

Testing Assumptions: The Impact of Two Study Abroad Program Models

Emily Mohajeri Norris

International Education Consultant

Mary Dwyer

Institute for the International Education of Students

I n t r o d u c t i o n

There are many untested, long-held assumptions within the field of study abroad concerning the impact of program elements such as study duration, language of instruction, program models, and student housing choices. One assumption embraced within the field is that direct enrollment (or full immersion) programs are more effective at achieving a full range of outcomes than other program models. However, the field lacks rigorous, longitudinal outcomes assessment research to support this conclusion. This study offers evidence that refutes this assumption.

Study abroad opportunities are increasing, creating more opportunities for American college students to add an international experience to their academic careers. The profusion of study abroad programs also offers a wide range of learning contexts, varying in length, academic content, and degree of immersion in the host culture. Generalizations about the value and impact of study abroad are common in the fields of international education, second language learning, and higher education. And yet, understanding differences in outcomes in study abroad is key to policy makers, educational program designers and administrators, students, parents, and academic advisors.

There are considerable variables in study abroad program designs; however, this article focuses on the learning context. Most definitions of program models (Soneson, Lochner-Wright, & Navari, 1997) as defined by learning context may be plotted along a continuum. At one end of the continuum is the “island” program which replicates most aspects of the American college/university learning context in a self-contained context, a bubble, within the host country. Frequently, “island” programs transport US faculty to the host-country to provide

all instruction. In the middle of the continuum are “hybrid” programs for which the home institutions offer support and services and which encourage students to take coursework offered by the program as well as courses taught by host-country faculty at the local university. At the end of the continuum are the “direct enrollment/full immersion” programs in which American students directly apply for admission to and participate in the courses and extra-curricular offerings of the host institution. The direct enrollment experience often provides American students with minimal orientation, and support services are offered through the host university’s office for visiting foreign students.

Early study abroad programs from the 1920s were created as island programs to ensure the academic quality of an American education in the overseas setting (Lathrop, 1999). Iterations of island programs, primarily US faculty-led semester and summer programs, served 48% of the study abroad market in 2002-03 (Open Doors, 2004). These programs rarely offer experiences integrated into a host university’s fabric.

Hybrid programs represent a middle ground. They largely emerged in the 1950s to accommodate academic calendar, credit transfer and instructional barriers that US students faced in enrolling in host-country universities. These programs continue to provide structured integration into the host-country culture by hiring local staff. Services that hybrid programs typically offer include: cultural orientation, daily assistance, health and safety support, structured cultural activities such as field trips, arrangement of housing and internships or field study, separate instruction by host-country faculty in specially-designed courses, and access to host-country university courses.

At the extreme end of the spectrum, direct enrollment is an education abroad option selected by a minority of American students who study abroad. Independent direct enrollment is a complex undertaking which may jeopardize a student’s enrollment status in their home institution. Transfer of credit or grades may be difficult. This program model requires a highly organized, rather independent student who can manage his/her educational experience without the assistance of specifically-dedicated support staff. Students are fully immersed in the host-country university for all coursework, housing and ancillary support. More students choose a variation of the direct enrollment model, facilitated direct enrollment. As defined by Lathrop (1999) and Soneson, et al (1997), this is a type of fully-integrated model, designed to immerse the student in the host culture and university, while providing administrative assistance with such tasks as course enrollment and grade reporting, and often additional support and planned cultural activities.

While other definitions of program models exist, they are often so specialized that not all programs can be defined within their rubric. The field lacks a standardized taxonomy of program definitions to accommodate the significant differences in program elements across program models. For example, the recent proposal by Engle and Engle (2003) of hierarchical levels based on degrees of immersion in the host culture is useful for programs conducted in non-English-speaking countries, but does not accommodate those in English-speaking countries. Over 30% of the 174, 629 American students who studied abroad in 2002-03 studied in English-speaking countries (Open Doors, 2004).

For the purposes of this study, we define and compare the impacts of two types of programs on the program model continuum: the facilitated direct enrollment model and the hybrid model.

L i t e r a t u r e R e v i e w

Little empirical research has been conducted regarding the impact of different models of study abroad programs. The vast majority of research on the impact of study abroad focuses on language skills gained (DeKeyser, 1991; Brecht, Davidson, & Ginsberg, 1995; Wilkinson, 1995; Waldbaum, 1996; Freed, 1998) or psychosocial development of participants (Herman, 1996; Kauffman, M., Weaver, & Weaver, 1992; Lathrop, 1999; Wortman, 2002). Most of these studies had relatively small sample sizes.

Some studies focus on participants in one study abroad program, greatly limiting the generalizability of results (see, for example, McCabe, 1994). Of the studies which attempted to measure longitudinal impact (Carlson, Burn, Useem, & Yachimowicz, 1991; Cash, 1993; Dukes, Lockwood, Oliver, Pezalila, & Wilker, 1994)), none included comparisons of different program models.

Of the research on program models, only two studies examine outcomes of multiple study abroad program models that include a control group. One of the studies (Wortman, 2002) focuses on one outcome only. Wortman's study investigated students' openness to diversity, with participants of fully-integrated programs and a control group.

In the other study (Lathrop, 1999), students in direct enrollment/full immersion programs showed more significant changes in the areas of career planning and academic autonomy than either the hybrid program participants or the control group; they also experienced more significant changes in salubrious lifestyle than the control group. The participants of hybrid programs showed more significant changes in the categories of tolerance

and salubrious lifestyle than the control group. The study revealed an overall enhancement in educational involvement among both study abroad models, with no significant differences between the two groups.

However, Lathrop's study is limited to psychosocial development of participants as measured by pre-test and post-test questionnaires. Additionally, the five programs selected for the study reveal some limitations in generalizability as they represented only semester-long programs, and the locations were limited. The three hybrid programs examined were all in non-English-speaking Western European countries and the two direct enrollment programs were in English-speaking Western European countries.

Some studies suggest that certain factors—such as the willingness of the host family to converse in the host language with the study abroad student and efforts by the host university to integrate the visiting student into the classroom and community—have an indelible impact on students (see Wilkinson, 1998; Lyakhovetska, 2003; Owen, 1997; Woolf, 2001). In some cases, students retreated when they encountered institutional or cultural roadblocks, spending most of their free time with their American peers abroad in a third culture (Citron, 1996).

The literature review revealed no empirical studies that correlated the type of program with longitudinal outcomes. The dearth of such research may be explained in part by the logistical and cost challenges such research presents. Wilkinson's (1998) view is that "given the sheer number of possible combinations of programs, host culture and participant factors, generalized understanding of the study abroad context seems hardly advisable" (123). However, small, qualitative studies alone will not satisfy higher education policy makers when considering institutional priorities and the allocation of resources. A broad understanding of the tangible, quantifiable outcomes of various study abroad learning contexts is necessary if education abroad is to acquire the resources to play a significant role in preparing America's next generation of leaders to excel in an increasingly global economy and culturally-complex world.

Study Design

The Institute for the International Education of Students (IES) is a not-for-profit, academic consortium which, in its 55 years of operation has provided opportunities for study abroad in some 45 programs in 15 countries. It educates nearly 4,500 students per year utilizing both facilitated direct enrollment and hybrid program models.

IES conducted a pilot study in 1999 with a limited sampling of 10% (N=2100) of the IES alumnae/i population for which there were current mailing addresses (Akande & Slawson, 2000). The purpose was to test the survey prior to the much larger retrospective longitudinal study reported in this article. The pilot study achieved a response rate of 34% or 707 respondents, after factoring in for undeliverable surveys. The pilot survey included open-ended questions that garnered responses characterizing the impact of study abroad on respondents' lives. Data from the pilot were used to expand and refine the questions used in the subsequent 50-year survey.

In 2002 IES conducted a retrospective longitudinal survey of 17,000 alumni who participated in its programs between 1950 and 1999. The primary purpose of the study was to measure the longitudinal impact of specific program features—including enrollment in foreign university courses, language study, participation in internships/field study, housing choices, and duration of study—with a variety of outcome measures. More recent alumni were not surveyed because less time had elapsed since their time abroad, which would have made it difficult to infer the sustainability of results.

A survey was designed based on the categories of the IES Model Assessment Program (The IES MAP[®]), a set of guidelines developed in 1997 to develop and assess study abroad programs. The IES MAP categories—student learning environment, assessment of intercultural development, resources required for academic and student support, and program administration and development—have been utilized in the design of several IES evaluation instruments, including the pilot survey described above.

The 2002 retrospective longitudinal survey consisted of twenty-eight questions, many with numerous sub-questions, divided into three categories: basic demographics, impact of key study abroad program elements, and impact of study abroad on select behaviors, attitudes, and specific achievements. The survey measured student outcomes in five general categories: academic choices and attainment, career development, personal and social development, foreign language commitment and use, and intercultural awareness. Each of these five categories contained between four and seven questions asking respondents to rate, on a five-point Likert scale, the impact of their study abroad experience on a specific developmental measure. Other questions queried respondents on specific behaviors since studying abroad, such as whether they had participated in another study abroad program, their highest academic degree attained, and if they had worked or volunteered in an international capacity since participating in the IES program.

An overall 25% response rate (N=3,723 of the 14,800 current alumnae/i addresses) was achieved. Alumni from the 1980s and 1990s produced the largest response rates of 40% and 41%, respectively. A representative sample was produced by US geographic regions, decade of participation in an IES study abroad program, and attendance across 25 IES academic programs in 14 countries. This response rate was sufficient to estimate statistical confidence at the 95% level.

The high response rate, large sample size, number of years of data, number of US universities from which the students originated (N= over 500), and the wide range of program models, lengths, and locations make the study particularly unique, valuable and difficult to replicate. The IES survey offers a rare opportunity to compare statistically valid and reliable results of the sustainable impact of specific program components on participants.

However, the study design has its limitations. Portions of the survey use self-reported data and participants' memories can be selective. The survey instrument is not a standardized questionnaire commonly utilized by other researchers. These data cannot be compared with data gathered by other researchers using standardized questionnaires, such as the Student Development Task and Lifestyle Assessment (Winston, Miller, & Cooper, 1995). This study lacks a control group. Since there is no control group, the results cannot infer causation, only correlation. Given that the IES alumnae/i pool represents 50 years of undergraduate study by students at over 500 US colleges and universities, achieving a control group that is truly comparable with the experimental group would be difficult, as well as very expensive.

Prior data analyses of the IES 50-year survey results have focused on the impacts of study duration, enrollment in foreign university courses, student housing choices, participation in internships/field study, and language study on a variety of outcome measures (see Steinberg, 2002; Dwyer, 2004a, 2004b; Dwyer & Peters, 2004; Ruhter & Opem, 2004; Norris & Gillespie, 2005). The focus of this article is the outcomes of studying abroad of two sub-groups within the population surveyed: participants in IES programs categorized as facilitated direct enrollment and in IES programs defined as hybrid. In this study, 49% of students participating in the hybrid model also enrolled in at least one host-country university course while 100% of students in the facilitated direct enrollment model took courses at host-country universities.

In this study, hybrid programs are defined as study abroad programs that offer a breadth of student services and academic opportunities. They combine certain aspects of island programs—such as cultural activities, student

support services, and coursework designed specifically for program participants—with those of direct enrollment programs, including enrollment in regular host-university courses taught in the host-country language and access to host-university libraries and computer centers. Over the 50-year period covered by the study, IES's hybrid programs also featured: on-site orientation to the host culture, daily assistance from local staff with a full range of matters including health and safety issues, organized field trips and other cultural activities, internship/field study opportunities for academic credit and use of stand-alone academic facilities.

Results

The facilitated direct enrollment group participated in four programs. There were 173 total responses from these programs, which represented 4.6% of the total survey response. The hybrid program group encompassed sixteen programs. A total of 3,469 responses were included in the hybrid group, totaling 93.2% of the survey responses. In both cases, 22% of the model's population responded resulting in equally representative sampling from both program models. Both the facilitated direct enrollment group and the hybrid program group had participants across the 50-year period.

Both program groupings contained programs ranging in length from six weeks to an academic year. The twenty programs operated in both English-speaking and non-English-speaking countries. However, it should be noted that all but one facilitated direct enrollment program was located in an English-speaking country. (See the Appendix for a list of program locations, by type.)

Unless otherwise noted, all of the results reported are statistically significant at the .05 level, which means these results would occur by chance less than 5% of the time.

There were differences in the demographic profile of each group. For example, the facilitated direct enrollment model respondents to the survey were 35% male and 64% female, whereas the hybrid program model respondents were 29% male and 71% female. Respondents from the hybrid program group were more likely to have had children; 47% of the hybrid group, versus 39% of the facilitated direct enrollment program respondents reported currently having children. Only this latter question yielded statistically significant data.

Career Development

The most statistically significant differences between the two program models' responses were in the area of career development. Of the total survey responses,

48% worked or volunteered in an international capacity following their IES study abroad experience. Of the facilitated direct enrollment respondents, 42% developed global careers, compared with 49% of the hybrid program group.

Table 1 illustrates the breakdown in types of international employment of alumnae/i of the two program models. Hybrid program alumnae/i were more likely to have developed international careers in private industry. This is the only finding in Table 1 that is statistically significant at the .05 level.

IES program participants with adequate foreign-language skills (where necessary) are encouraged to participate in internships or field experiences for academic credit while abroad in most programs. Students in hybrid programs were nine times more likely to participate in an internship or field experience than those in facilitated direct enrollment programs (see Table 2). This is noteworthy, given that most of the facilitated direct enrollment programs are located in English-speaking countries, where the foreign language hurdle is

Table 1: Career Development, Post-Study Abroad International Work, by Sector

Sector*	Facilitated Direct Enrollment	Hybrid Programs
Private Industry**	13%	22%
U.S. government	5%	5%
Foreign government	1%	2%
Non-profit/NGO	10%	8%
Teacher/educator	11%	14%
Volunteer for non-profit org.	6%	9%
Consultant	4%	5%
In any other way	8%	6%

* Some respondents marked multiple categories

** Only statistically significant correlation

non-existent. However, it is possible that this is an artifact of the program elements of facilitated direct enrollment programs, which were less likely to offer internships for academic credit.

Of the respondents who participated in an internship or field placement, 49% of those from the hybrid programs group agreed that it assisted or influenced their career choices, compared with 23% of the facilitated direct enrollment students. This corresponds with the higher percentage of hybrid program participants (66% versus 47% of the facilitated direct enrollment participants) who reported that their study abroad experience enhanced their ability to speak a non-English language, which they have utilized in the workplace. The 66% of

Table 2: Career Development Factors

Career Development Factor	Facilitated Direct Enrollment	Hybrid Programs
Statistically significant results:		
The internship/field placement assisted or influenced my career	23%	49%
The internship/field placement assisted or influenced my career	23%	49%
Enhanced my ability to speak non-English language in workplace	47%	66%
Statistically insignificant results:		
Ignited my interest in a career direction I pursued	56%	63%
Provided an internship experience that shaped my career choices	45%	50%
Allowed me to acquire a skill set that influenced my career path	78%	77%
Established relationships that became professional contacts	6%	5%
Influenced me to get a job overseas	16%	17%
Influenced me to work for a multi-national organization in the US	9%	15%
Changed career plans	12%	12%

hybrid program participants who found their IES experience enhanced their ability to speak a non-English language in the workplace is significant when considered against existing research on the use of foreign language gained abroad in the working world.

Table 2 illustrates that while there were three statistically significant correlations in the area of career development, the majority of questions yielded no statistically significant differences between the two program models.

Results for Program Features

Housing

IES students have a range of housing options available to them. These options naturally vary with each program given the differences in availability of housing at the host university, host government regulations regarding

visiting student housing, available housing stock, local customs, etc. There are several studies which explore the impact of student housing choices while abroad on their language development (see, for example, Wilkinson, 1998).

Nearly all participants of IES facilitated direct enrollment programs (97%) lived in residence halls, homestays, or apartments with host-country nationals. Seventy-two percent of hybrid program participants lived with host-country nationals, with the balance primarily living in apartments with US students.

The survey asked respondents whether they have maintained contact with host-country nationals with whom they shared housing while abroad. The facilitated direct enrollment group was more than three times as likely to have retained such relations as the hybrid program group (see Table 3). This difference corresponds to the higher percentage of facilitated direct enrollment students who lived with host-country nationals. It also reflects the much higher percentage of those students who lived with local peers, specifically – 95% of facilitated direct enrollment students compared with 10% of hybrid program students. This finding also correlates with the higher percentage of facilitated direct enrollment students studying in countries with English as the primary language. This continued contact may be due to lack of language barriers resulting in more substantive, lasting relationships.

Duration of Study

Participants of both program models studied abroad anywhere from six weeks to a full academic year. Facilitated direct enrollment programs were more likely to be offered for semester and full year lengths and one site required a full year of study. This may have affected the results. Table 4 illustrates that facilitated direct enrollment students were more than twice as likely to study abroad for a full academic year than participants of hybrid programs. Considering that

Table 3: Impact of Housing Choices

Housing Choice	Facilitated Direct Enrollment	Hybrid Programs
Lived with host-country nationals	97%	72%
Lived with host-country peers	95%	10%
Lived in homestay with a local family or resident	2%	62%
Maintained contact with host-country nationals with whom they lived	57%	17%

50% of respondents of the facilitated direct enrollment group participated in programs during the 1990s, compared with 42% of hybrid program alumnae/i, the program length data are impressive, as full-year participation in study abroad dropped nationally during that decade from 15.9% to 8.2% (Open Doors, 2004).

Academic Choices, Attainment and Language Acquisition

Of the several questions pertaining to academic choices/attainment, the two program models only differed significantly in two areas, both related to foreign language commitment and use (see Table 5). When asked if the study abroad experience reinforced the respondent’s commitment to language study,

Table 4: Program Length

Term of Study Abroad	Facilitated Direct Enrollment	Hybrid Programs
Full Year	65%	30%
Fall Semester	19%	32%
Spring Semester	14%	32%
Summer (6 weeks or longer)	2%	7%

86% of the hybrid program group responded affirmatively, compared with 70% of the facilitated direct enrollment group. Since most facilitated direct enrollment participants studied in English-speaking countries, the continued use of another language other than English is remarkable. Perhaps they studied another language while abroad, were bilingual, or studied another language after studying abroad. Similarly, 36% of the alumnae/i of hybrid programs reported that they still use a foreign language regularly, whereas 21% of the facilitated direct enrollment participants do.

There were no statistically significant differences in the majority of outcomes measured in the academic attainment area. However, the results for both groups remain high in many of these outcome areas, as shown in Table 5.

A high percentage of alumnae/i respondents stated that study abroad enhanced their interest in academic study. Because the IES entry requirement is a 3.0 GPA and the IES consortium colleges/universities are Carnegie-classified selective/very selective institutions, it is possible that IES attracts more academically talented and serious students at the outset. In other words, the high percentage of IES alumni who credit studying abroad with increasing

Table 5: Academic Impact

Academic Impact Factor	Facilitated Direct Enrollment	Hybrid Programs
Reinforced commitment to language study*	70%	86%
Use language other than English regularly*	21%	36%
Influenced decision to change/expand major	60%	63%
Enhanced interest in academic study	79%	80%
Created interest in lifelong learning	76%	81%
Influenced subsequent educational experiences	89%	87%
Influenced decision to go to graduate school	70%	64%
Highest academic degree earned – any degree beyond B.A./B.S.	55%	52%
Highest academic degree earned – MBA	7%	11%
Highest academic degree earned – Ph.D.	13%	4%

*Only questions which yielded statistically significant data at the .05 level.

their interest in academic study may in part be due to the type of student participating in IES programs.

Cultural and Personal Development

Table 6 shows that the cultural and personal development of respondents varied by program model in important ways. Overall, the hybrid program respondents developed a greater interest in the host culture, while the facilitated direct enrollment students developed stronger ties to host-country nationals. The hybrid model may have produced more interest in the host-country culture due to the increased structured activities, and the daily cultural interpretations/guidance that local support staff offer students. The facilitated direct enrollment result of developing longer lasting ties to host-country nationals may be due to the much higher percentage of facilitated direct enrollment students who lived with host-country nationals, especially host-country peers.

Hybrid program respondents were much more likely to acquire a new and on-going appreciation of the arts while abroad (92% versus 77% of the facilitated direct enrollment students). They also reported that studying abroad opened up an interest or passion for another language and/or culture (61% of the hybrid program participant respondents versus 50% of the facilitated direct enrollment participant respondents).

Table 6: Cultural and Personal Development

	Facilitated Direct Enrollment	Hybrid Programs
Statistically significant results:		
Gave me a new and ongoing appreciation of the arts	77%	92%
Met host country friends with whom I maintain contact	59%	22%
Opened up an interest/passion for another language and/or culture	50%	61%
Statistically insignificant results:		
Allowed me to better understand my own cultural values and biases	97%	98%
Influenced me to seek out a greater diversity of friends	87%	90%
Increased my self-confidence	96%	96%
Enabled me to tolerate ambiguity	88%	89%
Enabled me to learn something new about myself	98%	98%
Served as a catalyst for increased maturity	97%	97%
Caused me to change or refine my political and social views	85%	84%
Continues to influence:		
...my interaction with people from different cultures	92%	94%
...my political and social awareness	84%	87%
...my participation in community organizations	64%	66%
...my choices made in family life	73%	73%
...my perspective on how I view the world	95%	95%
...me to explore other cultures	61%	65%
...me to develop a more sophisticated way of looking at the world	83%	81%
Revisited the city or country where I studied one or more times after studying abroad	49%	52%

However, the facilitated direct enrollment respondents were considerably more likely to have met host-country friends and maintained contact with them (59% versus 22% of hybrid program respondents). This latter result corroborates with the results above regarding maintaining contact with host-country nationals with whom respondents shared housing.

Table 6 demonstrates the large number of outcomes in the cultural and personal development categories that yielded no statistically significant

differences. Only three outcomes were statistically significant, whereas 15 outcomes showed no significant differences.

While many of the cultural and personal development measures yielded no statistically significant differences in results between the two program models, these data are useful in several ways. For example, a high percentage of facilitated direct enrollment and hybrid program respondents (96% for each) reported that study abroad increased their self-confidence. Also, 88% of facilitated direct enrollment and 89% of hybrid program alumnae/i reported that their study abroad experience enabled them to tolerate ambiguity.

Additionally, the IES results offer evidence to the empirically unsupported statement of Goodwin and Nacht (1988) that students become more mature as a result of studying abroad. Ninety-seven percent of both types of IES program model respondents reported that studying abroad served as a catalyst for increased maturity.

M i s c e l l a n e o u s C o r r e l a t i o n s

The outcomes of the facilitated direct enrollment and hybrid program groups were more similar than different in several miscellaneous categories of outcome measures. While the two groups varied dramatically in terms of continuing friendships with host-country nationals, there was no statistically significant difference between the program models' impact when it came to maintaining contact with US friends made while abroad. Likewise, the two program models did not differ significantly in the areas of: meeting spouse or life partner abroad; ability to study abroad influencing choice of college; sparking an interest in travel; and current annual gross income (see Table 7).

Some American students participate in multiple education abroad experiences throughout their academic careers. The participants of IES hybrid programs were over twice as likely to have studied abroad prior to their IES experience than facilitated direct enrollment students (20% versus 9%, respectively). However, there was no statistically significant difference in the results of the two program models in participants who studied abroad again after they studied on an IES program.

C o n c l u s i o n s

Regardless of whether students participate in a facilitated direct enrollment program or a hybrid program, they benefit greatly from studying abroad in the areas of academic choices and attainment, career development, intercultural

Table 7: Miscellaneous Correlations

	Facilitated Direct Enrollment	Hybrid Programs
Maintained contact with US friends made while abroad	56%	52%
Met my spouse or life-partner abroad	6%	4%
Desire to study abroad influenced my choice of college	27%	23%
Study abroad sparked an interest in travel	76%	74%
Studied abroad prior to IES*	9%	20%
Studied abroad post-IES	19%	16%
Current annual gross income:		
Less than \$25,000	17%	13%
\$25,000–\$49,999	27%	24%
\$50,000–\$79,999	19%	19%
\$80,000–\$99,999	9%	7%
\$100,000–\$149,999	10%	10%
\$150,000–\$249,999	3%	6%
\$250,000 or greater	3%	5%

*This is the only statistically significant result.

awareness, and personal and social growth. This statement is supported in part by the fact that 74% of the outcome measures yielded no statistically significant differences between the two groups. This overall result reinforces the need to match successfully each student learner with the appropriate model. For example, since the hybrid model that offers internships produces greater career development outcomes, students should be counseled to enroll in these programs if their goal is to enhance their career opportunities through studying abroad. It also suggests that the popular assumption that students who are mainstreamed into foreign universities experience the greatest academic and cultural benefits may not hold.

Merits of Hybrid Programs

The hybrid program model has a greater, more sustainable impact on many aspects of career development over the facilitated direct enrollment model. In particular, hybrid program participants were much more likely to develop an international career, take part in an internship which influenced their career choices, and continue utilizing foreign language skills gained while abroad in the workplace.

Additional foreign language benefits were found. Hybrid program participants reported higher rates of reinforced commitment to language study and of continued regular use of a foreign language. The hybrid program model also produced a greater increase in appreciation of the arts and an interest/passion for learning another language and/or culture.

In the 50-year history of IES programs covered by this study, twenty times more respondents selected hybrid programs than facilitated direct enrollment programs. In addition to attracting more students than facilitated direct enrollment programs, hybrid programs appear to attract students who are more likely to study abroad for a semester or less, and have studied abroad previously. Likewise, hybrid programs attract approximately as many students as the facilitated direct enrollment programs do who study abroad again after studying with IES.

Merits of Facilitated Direct Enrollment Programs

While historical participation in IES's facilitated direct enrollment programs is a fraction of that of hybrid programs, it is on the rise, reflecting a national trend (Open Doors, 1996). The IES research demonstrates that the facilitated direct enrollment model has a greater, more sustainable impact on participants primarily in terms of continued contact with host-country nationals. Students were more likely to live with host-country nationals, maintain contact with host-country nationals with whom they lived while studying abroad, and meet and maintain contact with host-country friends. The higher likelihood of living with a host-country national may be a factor of housing supply in certain cities over the 50-year period of this study.

The importance of interaction with host-country nationals is noteworthy in light of other research. For example, Carlson, et al. (1990) concluded from their study that the most significant aspect of students' study abroad experience is the opportunity to interact with host-country nationals.

Facilitated direct enrollment programs appear to attract students who are more likely to study abroad for a full year. However, this may be an artifact of one university in this study that required full-year enrollment. In addition, students participating in these programs are more likely to be first-time study abroad participants and are about as likely as hybrid program students to study abroad again.

The lack of statistically significant differences in impact between the hybrid and facilitated direct enrollment models in most of the outcome

measures of the categories of academic attainment and cultural and personal development should be noted. It is a dramatic finding given the assumptions contrary to these findings currently held within the study abroad field.

F u r t h e r R e s e a r c h

Although research on the outcomes of different study abroad program models is still in its infancy, this study establishes groundwork from which others may launch their studies. Additional research comparing the academic, language, career, personal/social, and intercultural outcomes of each type of program model is needed to increase the generalizability of the findings. For example, since the IES consortium is comprised of selective/very selective Carnegie-classified colleges/universities, further research with student populations that represent other higher education institution types, ideally across the same range of decades, would broaden the findings of this survey. Likewise, the inclusion of island program alumnae/i in the survey would provide additional insights. Other studies have tried to include such populations without success (Lathrop, 1999) or have only focused on island program participants (Wetting, 2002).

Further research also could consider if there has been an increase in usage of foreign language in the workplace in the last two decades. It is likely that such research would yield a positive correlation for three reasons. First, over 80% of the IES survey respondents had participated in programs in the 1980s and 1990s, which reflects the national trend of increasingly more Americans studying abroad since 1980. Second, one would expect the workplace to reflect the increasing globalization of our world and the marked increase in multinational businesses. Third, there is an increasing diversity of languages spoken in the United States today versus twenty years ago—a development that is evident in US public schools.

Further research on the unique merits of each program model is needed with the goal of assisting advisors of students considering which study abroad program to pursue. The value of an American program faculty and/or staff who can systematically facilitate students' exploration of the host culture has been investigated anecdotally (Winston, 2001) and via a small-scale empirical study (Smith, 1985), and merits additional research in comparison with the on-site use of host-country staff. The significantly higher likelihood of IES hybrid program participants to report an increased interest/passion for another language and/or culture and appreciation for the arts suggests support for additional future findings on this topic.

The IES 50-year study could be analyzed to determine the impact of language of instruction. Longitudinal outcomes of programs taught entirely in English in English- and non-English-speaking countries could be compared with the outcomes of those programs taught in the language of non-English-speaking countries.

Also, the field would benefit from additional longitudinal research on the impact of various study abroad program models compared with control groups, as a means of verifying Waldbaum's (1996) case study which suggested the intensified development experienced by study abroad participants. Finally, more detailed research is needed to explore the impact of various program types when grouped into subcategories, including varying degrees of difference between the host culture and American culture and the level of personal development of the participant (see Stimpfl & Engberg, 1997).

Implications

The implications of the IES study for the study abroad field are numerous. First, the data support the increased attention to and resources of higher education policymakers and planners in developing and promoting various models of education abroad programs. Second, the study buttresses the importance of study abroad and academic advisors facilitating students in selecting a program that meets their academic, professional, and personal needs and goals. Third, the results point researchers in several directions of additional necessary research.

In conclusion, IES programs of the hybrid and facilitated direct enrollment type, across 50 years, have had significant and lasting impact on participants. The data show that the two program models benefit students equally well in most areas of intercultural awareness, personal growth and academic attainment. There are significant differences, however, in the areas of career development, continued foreign language use, appreciation of the arts, interest in learning other languages and cultures, and continued contact with host-country nationals across the two program models. In general, the study clearly illustrates that study abroad enriches participants' lives well beyond the college years.

References

- Akande, Y. & Slawson, C. (2000). A case study of 50 years of study abroad alumni. *International Educator*, 9(3), 12–16.
- Brecht, R.D., Davidson, D., & Ginsberg, R. (1995). Predicting and measuring language gains in study abroad settings. In B.F. Freed (Ed.) *Second Language Acquisition in a Study Abroad Context* (pp. 37–66). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Carlson, J.S., Burn, B.B., Useem, J., & Yachimowicz, D. (1990). *The experience of American undergraduates*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Carlson, J.S., Burn, B.B., Useem, J., & Yachimowicz, D. (1991). The experience of American undergraduates in Western Europe and the United States. In E.G. Barber & B.B. Burn (Vol. Eds.), *Occasional papers on international educational exchange #28, research series*. New York: Council on International Educational Exchange.
- Cash, R.W. (1993, May). *Assessment of study abroad programs using surveys of student participants*. Paper presented at the Association for Institutional Research Annual Forum: Chicago.
- Chin, H-K., Ed. (2004). *Open Doors 2003/04: Report on International Educational Exchange*. New York: Institute of International Education.
- Citron, J.L. (1996). The cross-cultural re-entry experiences of short-term study abroad students from the U.S. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1996). *Digital Dissertations, DAI-A 57/04*, 1514.
- DeKeyser, R. (1991). Foreign language development during a semester abroad. In B. Freed (Ed.), *Foreign Language Acquisition Research and the Classroom* (104–119). Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath & Co.
- Dukes, R., Lockwood, E., Oliver, H., Pezalila, C., & Wilker, C. (1994). A longitudinal study of a semester at sea voyage. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21 (3), 489–498.
- Dwyer, M., & Peters, C. (2004). The benefits of study abroad. *Transitions Abroad*, 27(5), 56–57.
- Dwyer, M. (2004). Charting the impact of studying abroad. *International Educator*, 13(1), 14–20.
- Dwyer, M. (2004). More Is Better: The impact of study abroad program duration. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 10, 151–163.
- Engle, L and Engle, J. (2003). Study abroad levels: Toward a classification of program types. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 9, 1–20.

- Freed, B. F. (1998). An overview of issues and research in language learning in a study abroad setting. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 4, 31–60.
- Goodwin, C. D. and Nacht, M. (1988). *Abroad and beyond: Patterns in American overseas education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Herman, N. B. (1996). The impact of study abroad experiences on the psychosocial development of college students (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio University, 1996). *Digital Dissertations, DAI-A 57/11*, 4659.
- Holman, M. A. (1996). Cooperation and Collaboration in US Study Abroad Programming. In Davis, T. M. (Ed.), *Open Doors 1995–1996: Report on International Educational Exchange*. New York: Institute of International Education.
- Kauffman, M., Weaver, H., & Weaver, T., (1992). *Students abroad: Education for a global society*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Lathrop, B. J. J. (1999). The influence of study abroad programs on United States students' psychological development (Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 1999). *Digital Dissertations, DAI-A 60/11*, 3917.
- Lyakhovetska, R. A. (2003, July). Welcome to Canada? Experiences and views of international graduate students at the University of British Columbia. Vancouver: University of British Columbia.
- McCabe, L.J. (1994). The development of a global perspective during participation in Semester at Sea: A comparative global education program. *Educational Review*, 246, 275–286.
- Norris, E.M. & Gillespie, J. (2005). Study Abroad: Stepping Stone to a Successful International Career. *NACE Journal*, In Press.
- Owen, D. L. (1997). International students : host perceptions of their social impact on home, school and community. Victoria BC: University of Victoria.
- Ruhter McMillan, A., & Opem, G. (2004). Study abroad: A lifetime of benefits. *Abroad View Magazine*, 6(2), 58&60–61.
- Smith, D.K. (1985). A confluent approach to the cross-cultural learning experience (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Santa Barbara, 1984). *Dissertation Dissertations, DAI-A 46/01*, 84.
- Soneson, H. M., Lochner-Wright, C., & Navari, J. (1997). Program designs and strategies. In W. Hoffa & J. Pearson (Eds.), *NAFSA's Guide to Education Abroad for Advisers and Administrators* (2nd ed., pp. 279–332). Washington, DC: NAFSA: Association of International Educators.

- Steinberg, M. (2002). "Involve me and I will understand": Academic quality in experiential programs abroad. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, Special Issue 9, Winter 2002*, 207–227.
- Stimpfl, J.R. & Engberg, D.E. (1997). Comparing apples to apples: An integrated approach to study abroad program assessment. *The IES Map for Study Abroad: Charting a course for quality*. Chicago: Institute for the International Education of Students. 1999, 2001, 2003.
- Wauldbaum, R.K. (1996). A case study of institutional and student outcomes of an educational exchange program: The University of Denver and the University of Bologna (Doctoral dissertation, University of Denver, 1996). *Digital Dissertations, DAI-A 57/07*, 2908.
- Wetting, P.M. (2002, May). Impacts on participants of an island study abroad program in London, England. Unpublished Capstone paper, School for International Training.
- Wilkinson, S. (1998, Fall). On the nature of immersion during study abroad: Some participant perspectives. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 4*, 121–138.
- Winston, R.B., Jr., Miller, T.K., & Cooper, D.L. (1995). *Student developmental task and lifestyle assessment, form F95*. Athens, GA: Student Development Associates.
- Winston, R.P. (2001, Fall). Discipline and interdiscipline: Approaches to study abroad. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 7*, 61–93.
- Woolf, M. (2001, Fall). Not waving but drowning: Arguments against immersion in study abroad. *International Educator, 10 (4)*, 29–34.
- Wortman T. I. (2002). Psychosocial effects of studying abroad: Openness to diversity (Doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 2002). *Digital Dissertations, DAI-A 63/07*, 2479.

Appendix
IES Program Locations, by Model

Facilitated Direct Enrollment Programs	Hybrid Programs
Adelaide, Australia	Berlin, Germany
Canberra, Australia	Dijon, France
Durham, United Kingdom	Freiburg Germany
Singapore	Kiev, Ukraine
	La Plata, Argentina
	London, United Kingdom
	Madrid, Spain
	Mexico City, Mexico
	Milan, Italy
	Moscow, Russia
	Nagoya, Japan
	Nantes, France
	Paris, France
	Salamanca, Spain
	Tokyo, Japan
	Vienna, Austria
