consistent and strongly indicative of many beneficial outcomes including broadened perspective and knowledge base, improved cross-cultural understanding and skills, significant maturation, attitude change and value-system enhancements, changes in career and career options, and so forth. Although the available data may not satisfy those wanting more rigorously produced results, they are strongly suggestive of the direction of impact (perhaps somewhat analogous to data about the impact of smoking on health that was available 60 years ago).

As study abroad participation increases, as more educational resources are directed toward it, and as the general public and policy leaders become more aware of it, there is greater interest in documenting the costs and benefits of study abroad. Two new studies, just underway, are mentioned below as examples of this new interest. They are a multi-year impact assessment study at Michigan State University and a Title VI-funded study just underway involving Georgetown (lead), Dickinson, Rice, and the University of Minnesota. But, there is an existing literature that also offers guideposts toward findings.

The General Literature: The existing literature reporting evidence of outcomes and impacts is based largely on, as reported above, limited samples and relies heavily on student self report data. There is also little similarity from study to study in the concepts being measured as well as a lack of commonality in the ways in which concepts are operationalized. Be this as it may, and with qualifications in mind about the quality of existing data, the question is, **What is known about the impact of study abroad?** The answer is complex because study abroad is not a homogenous concept, even under broadly held assumptions that its value is enhanced by longer stays abroad and through immersion in the local culture. Such assumptions may themselves

have a homogenous goal in mind, such as *Going native*. But not all outcomes intended for study and learning abroad necessarily require immersion in host cultures for long periods of time. Just as there are many different kinds of study abroad goals, there are many types of study abroad programs with differing objectives, substantive foci, pedagogies, duration, and location. Unfortunately, available data are so rudimentary, it is difficult if not impossible to assess how varying program models and designs differentially impact various study abroad goals and intended outcomes. So, our analysis presents only a general answer to *What is known* from available anecdotal data.

Although there were studies about the effects of foreign study experiences as early as in the 1950s and 1960s, with more surfacing in the 1970s, the results overall from these studies led one researcher to conclude in 1983 that *the evidence collected so far has been scant and inconclusive* (Sell, 1983, p. 133) about the impacts of study abroad. During the 1980s and 1990s the incidence of reported research about study abroad outcomes increased rather dramatically, but most of the findings were based on limited and generally small scale research designs as noted above. Most focused on impacts relating to changes in skills, abilities and attitudes and some sought to measure knowledge gain. These small studies reported a myriad of outcomes (largely positive), including results as diverse as increased maturity, impact on employability and career, a more critical perspective of one's own culture, growth in self awareness, intellectual growth, improved foreign language proficiency, increased independence, development of a personalized view of the host culture, intercultural sensitivity, and so forth (Steglitz, 1993).

Recognizing that many of the impacts of study and learning abroad may not be realized until some significant time after the experience, the Institute for International Education of Students (IES) conducted a survey of its alumni, incorporating subjects as far back as 50 years. Major findings (Akande & Slawson, 2000) included a strong perception among respondents that benefited *self awareness, cultural consciousness, arts appreciation, and influence on career choice*. (p. 8) Researchers also reported respondents believing that study abroad increased their open-mindedness, openness to diversity and improved their language skills. These and other findings from the study led the researchers to conclude that *study abroad has a significant and long-lasting impact on participants' personal lives, on their careers, on their world views, on their choices to have an influence in internationally-related activities, and on their development of intercultural competence*. (p. 14).

A good starting point for reviewing the more recent research literature on these issues, covering the period 1988-2000, is an annotated bibliography by Maureen Chao (2000). Several of the over 200 citations reflect a growing awareness of the importance of impact assessment and a growing methodological sophistication needed both to measure outcomes and to factor in control variables relating to program design, how impact goals are operationalized, and controls for extraneous factors. A greater appreciation for the multi-dimensionality of intended outcomes is also better reflected in the more recent research cataloged by Chao. However, an overview of this research suggests that problems of heavy reliance on self-report data and absence of consistency in operationalizing certain key measures of outcomes remain.

The Georgetown Consortium Study: This FIPSE-funded, three-year study plans to include control and experimental groups, collecting test data from 850 students enrolled in 50 different programs abroad and 150 control-group students on the four home campuses. The study aims principally at answering two questions: (1) what are students learning abroad, and (2) what are the key differences across program types that support or promote learning? Outcomes of interest include changes in foreign-language proficiency, intercultural proficiency, and learning within a disciplinary context. Validated instruments will be used, in particular the Simulated Oral Proficiency Interview (SOPI) and the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI).

As reported directly to us by one of the principal project directors, the researchers are particularly interested in measuring student learning in non-traditional locales, and in a variety of foreign languages, including Arabic, Chinese, French, German, Hausa, Japanese, Russian and Spanish. Working closely with faculty in disciplines historically under-represented in study abroad (business, engineering and the sciences), the project will identify the knowledge, skills, perceptions and values that the faculty believe their majors learn or acquire abroad, and then measure the impacts of study abroad. The researchers will develop instruments for each discipline that will allow them to measure these specific learning competencies. The Georgetown consortium study is just underway and results are not yet available.

Curriculum Integration at the University of Minnesota. Led by the Global Campus, its study abroad office, four University of Minnesota campuses (Crookston, Duluth, Morris and Twin Cities) are collaborating to integrate study abroad into all University of Minnesota undergraduate majors and minors. The intent is to make study abroad a permanent and integral part of undergraduate degree programs and to provide the international experience essential to succeed in every field in the coming decades. Both external and internal funding combine to provide more than \$4 million for scholarships and curriculum integration development for this broad-based program. It includes assessment of degree programs, training for faculty and advisers, evaluation and refinement of the advising process. It is expected that the processes and tools developed during this project will be transferable to other institutions.³

The Michigan State University Long-Term Impact Assessment Study. This study is a multi-year institutional commitment to measuring the impact of study and learning abroad on students as well as impacts on the institution itself (e.g., contributions to internationalizing the curriculum, reallocation of institutional resources, impacts on the faculty workloads and reward structures, etc.). The study is designed specifically to collect data relating to the institution's announced goals of study abroad, which include:

1. Facilitate students' intellectual growth by exposing them to knowledge, concepts and/or experiences that reflect a different cultural frame of reference, and stimulate students' interests in cross-cultural, international, and comparative learning.

³Further information is available at <http://www.umabroad.umn.edu/curriculum/>

2. Contribute to students' professional development by facilitating awareness of how their intended profession may be viewed/practiced differently in different cultural contexts and by encouraging the development of skills today's employers seek (such as self-reliance, cultural awareness, and cross-cultural communication skills).
3. Accelerate students' personal growth, including facilitating the development of confidence and self-reliance, stimulating a desire for exploration and trying new things, and expanding the students' ability to interact in unfamiliar situations.
4. Develop students' skills for relating to culturally different others in various situations, such as academic settings, social venues, and professional environments, so that they may become aware of cultural differences, reflect upon them, and be comfortable living and working in diverse environments.
5. Enhance students' self-awareness and understanding of their own culture by providing opportunities to compare and contrast host country customs, values, and traditions with their own.
6. Contribute to the on-campus internationalization of MSU by infusing the classroom with the various cultural perspectives to better prepare students for study abroad and be more receptive to global or comparative perspectives of returned study abroad students, by providing opportunities for faculty involvement in the study abroad process, by acting as a catalyst for faculty scholarship and research, and by linking faculty and student expertise gained through study abroad with college endeavors and initiatives.

Most of the assessment activity thus far has focused on student-centered outcomes. Assessment relating to goal six (institutional impacts) is just underway. Detailed outcomes are not yet available, but preliminary anecdotal evidence supports that the study abroad initiative at MSU is: (1) causing a transformation of undergraduate requirements to accommodate and integrate study abroad into majors; (2) expanding interests among some academic departments to begin mainstreaming international content into the on-campus undergraduate curriculum; (3) reallocating significant portions of the institution's instructional budget to study abroad and thereby strengthening incentives to departments and colleges to participate in study abroad; and, (4) broadening the number and kinds of faculty engaged in activity abroad (and equipped, therefore, to expand international and comparative content into their on-campus courses).

The MSU study has long term data collection elements that include: (1) pre and post testing of all study abroad students using an instrument that broadly measures their predeparture expectations and post-sojourn self assessments on a wide range of variables relating to the first

five MSU goals listed above; (2) faculty direct observation and in-depth analysis of impacts on students relating to the first five goals above; (3) faculty assessments of student knowledge gain relating to class learning objectives which in many cases expand beyond what one might measure in a normal on-campus class setting; (4) impacts on student GPA and time to graduation; (5) employer assessments of the value and contribution of study abroad; (6) longer term assessments of impacts on careers and life styles using cohort analysis methodologies, which track students from point of entry to the university through adult careers; and, (7) as data designs permit, comparisons of students who study abroad with those who do not. Data collection tools and methodologies include aggregate data analysis, the use of surveys, self-report, observations, cohort analyses, program case studies, content analysis of student writings, interviews, focus groups, pre-post measures, limited control and experimental group analyses, and longitudinal assessment. Also, because MSU now has over 180 programs in more than 50 countries of varying duration, immersion and pedagogy, there will be an opportunity as sample sizes build to assess for differential outcomes across types of programs. Results from the first two years of the MSU study will be available in early 2003.

Preliminary results from the MSU study provide consistent evidence documenting what most people who work in study abroad have long believed. The Summer 2002 college pilot-project reports in particular leave one with the unequivocal impression that the impact of the study abroad program for virtually every student in the pilot project was positive in each of the areas considered (intellectual growth, personal growth, intercultural awareness, and professional development), though perhaps especially in personal growth and intercultural awareness. But most important may be the way in which study abroad provides an opportunity for a synergy to be established between the academic, professional, personal, and intercultural components of the experience, which lead to an overall effect greater than the sum of the individual pieces. We have ample evidence that those who studied abroad graduated with higher GPAs than those who did not. However, we caution against any inference of cause and effect. The average number of terms in attendance at MSU is higher for those who study abroad than for those who don't; but it is important to note that average number of terms in attendance is NOT the same as time to graduation. (For example, a student who studies abroad for two summers might be able to graduate after seven academic-year semesters, but would have been in attendance a total of nine semesters.) An initial analysis of post study abroad surveys confirms the incremental degree of impact on students by virtue of the length of their sojourn and supports the general belief of study abroad professionals that the longer the sojourn, the greater the impact.

Integrating Study Abroad into Title VI Objectives and Other Federal Programs

The overlap between Title VI objectives and the general goals of study and learning abroad are striking. The existing Title VI legislation includes objectives that provide a basis for integrating

study abroad into wider efforts to internationalize the curriculum, as well a provisions that specifically support doing so:

Systematic efforts are necessary to enhance the capacity of institutions of higher education in the United States for producing graduates with international and foreign language expertise and knowledge..., promote access to research and training overseas..., advance the internationalization of a variety of disciplines throughout undergraduate and graduate education..., and support cooperative efforts promoting access to and the dissemination of international and foreign language knowledge.... (Sec. 601, U.S.C. 1121)

The Secretary [of Education] is authorized to make grants... for the purpose[s] of teaching and research materials; curriculum planning and development; establishing and maintaining linkages with overseas institutions of higher education and other organizations that may contribute to the teaching and research of the center or program; bringing visiting scholars and faculty to the center to teach or to conduct research; professional development of the center=s faculty and staff; projects conducted in cooperation with other centers addressing themes of world regional, cross-regional, international, or global importance; summer institutes in the United States or abroad designed to provide language and area training in the center=s field or topic; and support for faculty, staff, and student travel in foreign areas, regions, or countries, and for the development and support of educational programs abroad for students. (Sec. 602, U.S.C. 1122)

[Under the undergraduate international studies and foreign language programs section, grants may be made for T]he development of undergraduate educational programs in locations abroad where such opportunities are not otherwise available or that serve students for whom such opportunities are not otherwise available; and that provide courses that are closely related to on-campus foreign language and international curricula.... [Also supported are grants for] the integration of new and continuing education abroad opportunities for undergraduate students into curricula of specific degree programs, [and] the development of model programs to enrich or enhance the effectiveness of educational programs abroad, including pre-departure and post-return programs, and the integration of educational programs abroad into the curriculum of the home institution. (Sec. 604, U.S.C. 1124)

Finding more effective means for students to acquire, use, and build on language and area expertise and assessing outcomes related to these objectives should be common objectives between advocates of Title VI programs and those of study abroad.

Title VI support for area and language study not only provides a reinforcing, organizing mechanism for more effectively integrating on-campus and study-abroad curricula, but also offers access through area and language faculty to methodological expertise that can help shape and sustain longer-term impact assessments of both study abroad and the overall objectives of

internationalizing the curricula. Core faculty of the national resource centers in particular have a methodological expertise to help drive such a research agenda and, presumably, they share a professional interest in measuring the outcomes of their efforts.

Enhanced support for study abroad programming would also be consistent with the aims of many other federal programs. The Department of Education's Fulbright-Hays program supports group projects and seminars abroad for teachers and administrators. The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education's (FIPSE) comprehensive program supports innovative projects in international studies and foreign languages. The Department of State administers a variety of educational and cultural exchange programs, including the Fulbright-Hays Program for faculty, and student exchanges; the Educational Partnerships Program (previously known as the College and University Affiliations Programs) promotes partnerships between U.S. and foreign institutions of higher education. Foreign Study Grants for U.S. Undergraduates (Gilman Program) provides study abroad scholarships to needy American undergraduate students. The Department of Defense supports the National Security Education Program (NSEP) for undergraduate and graduate student study abroad, and it supports developing new international undergraduate programs. The National Science Foundation's (NSF) Division of International Programs encourages collaborative science and engineering research and education.

Expanding Internationalization and Curricular Integration. Internationalization of the on-campus area study and language curricula, as well as undergraduate curricula, more broadly provides the foundation for expanding study abroad opportunity and value. A commitment to mainstream international education and experience requires: (1) clearly articulated and constantly reinforced institutional goals; (2) faculty hiring and reward systems that encourage the vast majority of faculty to develop cross-border expertise and incorporate international and comparative content into their instruction and research; (3) changes in undergraduate curricula so that all majors integrate international content and experience; and, (4) collaboration across academic units. These are mutually reinforcing efforts. Just as what happens on campus strengthens study abroad, what happens overseas can and should contribute directly to broadening and strengthening the home campus curriculum.

Democratizing access to study abroad requires an institutional commitment to mainstreaming internationalization of the curriculum as well as parallel commitments to study abroad affordability, integration, and collaboration across the curriculum, expanding program choices, and attention to safety and security.

Universities and colleges can unintentionally make it difficult for students to study abroad. To increase access they must make meaningful strides to:

1. *Make study abroad affordable.* Commit to an integrated set of cost management and financial assistance actions to make it possible for any student who can afford to attend his/her home institution to have a study abroad experience at the same or less cost. Give priority to the development of programs abroad whose tuition and fees, room, board, field trips, and, in some

instances, airfare, do not exceed the cost of studying on campus; build on domestic and international partnerships and consortia to facilitate this. Restructure institutional processes and procedures to eliminate unnecessary practices and reduce administrative overhead. Remove restrictions when applying financial aid for study abroad. Make the establishment of endowments and scholarships for study abroad an institutional goal for private fund-raising. Institute a series of incentives and cost control measures to encourage academic departments to reinvest in study abroad and in their own further internationalization.

2. *Expand study abroad choices.* Expand course and program offerings beyond the humanities and social sciences and into fields such as science, engineering, education, and business. Widen the range of choices in program length, time of year offered, country and regional location, and program types (e.g., internships, faculty-led programs, direct enrollment, symmetric and asymmetric exchanges). Expanding options means diversifying options.

3. *Integrate study abroad into curricula and majors.* Prepare students for study abroad through systematic orientation programs. Provide academic advising that helps students plan well in advance and connect study abroad to their majors and their career goals. Design curricula that prepares the students in languages and cross-cultural knowledge and provides for reintegration on return by using study abroad learning and experiences in the classroom. Closely involve academic departments in the planning and design of the study abroad experiences. Diversify forms of faculty and departmental involvement in planning, delivering, and evaluating the quality of programs. Be prepared to take advantage of what students have to offer when they return.

4. *Enhance study abroad safety.* Have credible, independent and documented safety assessment processes. Commit to on-going assessment of program sites for health, security and safety. Establish authorities to alter or cancel programs. Establish and document emergency procedures.

5. *Improve program quality and program impact evaluation.* All programs should strive to maximize the quality of the learning experience within the stated goals and objectives of the particular program and program model. Impact on student knowledge, skills, abilities, and attitudes should be a fundamental part of program evaluation.

A comprehensive approach to internationalizing the curriculum, as is implied under Title VI, not only speaks strongly for mainstreaming international content throughout the curriculum, and for democratizing access, but it also implies a commitment to deal effectively with barriers to participation such as the five listed above.

Funding Study Abroad and a Role for the Federal Government

A national agenda supporting study abroad development and scholarships is essential if we are to broaden access and improve the value and integration of study and learning abroad to

internationalization efforts. There are needs to shape and support both study abroad program options and design and student access. A federal program to encourage study abroad integrated into wider objectives to internationalize the curriculum would help reduce barriers to both expanded study abroad opportunity and to incorporating the experiential components into campus-based efforts to internationalize curricula. We believe that institutions must also participate in reducing barriers such as the five discussed in the previous section as a condition of participation in the federal program.

The Need for Scholarship and Program Development Support: The prospect of external funding is often the essential catalyst for activating change in individuals as well as in organizations. Outside funding serves to legitimize activities being proposed, as well as shape the nature of change. Our proposed study abroad support program seeks to promote an expansion of study abroad by motivating institutions to reduce barriers and develop program options for students that meet stated criteria. Expanded scholarship support for students is an essential ingredient for success.

Study abroad scholarships provide an incentive for students, but also recognize real constraints confronted by students when they think about study abroad. Unlike students in many other higher education systems around the world, a majority of American students work while attending school and the income from their work is essential for meeting their living or educational costs. This is particularly true for the rapidly-growing populations of mature students on American campuses today. Foregone income while studying abroad is a serious impediment to participation. Modest scholarship support to offset foregone income and to meet the additional marginal costs of study abroad (e.g., airfare, health and accident insurance) is essential if democratization of study abroad opportunity is to become a reality.

Program development grants are necessary to expand capacity in the system to meet the demands of new study abroad enrollments. New programs that meet the criteria discussed below are particularly urgent. Modest funds for new program development will help to expand system capacity to accommodate increased student demand and build program capacity in high need areas of the world and subject matter.

Basic Concepts: We propose creation of a higher education undergraduate study abroad scholarship and development program to support a national goal of raising study abroad participation among undergraduates to 25% within this decade. The program would provide **new** money for study abroad program development and scholarships from federal, private and higher-education sources. Federal funds would be new allocations, not re-allocations from existing federal programs supporting area studies, language study and exchanges. Federal funds would be awarded to qualifying higher-education institutions that would be required to provide equal matching funds from institutional sources.

Planning Concepts for Federal Support

1. The six higher education presidential associations will foster commitment and goal-setting on the part of universities and colleges throughout the United States to expand study abroad opportunities and participation rates.⁴
2. These presidential associations will advance partnerships among higher education institutions, federal and state governments, and the private sector to reduce barriers to study abroad and to increase funds available to support nationally competitive study abroad scholarships and program expansion.
3. The proposed program will provide institutional grants to qualifying higher education institutions for scholarships and program development. Institutions are required to provide matching funds on a 1:1 basis. Fifty million dollars of federal funds will be available annually. Institutional matching funds will come from institutional sources (which could be any combination of institutional, private sector, state and foundation support arranged through the institution).
4. No less than 90% of annual federal expenditures will be reserved for scholarships. A significant proportion of scholarship funds should be focused on increasing participation rates among students with limited economic means. (Specific criteria for all aspects of the student scholarship program would need to be developed.)
5. Scholarship awards from the program will be set to contribute toward total program costs. They are not intended to meet all costs of a study abroad experience. Federal contributions are to be an incentive to find matching support from other sources at least equal to the federal dollar component. Federal support is also to be an incentive to develop institutional goals to expand study abroad participation and to reduce barriers such as those noted in the previous section of this paper.
6. No more than 10% of annual federal expenditures will be reserved for program development seed grants to qualifying institutions to increase study abroad opportunities (and overall national enrollment capacity), with special priority given to one or more of the following: non-Western European program locations; under-represented majors such as professional programs; programs using high quality and innovative instructional and experiential models; and high quality programs with low cost barriers. Inter-institutional collaboration or partnership programs would also be looked on favorably.
7. **Competitive Institutional Awards:** Scholarship or program-development grant awards will be made through a competitive peer-review process to institutions that are qualified to apply. (See qualification criteria below.) Institutional awards for scholarships will be

⁴American Council on Education, American Association of Community Colleges, American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Association of American Universities, National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

made for three-year periods. Institutional awards from program development will provide one-year awards. Institutions are eligible to re-apply in the open competitive process.

8. **Match:** Institutional cash match on a 1:1 basis is required for scholarships. Institutional in-kind or cash match is required on a 1:1 basis for program development grants.
9. **Institutional Qualifications:** Institutions will qualify to apply for scholarship and program development grants that will be awarded on a competitive basis if they meet the following criteria:
 - * Demonstrate a commitment to integrate the study abroad experience into the institution's undergraduate curriculum.
 - * Have a credible institutional plan and commitment to addressing barriers to study abroad.
 - * Reserve federal program funds for study abroad that provide at least 12 semester or 12 quarter academic credits for the student's study abroad experience.
 - * Adopt and have a credible plan for significantly increasing the study abroad participation rate of the institution's students. The meaning of A significant growth@ will depend on the size of the institution's present study abroad participation rate, and the present participation rate of its students will also shape the maximum size of award as provided in the table below. The table is meant to serve as an example, rather than to be taken per se as a recommended formula.

<u>Present Number of Students Studying Abroad</u>	<u>Three-Year Growth Goal: Head Count</u>	<u>Maximum Federal Award Per Year</u>
25-100	100	\$80,000
100-300	150	\$120,000
300-500	200	\$160,000
500-1000	400	\$320,000
Over 1000	600	\$500,000

Once an institution achieves and maintains a participation rate of 50% or greater among its graduating seniors, the institution will qualify to apply for additional awards without specific growth goals.

- * Higher education institutions, as a condition of eligibility to access federal scholarship or program-development funds, must adopt specific numerical goals

for significantly increasing study abroad participation rates of their undergraduate students. In pursuance of these goals they will implement policies and programs to broadly internationalize their curricula, reduce economic barriers to study abroad through cost control, diversify study abroad options, assure quality and integration of study abroad into the curriculum, and attend to safety and security abroad.

* Institutions will award scholarships to individual students for an amount that includes no more than \$4,000 in Federal funds from this scholarship source.

10. Government and the private sector will work to create experiential opportunities abroad for students (e.g., internships).
11. Expenditures of federal scholarship and program-development funds will be managed by an appropriate Federal office, e.g., within the U.S. Department of Education. Peer review that appropriately involves the higher education community would be used in making awards. A national advisory body composed of members from higher education, government, and the private sector will advise on policies and criteria.
12. Individual Scholarship Awards: At the discretion of the Program's administering agency, a national competitive scholarship program for direct awards to individual students can be established. The direct-award scholarship program may use up to \$3 million dollars annually in federal funds. The maximum direct award to an individual student will be \$5,000 and limited to enrollment in programs providing up to 12 semester or quarter credits that will be accepted by the student's home institution.

Summary

Starting from the assumption that study abroad, although widely misunderstood, is growing rapidly and contains huge potential value for undergraduate education in the United States, this paper identifies some fundamental problems which currently hinder the acceptance of study abroad on American campuses. It indicates that interest in learning about other countries, other cultures and other languages is growing among pre-college students. It documents growth in study abroad participation by undergraduate students and a simultaneous decline in language learning. It then makes the case, not only for providing American students with international knowledge and first-hand intercultural experience, but for study and learning abroad as a key strategy for attaining that end.

Although there is a need for more and better data reporting on study abroad, existing statistics are used to describe important trends. These include an increase in student participation, a growth in the diversity of destinations, and shifts in the areas of academic interest. There is,

however, an alarming decline in the amount of foreign language being studied by American undergraduates. This decline is reflected in the study abroad data as well.

With these concepts established, the paper looks at recent developments on campus. It documents the need for outcomes assessment and presents examples of recent projects intended to address shortcomings in this area. Each project discussed is designed to be replicable by other institutions interested in working along similar lines.

The paper then identifies five critical areas for development and strengthening in order to improve access to study abroad programs and to assure their relevance and effectiveness in curriculum internationalization. It moves from this to the development and presentation of a suggested role for the federal government. The new, federally funded, undergraduate study abroad scholarship and development program will play a significant role in the advancement of both public and private higher education toward a national goal of increasing this nation's knowledge of the world, its languages and cultures by tripling participation in effective study abroad programs during this decade.

References

- Akande, Y., & Slawson, C. (2000, May). *Exploring the long term impact of study abroad: A case study of 50 years of study abroad alumni*. Paper presented at the meeting of NAFSA: Association of International Educators, San Diego, CA.
- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Inc. (n.d.). *Standards for Foreign Language Learning: Preparing for the 21st Century*. [Brochure]. Yonkers, NY: Author.
- Brecht, R. (2003). Curricular integration and student preparation for study and learning abroad. In J. K. Hudzik, E. C. Ingraham, & D. L. Peterson (Eds.), *Widening opportunity and commitment to study and learning abroad: Proceedings of the national conference on study and learning abroad*. (pp. 56-57). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.
- Broad, R., & Welles, E. B. (2000). Foreign language enrollments in United States institutions of higher education, Fall 1998. *Association of Departments of Foreign Languages Bulletin*, 31(2), 23B29.
- Chao, M. (2000). *Research on U.S. Students Study Abroad: An Update 1988-2000*. Retrieved December 5, 2002, from University of Southern California, Center for Global Education Web site: http://www.usc.edu/dept/education/global/ro/book_research_chao.htm
- Council for International Educational Exchange (1988). *Educating for global competence: The report of the Advisory Council for International Exchange*. New York: Author.
- Davis, T. M. (Ed.). (1996). *Open doors 1995/96: Report on international educational exchange*. New York: Institute of International Education.
- Davis, T. M. (Ed.). (2002). *Open doors 2001: Report on international educational exchange*. New York: Institute of International Education.
- Engberg, D., & Green, M. F. (2002). *Promising practices: Spotlighting excellence in comprehensive internationalization*. Retrieved January 8, 2003, from American Council on Education Web site: http://www.acenet.edu/bookstore/pdf/2002_promising-practices.pdf
- Green, M. F. (2002). Opening welcome. In J. K. Hudzik, E. C. Ingraham, & D. L. Peterson (Eds.), *Widening opportunity and commitment to study and learning abroad: Proceedings of the national conference on study and learning abroad*. (pp. 13-14). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.
- Hudzik, J. K., Ingraham, E. C., & Peterson, D. L. (Eds.). (2003). *Widening opportunity and commitment to study and learning abroad: Proceedings of the national conference on study and learning abroad*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.

IIE backgrounder: Study abroad for US students post September 11. *Survey on the impact of September 11 on international educational exchange 2002*. Retrieved January 8, 2003, from the Institute of International Education Web site:
http://www.iienetwork.org/index.v3page?pg_v=pg&pg_pid=7706&pg_fid=18644&g=1710&ct=v2pages

National Geographic-Roper 2002 global geographic literacy survey. (2002, November). Retrieved January 8, 2003, from National Geographic Education Foundation Web site:
<http://www.nationalgeographic.com/geosurvey/download/RoperSurvey.pdf>

Riedinger, J. M., Silver, B., & Brook, K. (2002). *Foreign policy: Can America go it alone?* (MSU State of the State Survey Briefing Paper, 02-51). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University, Institute for Public Policy & Social Research.

Riedinger, J. M., Silver, B., & Wallmo, K. (1999). *The international orientations of the Michigan public*. (MSU State of the State Survey Briefing Paper, 99-44). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University, Institute for Public Policy & Social Research.

Schneider, A. (2001, March 9). A university plans to promote languages by killing its languages department.. Retrieved January 7, 2003, from *Chronicle of Higher Education* Web site:
<http://chronicle.com/weekly/v47/i26/26a01401.htm>

Sell, D. K. (1983). Research on attitude change in U.S. students who participate in foreign study experiences: Past findings and suggestions for future research. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 7, 131-147.

Siaya, L., Porcelli, M., & Green, M. (2002, September). One year later: Attitudes about international education since September 11. *Public Opinion Poll*. Retrieved January 8, 2003, from American Council on Education Web site: http://www.acenet.edu/bookstore/pdf/2002_one-year-later.pdf

Steglitz, I. E. (1993). *Intercultural Perspective-Taking: The Impact of Study Abroad*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Minnesota.

Title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965, Part AB International and Foreign Language Studies, as amended 1998, 20 U.S.C. 1121 et seq.