|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question No.** | **Task** | **Points** |
| 1 | Identifying the writer | / 5 |
| 2 | Making an in-text citation | / 10 |
| 3 | Summary | / 15 |
| 4 | Analysis | / 20 |
| Total |  | / 50 |

**Use this text to answer the questions on Pages 5 and 6.**
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**How Valuable Are Student Exchange Programs?** *Patience A. Sowa*

Establishing student exchange programs is one of the ways in which U.S. and overseas institutions are working toward internationalizing higher education. In general, international education can be defined as activities and programs that encourage the flow of ideas and people across cultural and international boundaries (Arum and Van de Water, 1992; Harari, 1992). In light of this definition and for the purposes of this chapter, student exchange programs will be defined broadly as “the international movement of scholars and students” (Harari, 1992, p. 69). This would include U.S. and foreign nationals, graduate and undergraduate students, and long- and short-term programs. In addition, this definition includes the myriad of programs and activities that enable U.S. students to attend foreign universities and foreign students to attend U.S. universities. This chapter examines the merits and liabilities of student exchange programs and discusses the factors that make for the establishment of successful programs.

***Models of Student Exchange Programs***

Kraft, Ballantine, and Garvey (1994) list three models of student exchange programs: total immersion, protective studies, and tour models. These researchers claim that most student exchange programs are based on either one or more of these models. The total immersion model places U.S. students in a foreign university for the duration of at least one semester but typically for a year. This model allows students to participate in academic courses and experience an in-depth study of the language and culture of the country in which they are residing. The protective studies abroad model “ties students to a U.S. program with resident advisors and instructors” and “the study tour provides an overview of a topic or of a country” (p. 27). The study tour is usually short in duration, lasting from about two weeks to a summer. These models, the authors state, are neither mutually exclusive nor in conflict; the semester at sea program, for example, encompasses all three models.

***Goals and Missions of Student Exchange Programs***

The various goals and missions of students and institutions of higher education determine the model variety and the scope of student exchange programs. Goodwin and Nacht (1988) state that the goals of student exchange programs can range from being a grand tour to exploring one’s roots to improving international relations. Kraft, Ballantine, and Garvey (1994) note that although programs in both the United States and Europe (France, Germany, Sweden, and the United Kingdom) have the goals of improved language skills and communication with foreigners, the U.S. programs also tend to focus on individual development and international understanding. Similarly, the Council on International Educational Exchange (2001) states that its goals are to promote peaceful cooperation between countries, to help individuals gain insight into their societies and those of other countries, and to enable students to learn new skills. The Fulbright/International Institute of Education (Fulbright/IIE), which offers a variety of programs for U.S. and foreign nationals, has the goal of “creating a better world community” through “investing in people” (p. 1). Institutions of higher education and state governments also see student exchange programs as a vital way of competing in the global market place and maintaining U.S. economic strength. Fugate and Jefferson (2001) state that the academic community has fallen behind in preparing students to be “global citizens” who can compete with other nations and work and live in different countries. To prepare students for the international workforce, the Fulbright/IIE created the Work Abroad Program, which authorizes current students and recent graduates to work in countries such as Australia, Canada, Costa Rica, Great Britain, France, Ireland, and New Zealand (Meyers, 2001). In 1997, almost 5,700 American students participated in this program, which gives students the opportunity to experience total immersion through living and working in another country. Other goals of student exchange programs are helping to improve the lives of people in developing countries through technical assistance, educational cooperation programs (Arum and Van de Water, 1992), or international service-learning. For example, students from Mennonite institutions such as Goshen College are required to spend a semester abroad in developing countries in Africa, the Caribbean, Central America, and Europe (Racette, 1996).

***Merits of Student Exchange Programs***

According to the research literature, the benefits of student exchange programs are many and varied. Research from the 1950s primarily focused on the effects of exchange programs with respect to students and regarding “cross-cultural interactions . . . the increase in knowledge and language skills of other countries and changes in attitudes and career goals” (Kraft, Ballantine, and Garvey, 1994, p. 29). These researchers found that students who participated in exchange programs were more reflective, more prepared to help others, more knowledgeable with respect to international affairs, and more self-confident. Nevertheless, with respect to the attitude toward the host country, researchers cited in Kraft and others state that although there was increased understanding, student attitudes were not necessarily positive. No matter the focus of study, however, the majority of research points to the fact that student exchange programs are a valuable and crucial component in internationalizing colleges and universities. Holman (2001) divides the merits of student exchange programs into educational and organizational benefits. The former consists of personal development, increased language proficiency, and the cultivation of a “comparative perspective and cross-cultural understanding” (p. 1). The latter comprises student recruitment, alumni giving, and faculty development. The majority of organizations and universities, however, tend to place more emphasis on the educational benefits of student exchange programs. The American Council on Education (2001) for example focuses on the improvement and development of foreign affairs. The ACE states that student exchange programs provide Americans with the experience of living in a foreign culture and foreign students with an understanding and appreciation of U.S. cultures and systems. In addition, exchange programs can be the means of developing personal relationships that can be helpful in international relations. The council states: The personal relationships that develop in such programs contribute to a web of interconnectedness and trust that links our country with the rest of the world. Because exchange programs involve so many people who become leaders in their own countries, they are among our most effective tools for advancing our national interests in foreign affairs. [p. 340] The Fulbright/IIE organization, which has been successful in sustaining international exchange, also cites the merits of these programs with respect to international relations. The more than 200,000 foreign Fulbright alumni are leaders in all sectors of their countries. These alumni, the organization notes, can work to forge stronger relationships between the U.S. and their countries. Exchange programs also help support the U.S. economy. Foreign student enrollment, for instance, has created more than 100,000 American jobs, and the nation’s universities and colleges are the fifth-largest exporter of services. According to NAFSA: Association of International Educators (n.d.), during the 1999–2000 academic year, foreign students “brought almost $12.3 billion into the U.S economy” (p. 1). Furthermore, foreign students can contribute to enriching the curricula and culture of colleges and universities. Exchange programs that send U.S. scholars and students abroad have assisted developing countries in areas such as health, the environment, and agriculture. Research in these and other areas has enabled world institutions of higher education to forge partnerships and strengthen collaborative efforts with each other (Jenkins, 1996). Racette (1996) maintains that student exchange programs have the potential “to give students an intensive understanding of the environmental and social problems mounting in the non-industrial world as well as of their global implications” (p. 32). She also suggests that it is vital for U.S. students to have experiences in developing countries because “these experiences can also lead to developing tools of peaceful coexistence within America” (p. 32) with respect to understanding and living with immigrants. Ultimately then, international exchange programs can be beneficial to all countries involved.

***Liabilities of Student Exchange Programs***

The idea of international student exchange is an excellent one and can be said to have liabilities only inasmuch as students fail to participate in exchanges, programs fail, or program or student goals are not met due to factors such as the costliness of programs, the disruption of the traditional academic cycle, the length of the programs, poor institutional linkages, the lack of equal two-way exchanges with developing countries, and the poor preparation of students. Despite increases in the number of American students studying abroad, statistics on student exchange programs indicate that, on the whole, very few American students participate in these programs. Goodman (2001) and Christie (1999) state that less than 1 percent of all Americans enrolled in higher education study abroad. The problem of the lack of American student participation in exchange programs frequently stems from the U.S. higher education system. The literature indicates that students do not participate in these programs because they are frequently not given academic credit and feel that going abroad will lengthen their studies. Faculty members often discourage students because they feel that leaving in the junior year will “disrupt the traditional academic cycle” (Marcum, 2001, p. 1). A lack of information about and variety in programs may also lead to poor participation. Student exchanges can be expensive in that students may have to pay for personal expenses, travel, and housing costs. Staying in cities like London or Paris can be very costly. These factors discourage students and have the consequence of attracting middle- and upper-income students and eliminating lower-income students, leading to little diversity among students who study abroad. Student exchange can also be costly for institutions of higher education in developing countries that might not have the resources to match institutions in the West. The lack of resources, as well as poor management and miscommunication, may also lead to weak institutional linkages, which can again affect the success of programs (Jenkins, 1996). Although the numbers of students participating in exchange programs in developing countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin America have increased (American Council on Education, 2001), the majority of U.S. students still go to Europe (National Association of Foreign Student Advisors [NAFSA], 2001). Jenkins (1996) asserts that “developing countries are poorly represented in student exchange and study abroad programs” (p. 9) because areas such as sub-Saharan Africa have very few educational resources and opportunities.

***Establishing Exchange Programs***

To establish and maintain successful student exchange programs, universities and colleges first have to analyze their strengths and weaknesses and ascertain that they have the resources, financial and otherwise, to institute a program and sustain it for a lengthy period of time (Jenkins, 1996). In addition, presidents, administrators, faculty, and the university communities need to ensure that their goals for the programs are in line with the mission of the institution. A unity of mission and purpose among stakeholders should lead to the establishment of strong programs that are fully integrated into university curricula and life. These stakeholders, especially the administrators, have to be cognizant of the factors that have led to the success of existing programs. Essentially then, the literature indicates that to establish successful programs, universities need to focus on best practices, thereby avoiding the liabilities stated in the previous section. Moreover, to establish successful programs, universities need to diversify and tailor student exchanges to the needs of their students. Florida State University’s Beyond Borders offers short programs of a week to two weeks in Europe, the West Indies, and Latin America (Christie, 1999). Although the stay is short, total immersion is achieved through living with host families and performing community service. Christie notes that short-term programs are valuable to students who need to complete their degrees within a certain time. Moreover, these programs frequently serve as catalysts and heighten the desire of students to go abroad again for longer periods of time. For students who do not have the means, the three-to six-month Fulbright/IIE Work Abroad Program, for example, is cost-effective in that students are employed and can pay their own expenses (Meyers, 2001). To overcome inflexible curricular requirements, and to encourage the participation of non-traditional students and students in underrepresented areas such as the sciences and engineering, Marcum (2001) recommends that colleges and universities offer these students the opportunity to participate in short-term programming. For example, they could go abroad over two summers or for two weeks. Other alternatives he suggests are developing pre-major study abroad programs, or on-line courses. The development of on-line courses, as well as strong institutional linkages with the curricula of overseas institutions, should address the concern of many faculty members that student exchange programs are frequently not academically rigorous (Kraft, Ballantine, and Garvey, 1994). Wherever these programs are considered to be academically rigorous, students should be given academic credit. Establishing strong and sustainable linkages with institutions abroad is also vital in instituting successful student exchange programs. Linkages between institutions can be made strong through effective program design, which, as Jenkins (1996) asserts, provides a “way to set priorities, encourage open communication, and establish a working environment that recognizes the impact of organizational history and organizational culture” (p. 13). In the case of developing countries, both sides also need to understand and work to avoid the political and economic issues, as well as institutional resources that might cause problems and prevent the maintenance of successful programs (Jenkins, 1996). Program designs should also include thorough orientation programs for both U.S. and foreign students. These programs can help students understand and deal with culture shock and prepare them for living and working in a different culture. Collaboration through state-wide, regional, federal, or international consortia can also help establish successful student exchange programs (Jenkins 1996; Pickert, 1992). Using consortia, Pickert (1992) notes, leads to the sharing of manpower, administrative resources, and costs. In addition, participation in such groups helps to further internationalize the curricula of participating institutions. According to Pickert, “consortia seem highly successful in helping institutions with limited resources widen opportunities in international education” (p. 53). Finally, programs should institute different forms of assessment, which can help students, communities, faculty, and administrators examine the study abroad experience. By doing so, stakeholders can determine whether their goals have been achieved.

***Conclusion***

The concept of student exchange goes far back in human history. Scholars, students, and institutions of higher education then and now realize the importance of forging links for learning, developing personally, global understanding, and peace-making. Currently, people have also realized how interdependent nations have become and therefore how crucial it is to encourage and foster the internationalization of higher education through student exchange programs. As this chapter indicates, the value of these programs far outweighs any liabilities they might have.
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**Using the text above answer all FOUR questions.**

1. ***Identify which academic writer(s): ONE POINT for EACH correct name (minus ½ a point for a spelling mistake).***

a. formulated the definition of student exchange programs which is used in this text: **HARARI**

b. claimed that United States academia needs to do more to prepare students to be global in their outlook: **FUGATE & JEFFERSON**

c. described one instance of international service learning: **RACETTE**

d. explained how research and aid programs in areas such as food production have promoted international collaboration between universities: **JENKINS**

e. stated that many US students are discouraged from participating in exchange programs: **MARCUM**

1. ***TWO points per sentence: ½ point for the correct author; ½ point for each correct year (which must be correctly formatted in brackets); 1 point for a grammatically correct paraphrase that has kept the meaning (just ½ point for a grammatically nearly correct paraphrase that has kept the meaning)***
   1. (In ***Models of Student Exchange Programs***) “*the study tour provides an overview of a topic or of a country*” **Kraft, Ballantine and Garvey (1994) explain that study tours give a broad picture of a subject or a region.**
   2. (In ***Goals and Missions of Student Exchange Programs***) “*The various goals and missions of students and institutions of higher education determine the model variety and the scope of student exchange programs*.” **Sowa (2002) states that the type of program is determined by the aims of students and institutions.**
   3. (In ***Merits of Student Exchange Programs***) “*these experiences can also lead to developing tools of peaceful coexistence within America*” **Racette (1996) suggests that experiences in developing countries can help people live together in America.**
   4. (In ***Liabilities of Student Exchange Programs***) “*developing countries are poorly represented in student exchange and study abroad programs*” **Jenkins (1996) states that there are not many developing countries in exchange programs.**
   5. (In ***Conclusion***) “ … *the value of these programs far outweighs any liabilities they might have*.” **Sowa (2002) concludes that the merits of exchange programs are much more important than their liabilities.**
2. ***Write a summary of the chapter in 130 – 170 words. 15 POINTS:***

***Up to 5 points for an appropriate structure as follows***

* 1. A framing sentence (along the lines of): This chapter/text discusses/analyses/describes advantages and disadvantages of student exchange programs and explains / outlines elements of the establishment of successful programs;
  2. A sentence-long classification of the 3 models;
  3. A sentence-long summary of the goals/missions
  4. Sentence-long list of some main point merits;
  5. Sentence-long list of some main point liabilities
  6. Sentence-long list of factors such as aims/resources/good practice.

***0 Did not attempt the question***

***(If the summary is clearly too short/long award no more than 3 points)***

***Up to 5 points for language use and correctness:***

***5/4.5 Very easy to read and grammatically correct***

***4/3.5 Comprehensible and grammatically correct OR Very easy to read with odd grammatical slips***

***3/2.5 The reader has to work to extract meaning, because of sub-optimal syntax or sub-optimal lexis***

***2/1.5 The reader has to work very hard to extract meaning because of (in addition to sub-optimal syntax or sub-optimal lexis) problems such as deficient signalling, other vagueness, irrelevance (or padding), repetition.***

***(1)/0.5 It is (almost) impossible for the reader to extract meaning***

***0 Did not attempt the question***

1. ***In between 700 and 1000 words, explain to what extent the analysis in the text is applicable to the Erasmus exchange program that you would like to qualify for***. (*You may request extra sheets of paper*)

20 points, as follows:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Requirement** | **Maximum points** | **Partial points?** | |
| A*n appropriate* **Title** | 1 pt | All or nothing | |
| An appropriate **Introduction** | 4 pts | Up to 2 points for statement of student’s own Erasmus aim | |
| Up to 2 points for a statement of how the student’s answer will be organized. | |
| An appropriate **Conclusion** | 2 pts | All or nothing | |
| Appropriate use of **conventions** | 3 pts | 1 point for an overall register that is academic (lexis and syntax) ***All or Nothing*** | |
| 1 point for use of citations ***All or Nothing*** | |
| 1 point for a references list ***All or Nothing*** | |
| **Content** | | **Points (Max: 10)** | |
| Although this is not an exhaustive list, and students will be given credit for all reasonable points, these are relevant points that students would be expected to make:  ***General***: The chapter is about US students not students in Turkey.  ***Models***: The Erasmus exchange program fits the description in the text of an immersion program: no resident instructors or administrators (from the home country)  ***Aims***: Like in the description, students on an Erasmus Program (EP) would aim to improve their language and communication skills;  Like in the description, students on an EP would look for opportunities for (other) individual development;  The EP also has aims in the area of international understanding and cooperation;  Unlike the chapter, the EP has no aims to improve the lives of people in developing countries or to provide service learning.  ***Merits***: The EP like the programs described in the chapter promotes personal development: both improved language performance and cross-cultural understanding;  Like in the US, there may be institutional benefits (students attracted by the idea of the EP may more readily enrol to a university that offers it)  Like in the description of benefits to the US, it is possible that Turkey too may benefit EP may benefit from increased interconnectivity with other countries that comes from exchange programs such as the EP  Whereas servicing incoming exchange students to the US is a huge sector (100, 000 jobs) there is nothing comparable in Turkey;  Like US institutions described, Turkish universities may benefit from the academic collaboration that the EP can promote.  ***Liabilities***: In the US, there seems to be little appetite for exchange programs ≠ Turkey/Abdullah Gul University;  The success of programs everywhere is limited by the risk of poor student preparation;  A liability in US programs is that in many cases students are sent t particular centres such as the big capitals, whereas the EP aims to send students to all corners of Europe. In the same way that US students on exchanges tend to go to Europe, students on EPs focus on Europe.  Establishing exchange programs:  The description of important principles for the establishment of successful programs for US students would seem to be universal. | | (Almost) total coverage of the scope and particular points listed left | 10 |
| (9) |
| (Just about) sufficient coverage for the answer to be an interesting read | 8 |
| (7) |
| Coverage of (more than) half of the scope and particular points listed left, but with vagueness and or repetition | (6) |
| 5 |
| Coverage of significantly less than half of the required scope and salient points | 4 |
| 3 |
| Very little successful engagement with the salient points | 2 |
| 1 |
| 0 |