

***Study Abroad:
A 21st Century Perspective, Volume II
The Changing Landscape***



Martin Tillman, Editor

Compiled by the American Institute For Foreign Study Foundation

Table of contents

Preface	
by Martin Tillman	5
The Globalization of Community Colleges	
by Frank M. Falcetta	7
An Effective Consortial Model for Study Abroad: A History of the College Consortium for International Studies	
by Harlan Henson	10
Demographic Factors Redefining Education Abroad	
by Gail A. Hochhauser	12
The Impact of Communications Technology on the Study Abroad Field	
by Clay Hubbs	14
The Role of the Institutional Setting and its Impact on Education Abroad Policy and Programs	
by John Pearson	17
Hitting the Ground Running: The Impact of A Pre-Departure Class on Study Abroad Participants	
by Andrea Poehling	20
Study, Service and the Self-Transformed	
by Humphrey Tonkin	22
Partner or Perish—Study Abroad in the 21st Century	
by Jack Van de Water	26
New Study Abroad Destinations: Trends and Emerging Opportunities	
by Carl U. Zachrisson	28
Afterward	
by Bill Gertz	31
American Institute For Foreign Study Foundation	
.....	33

Study Abroad: A 21st Century Perspective, Volume II

The Changing Landscape

Preface

by Martin Tillman, Editor

Assistant Director, Office of Career Services

Johns Hopkins University, Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies

In the ever changing world of international education, the landscape of the study abroad field is constantly challenged by a myriad of complex forces: from within the academy, by socio-economic, political and demographic forces and by new technology. And it's fair to add, in the spring of 2001, by infectious disease. Witness the ravaging of the British economy by the epidemic of foot and mouth disease (which is impacting both tourism and overseas study), and the ever-widening impact of the HIV pandemic in Africa. Adding further confusion to the policy and program landscape is the unexpectedly steep economic downturn in both the United States and other global markets. Despite growing budget surpluses, projected new government spending at both the state and federal levels appears more uncertain. Study abroad professionals must skillfully negotiate the implications of these challenges to sustain the momentum of their programs, and remain on the cutting edge of social, economic and political change in the world community.

In this second collection of essays by leading international educators, the issues raised above are examined. Frank Falchetta describes the challenges of increasing access to study abroad for community college students.

Harlan Henson chronicles the design of a unique study abroad consortial arrangement providing access to under-served community college students.

Gail Hochhauser discusses demographic factors and trends shaping the design and focus of study abroad programs.

Clay Hubbs reviews how technology has changed the patterns of communication with students and the process of study abroad advising.

John Pearson reviews how education abroad professionals must carefully navigate the internal academic and political landscape within their institutions.

Andrea Poehling describes an innovative non-credit course to increase the intellectual "readiness" of students prior to departure for a period of overseas study.

Humphrey Tonkin explores the transformative nature of the service-learning experience—both on the student and the community.

Jack Van de Water describes the new imperative for developing public-private partnerships to cope with the irony of decreasing resources available for an increasing number of programs.

And, Carl Zachrisson analyzes the recent statistics in *Open Doors* and how these numbers impact the flow of student to new overseas destinations.

We hope you find these essays to be of interest, and we welcome your comments.

The Globalization of Community Colleges

by Frank M. Falcetta

Associate Provost, Middlesex Community College, MA

The “junior year or semester abroad” is a stereotype that is as applicable to community colleges as a 500 student lecture hall. When one profiles the community college student on campuses across the country, we are likely to find a 28 year old part time learner who is working an average of 20 hours per week. This student is more likely to be female than male and is probably a first generation college student. The thought of spending even a semester abroad is a foreign concept to this learner.

Even the younger full-time learner at a community college would have difficulty “getting away” for an extended period of time. This is due to the cost of the time away from employment opportunities. Many community college students need to work year round to fund the cost of their education and lifestyle.

This clearly places community colleges in a dilemma. The need for a broad global perspective is an increasingly acknowledged component in a student’s education but there is so little time (and money) for the cost of a traditional study abroad experience.

Some community colleges have met this challenge by creating shorter-term study abroad opportunities for their students. At Middlesex Community College (Bedford/Lowell, Massachusetts) we have created four short-term study abroad fellowship programs. When designing our programs one of the most important criteria was student access. Community colleges are institutions of access. It is therefore an important value that this access exists for all activities at a community college.

This of course presented us with a challenge – how do you create student access, keep costs to a minimum and also provide a quality program? If these were not seemingly insurmountable challenges we decided to add one more—the country with whom the first program would be developed was the People’s Republic of China. Why not choose England, France, Italy or some other country where travel arrangements would be easy to make? The best response I can provide 10 years later is we had an opportunity and there was significant interest in Asia on both campuses. We had just been designated by the East-West Center at the University of Hawai’i as

an Asian Studies Regional Development Center. Additionally, Lowell the site of one of our campuses, had recently experienced a significant population change with the recent arrival of an estimated 25,000 to 30,000 Southeast Asians. An Asian country became the logical choice for us.

Through a series of seemingly unrelated events, I had found myself a year earlier sitting in a hotel lobby in Jinan, Shandong Province in the People’s Republic of China, having a conversation with senior officials from the Shandong Tourism Bureau. We were discussing their desire to attract more tourists especially from the United States. One “solution” that I offered was what was needed is more familiarity with the United States and a deeper understanding of American values toward cleanliness, neatness, accommodations, etc.

I offered, “It would be wonderful if we could provide training to some of your employees. We have both a Travel and Tourism Program and a Hotel Restaurant Management Program. Why not have some of your employees come to Middlesex to study?” Cost was their immediate response.

I quickly responded “What if we provided scholarships to these students?” Slowly but surely the plan began to fall into place. We would provide a scholarship for two employees of the travel service for an academic year and cover their living expenses. The travel service would provide a study tour for 12 students and two faculty escorts for two and a half weeks. The study tour would include Beijing, Qingdao, Jinan, Qufu, Shanghai and Hong Kong. All costs of hotels, meals, travel guides and admissions would be covered by the travel service.

The missing link was the international airfare. The Student Union Government Association (SUGA) at Middlesex had expressed an interest in international opportunities for students. A presentation of the proposed program with China was made. SUGA agreed to fund the air tickets. They have done this for the last 10 years.

Shortly after reaching the agreement we had to design the program, develop a student selection process, appoint a selection committee, publicize the program, design application forms and much more.

All had to be established. The selection process including forms, criteria (GPA and number of credits earned) and the selection committee were pulled together. After several very intense days of interviewing and even greater intensity for the final selection process, all the pieces fell into place. We had our dozen fellows.

It became very apparent early in the selection process that our fellows were not seasoned travelers. Most did not have passports, many had never flown, and those who had flown, had flown to Orlando. Significant time was devoted to "Travel Ed101." Basics such as what to pack, what to carry on, are hair dryers needed? do we tip?, etc. It was even more important that we prepare them intellectually. A philosophy professor who was very knowledgeable about Confucius was selected. This was important since the fellows would spend three days in Qufu, Confucius' birth and burial place. A course focusing on Chinese history, society, social institutions, government, arts and economy was developed. The course met for 18 hours prior to departure. The fellows also gained insights by a visit to the Asia galleries at the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston, a tour of Boston's Chinatown, enjoying an authentic multicourse banquet without silverware, and viewing Chinese film.

The fellows experience for many was life changing. It was often described as "one of the highlights of my life." We realized our judgment was accurate and three weeks was the optimum length of time. Significant signs of homesickness developed for many of the fellows after two weeks. We also discovered the importance of building group cohesion. Three weeks of travel under sometimes stressful conditions can sometimes cause tempers to flare, and they did.

In response to some of the group dynamics problems that occurred, we instituted an all day retreat which all fellows and all faculty escorts must attend. The retreat stresses team-building exercises designed to build group cohesiveness.

New Fellowship Programs

Since our original program with the People's Republic of China, we have added three additional fellowship programs for our students—Europe, The Republic of Ireland/Northern Ireland and a Spanish speaking country.

The European program is a partnership with the Noordelijke Hogeschool Leeuwarden (NHL) in the Netherlands. Every year, NHL implements a two week institute for 100 students from colleges and univer-

sities throughout Europe. The institute is built around a common theme such as crossing borders or water. The institute's location varies from year to year. One year it was the Netherlands, Germany, France and Italy. Another year it was Austria, Hungary, Romania and yet another it was the Netherlands.

For the last three years we have had a program with a Spanish speaking country. For two years it was Costa Rica and this year it was Spain. This program is different from the others since it occurs in January. The other programs occur at different times throughout the summer. The programs are spaced out throughout the year to ease the administrative burden.

In 2000, we added our fourth fellowship program – the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland. This was an outgrowth of our Wider Horizons Program which brings recent teacher college graduates from both the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland to participate in a program focusing on peace and reconciliation. This has proven to be our most popular fellowship program. Given the Greater Boston region's large Irish heritage population, it is no surprise that this program was so popular.

Lessons Learned

We have been designing and implementing the above short-term study abroad programs for 10 years. During this period, we have learned some valuable lessons we would like to pass on to our colleagues:

- **Access, access, access.** Community colleges are institutions of access. Your study abroad programs should also provide that access. Programs that have high costs or require a semester of even six weeks abroad create barriers that are difficult if not impossible for many community college students to overcome. The program's design should carefully consider the needs and lifestyles of your students.

- **The program's education value.** There are critics who refer to short term (one to three week) study abroad programs as "academic tourism." Their rationale is how can one learn about a country or its people in such a brief period of time? If there is a strong academic component built into the experience, short-term programs can be dynamic, thought provoking and life-changing experiences.

- **Our students are Neophytes when it comes to travel.** Many of our students are inexperienced travelers. It is our responsibility to not only prepare our students intellectually, but also to prepare them to be travel savvy: to understand that packing light is

not a phrase, but a necessity; to always carry valuables on their person, and to also carry one days' travel needs on the flight in case baggage is delayed, etc.

- **The selection process and criteria should be clear and well publicized.** Academic communities can be highly politicized environments. The selection process should be broad based and the established criteria should be rigorously adhered to. If you require 12 earned credits to apply do not interview a student with nine.

- **Positive group dynamics are critical and should not be overlooked.** When a group of near strangers is traveling together, occasional friction between people is inevitable. When assembling the participants consider group dynamics. After all, there is no tribal council.

What does the future hold? Community colleges have been engaged in the global education movement for a little more than a decade. The number of programs and participants will only increase. Increasingly, the community college movement is realizing the value of study abroad. Lourdene Huhra, Executive Dean, Bunker Hill Community College remarked: "Community college students are increasingly seeing the value of the skills gained through the study abroad experience. With the availability of student grants and other financial supports, study abroad opportunities at community colleges will only grow."

An Effective Consortial Model for Study Abroad: A History of the College Consortium for International Studies

*by Harlan Henson, Executive Director
College Consortium for International Studies*

The new millennium coincides with a vigorous interest in globalization, particularly as global activities impact international commerce. One part of this interest is manifested in the demand that more U.S. students gain international educational experiences, particularly by going abroad. Since study abroad has long been promoted for the contributions it makes to students' personal, academic and career goals, these current commercial concerns are not inconsistent with some of the values traditionally associated with education abroad.

It is the contemporary emphasis on increasing participation coupled with the mounting financial constraints faced by study abroad providers, both public and private, profit and non-profit, that makes education abroad a more complex and potentially expensive issue today than it has been in the past. One response, thus, to the pressures for internationalization in the educational community has been a renewed emphasis on the need for forms of cooperation that would allow the sharing of costs, as well as of benefits. While such arrangements have a long history, one finds that ideas such as "linkages," inter-institutional cooperation," "partnerships," "partnering," "alliances," "councils," "secretariats," "coordinating committees" and "consortia" are becoming increasingly prominent in discussions about expanding international education.

As professionals explore ways to provide effective and efficient means of delivering the expansion of education abroad, it is instructive to examine past cooperative efforts. This article will use the example of the College Consortium for International Studies (CCIS) to demonstrate how cooperation can be innovative, cost-effective, participatory and successful. The beneficial aspects of sharing capital and human resources will be illustrated.

CCIS began nearly 30 years ago as the Tri-State Consortium (1973). The three inaugural colleges were SUNY Rockland Community College (NY), Mercer Community College (NJ) and Harrisburg Area Community College (PA). In 1975, this Consortium became the College Consortium for International Studies as it is known today.

The motivation for forming the Consortium had

less to do with now popular concerns like "global competition," than did they with issues of access to education abroad in the early 1970's. They were "populist" in spirit, if not in the strict political sense of "meeting the needs of the common people and advocating more equitable distribution of wealth and power." The Consortium's founders were aware that most existing study abroad programs did not provide opportunities for two year college students, nor for students from many regional and/or smaller four year institutions. The available programs were largely limited to students of means who were primarily from prominent private colleges. The participants often majored in European languages. Cost factors discouraged students of lower and middle income backgrounds, as did lack of linguistic preparation and specialization in certain academic disciplines.

The Consortium's approach was profoundly innovative as seen from the perspective of today's global realities, and it was one of the earliest attempts to broaden the base of study abroad participation. The CCIS example illustrates how an organizational approach can transcend a single institution's hesitation to engage in study abroad programming.

With hindsight, it is useful to note it was only in the early 1970's that a national voice for the promotion of study abroad, the Section on U.S. Students Abroad, was given recognition by the National Association of Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA). It was also during that time that several major state universities began the development of university-wide (or system-wide) activities that would initiate the process of facilitating study abroad beyond traditional subjects like the study of foreign languages. And while study abroad in some form or another has occurred at least since the time of Herodotus (fifth century B.C.), its more "populist" aspect surfaced in the United States with activities like those started by the College Consortium for International Studies.

The Consortium continued to increase membership first in two year and then in two and four year colleges and universities though the 1970's and into the 1980's when, in 1982, it was incorporated as a non-profit, tax-exempt organization.

The goals were clearly articulated. It was to:

- 1) Coordinate international/intercultural programs for students in participating colleges;
- 2) Coordinate and disseminate information concerning international courses, programs and activities; and
- 3) Promote ease of transfer of international courses and credits among participating institutions.

Early study abroad programs were first offered in England, Israel and Sweden, and currently 83 CCIS-approved programs are administrated by 19 member institutions in some 30 countries around the world. The programs are arranged by the CCIS sponsoring member in cooperation with host institutions abroad. The latter may be language institutes and private or public colleges and universities. Faculty is provided by the host institution and students are usually housed with local families. Consistent with the early goals of CCIS, subject matter may be taught in English with direct matriculation possible and with the provision for the study of local languages. Currently these languages include: Arabic, Bulgarian, Chinese, French, Gaelic, German, Greek, Hebrew, Hungarian, Japanese, Italian, Korean, Portuguese, Russian and Spanish. All programs are approved by the Consortium's Academic Programs Committee and its Board of Directors. The sponsorship and administration of each program remains with the CCIS member institution.

The founders of the Consortium were not only concerned with the paucity of programs available to their students, but also with the lack of international educational opportunities open to their faculty and administrators. Thus, in the early 1980's they began CCIS Professional Development Seminars organized by member institutions. The seminars were to provide faculty and staff with "condensed" study abroad experiences. The seminar context might be of an introductory nature to a particular country or cultural area, or it might be specific to an academic discipline or to a contemporary political, economic or social issue. In 1984, for example, Professional Development Seminars were held in Belgium, India and Sweden. CCIS continues the tradition of sponsoring seminars, and during 2001 seminars were offered in Ghana, Israel and Russia.

The organization that began with three community colleges nearly three decades ago has expanded to become a partnership of approximately 130 U.S. colleges and universities with 50 associated members abroad. Membership is almost evenly balanced among two and four year institutions, and the blend

includes rural and urban, large and small, public and private campuses. A wide range of higher educational institutions in the United States is represented. Members continue to offer a variety of study abroad programs which include foreign language study and summer, semester and academic year options. Professional Development Seminars remain a focus and have recently been enhanced with the introduction of a "featured" seminar which provides grants for cost-sharing between CCIS and seminar participants. The Consortium provides a modest, but growing, scholarship fund for students from member institutions, and awards are available for professional program site visitation.

The continued growth and vitality of CCIS demonstrates cooperative efforts can broaden and expand participation in study abroad. Consortia are able to provide an extensive range of programs and a range of program fees by drawing from a large and diverse applicant pool. In addition, sharing costs, benefits and governance yields a sense of "ownership" that often results in greater institutional involvement and ultimately in greater student participation.

Consortia can be innovative and proactive in that they can capture and channel the energy that comes from a shared philosophy that education abroad is a viable and necessary component of higher education for U.S. students, regardless of academic major, prior knowledge of foreign languages, income level or institutional affiliation.

Demographic Factors Redefining Education Abroad

by Gail A. Hochhauser

Senior Director, Special Programs, NAFSA: Association of International Educators

There is no blueprint for predicting success in education abroad programming. How can an administrator plan for future sites, for example, when a report issued in November, 2000 by the American Council on Education noted that while 48% of high school students said they planned to study abroad, only 1% of college students do so annually? What to make of the fact (according to *Open Doors 2000*) that education abroad stays are getting shorter – one semester or less—and access to education abroad programs by minorities remains very low? What are the implications—for education abroad program development—of the growing partnerships between the private sector and U.S. colleges and universities, and the resulting increase in development funds from corporations who want institutions to target certain countries and/or fields of study as terms of their support?

Analysis of trends and factors affecting study abroad in the future indicate that a redefinition of education abroad is just beginning. A study in June 2000 by NAFSA: Association of International Educators, points to changes in the population of students likely to participate in study abroad. Certainly enrollment trends and changes in demographics of the U.S. population will impact study abroad program planning. The NAFSA study highlights the following trends:

- The rise in the overall number of school-age children in the United States, and the resulting baby boomlet, is expected to continue over the next decade. More students are coming through the pipeline to higher education. The U.S. is also experiencing growth in the traditional college age population over the next seven years. This growth insures that a pool of students in colleges and universities can be recruited for study abroad. Minorities will account for the most population growth according to the Minority Business Development Agency. From 1995-2050, for example, minority population growth will account for nearly 90% of the total growth in the U.S. population.

- Incoming freshmen are better prepared in a number of ways for higher education. Entering classes, for example, are diverse in language studies, computer literate, comfortable with taking part in com-

munity service and volunteer projects and have some experience working while in high school.

- More students enroll directly into higher education upon graduation from high school. At the same time, however, students are taking longer to complete their B.A. degree. In 1995-96, four out of five undergraduates worked while enrolled, and one half of these students reported that the primary reason for working was to help pay for their education.

- Students are used to matriculating at more than one institution over the course of their undergraduate years. To the extent that the home institution allows it, students will pick up courses at more than one institution and location. Students are used to travel to different institutions. They are also becoming used to participate in distance education programs.

- Adults in the United States are more educated and are active participants in continuing education programs. While the latter is usually related to work, adults are also participating in short-term study abroad experiences through social institutions, such as museums, alumni organizations and groups such as Elderhostel.

- Paying for higher education continues to be a serious consideration for most students, and the number of students receiving some form of financial aid has grown. This support has come mainly from federal loan programs, supplemented by federal grants, and state and institutional loans. Fortunately, it has become a more prevalent practice in recent years for students to apply their federal aid to study abroad, as long as they are being awarded credit by their home institution for the course work taken abroad.

- Along with demography, occupational trends and educational choices of higher education students are changing, reflecting employer needs in a global society. For example, according to projections by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, from 1998-2008, some of the fastest-growing occupations will be computer-related. Other fast growing areas include legal assistants, medical and health aides, social and human service personnel. At this time, the proportion of U.S. students studying abroad who are majoring in lan-

languages, social sciences and humanities has been dropping, while the proportion majoring in business and management and technical fields has been rising.

- Enrollments in foreign language classes show a decrease in registrations for French classes, and a substantial increase in student registrations for Spanish classes. If students are increasingly motivated to 'learn to earn,' as noted above, Spanish is the 'career' language for an increasing number of students.

The demographic shifts and occupational forecasts have already been incorporated by some administrators in their education abroad program planning. For example, study abroad for high school – and even middle school – students have increased in popularity. These students will participate in college and university study abroad programs, and are increasingly the target of higher education's study abroad recruiters. The study abroad community has already diversified the kinds and duration of programs, offering students an array of short-term practical training opportunities and internships as part of their study abroad program.

The development of short-term programs (i.e., one month) lends itself to more faculty involvement for some institutions. The timing is good for faculty and there are incentives to participate, such as the opportunity to travel, conduct research, receive a stipend and renew academic networks abroad. Developing faculty support outside of the traditional language areas is critical to the sustainability of most study abroad programs. Faculty members can be the greatest asset a school has for developing or expanding programs abroad, or they can be a stumbling block in the process.

Study abroad program administrators are also working with alumni organizations on campuses to develop programs that can be marketed to the aging baby boom generation. Retirees tend to travel, often look to venture off the beaten tourist paths abroad and seek to incorporate a learning facet into their travel programs.

With more students taking Spanish as undergraduates, there is an expected increase in students looking to study Spanish abroad, and thus an increase in interest in programs in Spanish-speaking countries. However, students without language capability are also looking for programs abroad and locations where some course work – if not all – is conducted in English.

Study abroad has entered the radar screen of national and international organizations, with groups calling for greater growth in the numbers of students

studying abroad. The first national International Education Week took place November 13-17, 2000; focused support on U.S. campuses and communities increased the visibility of international education and exchange. NAFSA has recently established a national Task Force on Study Abroad to examine barriers to access to study abroad, and the legislative and programmatic implications for overcoming the barriers. There is also a number of college and university mandates to increase overall study abroad significantly.

The Association for International Practical Training (AIPT), committed to improving international understanding through on-the-job practical training experiences, has recently cited a large imbalance in the composition of their training exchanges: 90% of their program participants are foreign nationals coming into the United States, while only 10% of their participants are Americans going abroad. An "Americans Abroad Campaign" launched in Spring 2001, will examine long and short-term strategies to increase the number of U.S. students in the organizations' experiential programs.

And then there is the mid-West liberal arts institution which proposes to eliminate all classroom instruction in foreign languages. This radical plan would send students abroad to learn a foreign language. The idea is both a reaction to decreasing enrollments in their foreign language programs, and an acknowledgment that learning a language is best accomplished via immersion in the host country. The plan by this college is certainly not a trend, but an example of how institutions are examining demographic shifts and occupational forecasts, and also re-examining accepted curricular practices.

So what does the immediate future of educating U.S. students abroad look like? It seems clear that participants' numbers will increase, in real terms and in the capacity of institutions to better document student participation. Education abroad programs will continue to be developed for a student population that is increasingly varied—by age, background and ethnicity. Programs will be shorter in length, to accommodate the needs of students who work and/or have family obligations and who, therefore, cannot afford to be away for a semester or academic year. There will be efforts to diversify the curriculum for education abroad to attract students interested in education for careers in the new economy. And along with these efforts, program administrators will also look to diversify program locations to better attract older students with the interest, income and flexibility to travel abroad.

The Impact of Communications Technology on the Study Abroad Field

by Clay Hubbs, Founder, Editor and Publisher of Transitions Abroad; Former Associate Professor of Humanities and Arts and International Studies Director, Hampshire College

Before computers there were index cards and shoe boxes. That's where I began. From there to here has been an interesting journey.

It all started in 1977, when my college asked me to be its study abroad adviser. The first person I turned to for advice in setting up a resource library was Lily von Klemperer (editor's note: in whose name NAFSA annually makes an award honoring a young member for their contribution to the field of study abroad). But Lily did much more than help me identify and assemble resources. For many years, she made the five hour bus ride from her apartment in Greenwich Village (in New York City) to the apple orchards and sheep pastures of Amherst, Massachusetts. She was the annual guest of honor and speaker at an enthusiastically attended and festive Study Abroad Night on the Hampshire campus. The next day, she met with students singly and in groups until she answered all their questions—or assured the rare student whose question she couldn't answer that she would go home and search through her box of index cards until she found the answer and get back to them through me. (During these daylong advising marathons, I mostly sat still and listened.)

Without her box of cards, Lily relied on the *New Guide to Study Abroad*, her own selection of U.S. programs abroad and courses open to U.S. students in overseas schools. Unfortunately, much of the information in the book soon went out of date and the book itself eventually went out of print. Before it did, I enlisted Lily's help to introduce a periodical guide to international educational opportunities so that we could systematically gather, update and share material on study, work and educational travel abroad. (I was interested in introducing students to all the ways to gain international experience and adults to ways to include an educational component in their travel.)

While some compiled lists of study abroad programs already existed, none, except Lily's *New Guide*, provided judgments about the quality of the programs—judgments that were largely implicit in what was left unsaid. One of the first things I did with *Transitions Abroad* was design an evaluation form and send it to all overseas program directors for their students fill out and return to me. I then edited the responses and printed my summaries in the magazine. The vol-

ume of responses and increasing unreliability of the sources meant I had to give up this part of the project. Lily, meanwhile, continued to write her own overview of programs: "Study Abroad Advisor."

After I abandoned my perhaps naïve attempt to evaluate programs through questionnaires, I turned to evaluating resources. In 1980, I published "Internships, Traineeships and Work-Study Experience Abroad: References and Resources." A few years later, I connected with a young man in Toronto, Jean-Marc Hachey, who was compiling a list of work abroad opportunities for Canadians. Hachey agreed to share his disks containing all that he had discovered. I could edit and add to them. I don't recall the name of the software, but for me it was a fantastic revelation! The first comprehensive guide to work abroad resources was published that year.

Other resource guides followed, including not only guides for undergraduate study abroad (already being assembled by other SECUSSANS), but ones to programs and resources for high school students, seniors, persons with disabilities, etc. Meanwhile, William Nolting, the Director of International Opportunities at the University of Michigan (this year's SECUSSA Chair-Elect), picked up on our *Work Abroad Resource Guide* and created a valuable set of handouts for his students on all types of overseas opportunities. From this evolved Bill's own extraordinarily rich web site [www.umich.edu/~icenter/overseas] and his selection and description of other important web sites for international educators and students. (*Work Abroad: The Complete Guide to Finding a Job Overseas*, edited by William Nolting and Susan Griffith and published by *Transitions Abroad*, now in its third edition).

Meanwhile, my work with *Transitions Abroad* had exactly the same purpose as my work as the faculty member responsible for international education at Hampshire College: to gather information on international education, evaluate it and share it. Communications technology made this possible to an extent that I could not have imagined when I entered the field in the 1970s. *Transitions Abroad* now maintains an active mailing list of nearly 30,000 organizations, divided into "Programs" and "Resources." Frequent mailings assure us that none of our information can be more than a few months old (much of it is up-

dated directly on the Internet by the organizations themselves).

By the early 1990s advisers had begun to use computers to track and communicate with students, and by the mid-1990s, as Bill Hoffa points out in his well-argued piece on "E-Mail and Study Abroad: The Pros and Cons of Travel and Living in Cyberspace" (in the January/February 1996 issue of *Transitions Abroad*), electronic technology played a central role in international education.

Simultaneously with its appearance as a major communication and tracking device, the Internet became a major marketing tool for program sponsors.

Mark Landon, who, with Mark Shay, started Studyabroad.com on Labor Day weekend 1995, recently told me that program directors as well as students loved the site from the beginning, and that there was little resistance from international education advisers to the use of the Internet as a marketing tool. If a potential client lacked a web site, Landon and Shay would create one for them at a nominal cost so that their sites could be linked to Studyabroad.com. At *Transitions Abroad*, although we never planned to sell banner advertising on our web site, a number of the magazine's advertisers insisted they wanted to be represented there. So we changed our minds.

Heather O'Conner, the Study Abroad Adviser at Bentley College, argues in the March/April 1999 issue of *Transitions Abroad* ("Marketing on the Internet: Using the Web to Sell Your Programs and Support Study Abroad") that promoting your own overseas programs and promoting international education go hand in hand. With a web site, program sponsors can reach a large and growing audience of students, parents and international educators without spending a fortune. Web sites can promote programs day and night and update as changes occur. In short, the Internet is a natural for promoting study abroad programs.

But is the Internet equally as valuable to advisers? In researching the article mentioned above, Hoffa received responses from 40 schools of all sizes and descriptions. Students at half of them reported that they already used the Internet to get information about where they were going, particularly by linking to the receiving school's web site. Once the possibility for students to do their own research existed, students apparently took full advantage of it.

Another respondent to Hoffa's survey, John Pearson at Stanford University, put it this way: Student access to overseas host institution information puts

them "ahead of their advisers (me!) in figuring all this out... We can't control this information anymore."

Pearson thinks this is good (or at least he did at that time). Others have reservations.

Kathleen Sideli, writing on "Technology and Study Abroad: Lessons I Have Learned," in the Fall 2000 issue of *International Educator*, describes five "ironies" associated with the uses of technology in international education advising. The first is that the more information the students have to choose from, the more they seem to resist absorbing any of it. The second, which follows from the first, is that schools have become so sophisticated in their ways of presenting information that students do not easily distinguish between quality and the lack of quality: "One effect of the rise of dot.coms has been that advisers have lost ground as the chief sources of information about programs. The obvious lesson here is that flashy web sites are not necessarily representative of the quality of a program. How do we ensure that students somehow get this message in time to save them from a costly error?"

In my own experience, we often don't get to students in time. Sometimes we may not get to them at all. Compared to my early years as an advisor, I found my last years much less satisfying. It was wonderful to be in instant e-mail contact with students who were in schools abroad where, by working together, the student and I had located the right match. It was also great to be able to talk directly with the on-site directors and hear their versions of what was happening with the students. In short, I found e-mail a boon to advising. But not web sites, not even our own. While modest, I thought our web site was pretty good (after all, I copied much of it from my neighbors down the road at the University of Massachusetts). I thought it communicated what needed to be said. But our students didn't seem to use it. Our message couldn't compete with those of dot.coms and fancier institutional web sites.

At the end of my tenure as international studies advisor, despite all the computers and databases and listservs with knowledgeable advisers standing by, I missed the early days when Lily von Klemperer sat beside me with her dog-eared copy of the *New Guide to Study Abroad* and answered students' questions. Obviously, she didn't know everything, but students trusted and believed her because she had done her research on the quality of the programs. Finally, lists of programs are only lists of programs, whether they're on my web site or someone else's, and the looks of a web site depends upon how much you can afford to spend to develop it.

After nearly 30 years as an advisor on international education, I agree with Kathy Sideli in the article mentioned above (and I'm glad a younger and much more technically proficient adviser than me said it): "Study abroad, although enhanced by technology, is basically a field with core objectives and results that remain virtually untouched by technology. . . .We have a long way to go before we know how to marshal the power of technology to enhance the academic and intercultural components of study abroad."

The Role of the Institutional Setting and its Impact on Education Abroad Policy and Programs

by John Pearson

Director, Bechtel International Center, Stanford University

Institutionally based education abroad professionals, whether they are program directors or advisors, often find themselves playing the role of advocate, historian, guide and persuader as their day to day work and longer term objectives come into contact with various institutional policies, philosophies and practices. To be successful, we often must balance the desired goals of our office with the impact on these goals of institutional forces. As there is no typical U.S. institution of higher education, so there can be no standard set of guidelines that assist us in working within our institutions.

Nevertheless, we need to keep in mind the individual characteristics and peculiarities of institutions. For while there may be national action intended to increase, or encourage an increase, of the numbers of students pursuing some form of academic experience overseas, it remains the case that almost all students who study abroad are, at the time of their decision, enrolled in a U.S. college. Institutional issues, policy and commitment therefore remain as important, if not more so, than national gestures and actions.

However, institutions of higher education are complex; it is often difficult to understand how they operate and difficult to predict how they will respond to internal and external pressures. It is also a challenge to impose a new and different way of doing things. It is therefore important to understand the politics, and indeed policies, of an institution in order to be able to develop and encourage education abroad. Being a leader means, in the manner of how Richard Neustadt described the challenge of being President of the U.S.A., having the power to persuade and the patience to understand, to know what is possible in the context of the realities of the institution.

What are some of the internal complexities that help determine the climate for education abroad and which may need close attention for anyone hoping to affect change? Many of these issues do not exist in isolation from each other; they not only often intersect, but they also involve the same campus players. The following questions frame the complex nature of the academic environment and shape the climate in which education abroad professionals must perform their work.

- Who drives the desire for education abroad opportunities?

Is it faculty driven, supported by an administrative office, or does an administrative office develop programs in cooperation with interested faculty. If the institution has an international mission, or if it talks of being a global or an international university, is this connected in any direct way to education abroad? What is the oversight, as opposed to the reporting lines, of an education abroad office?

- Are education abroad opportunities part of the mission of undergraduate education?

If so, how is this articulated? Is there a clear sense that the institution has clear objectives for education abroad? Or is it just another of the many student related services that institutions now provide, sometimes minimally, and often without much overall strategy? To influence the future of education abroad will mean knowing the history of the program or office: when, how and who decided that education abroad was to be offered at a particular institution is as instructive as knowing the current scenario.

- Who has an interest in the work you do in education abroad at an institution?

Can you feel confident that you could articulate the various parts of the institution that have an interest? Often it is not just the obvious offices and departments that are important. One way to do it is to spend some time, as a staff, detailing all the various offices and units on your campus that have an interest in what you do. Which offices seem favorable and why; which offices seem actively discouraging and why? Are there offices that show a form of "benign neglect" but could, with some effort, turn into your supporters? A secondary question is: Who, on campus, should know about your work?

- How are education abroad opportunities related to broader institutional philosophies? Examples of these would be: the institutional philosophy on admissions; and the financial and educational goals of the home campus curriculum, including, but not related to, language and area studies requirements.

What can we learn from campus admission standards and from an institution's financial aid policies

that would suggest education abroad is a possible, and popular, choice for students? For example, a very selective private institution is likely to accept a certain percentage of students who may already have had some overseas experience which can prepare them for further journeys; institutions whose mission is different may need more incentives to encourage students to spend time overseas. Likewise, financial aid can be used as a strong inducement to allow students to broaden their experiences.

Curriculum issues are also integral to whether an institution might be laying the groundwork for supporting education abroad. For example:

- What are the distribution and graduation requirements?
- Are there area studies majors?
- Do some majors encourage learning about other cultures and areas of the world through overseas experience?
- How secure are faculty in recommending education abroad as a means to meeting home campus requirements, not in a technical, unit count, but rather in a pedagogical sense.
- Does the institution have intentional barriers to education abroad, or are there policies and procedures that indirectly affect education abroad?

What are some of these intentional barriers? It could be the absence of an office providing either programming or advising; or the absence of clearly stated faculty commitment to education abroad suggesting the home institution offers all a student needs academically. It may be that there is a stated policy that institutional financial aid cannot be used to study abroad on programs administered by other institutions. Perhaps the institution allows students to study abroad only on a few selected programs. Such intentional barriers are usually reasonably easy to identify because they tend to be transparent - that is, expressed in writing.

Unintentional barriers are barriers nevertheless; they are difficult to overcome, and often not specifically in place to negatively affect education abroad. These barriers could appear in several ways and include: transfer credit may be possible, but, it is a complicated process; federal financial aid may be difficult to use; faculty may be neutral to education abroad or indifferent; the international office may have minimal staffing with few institutional expectations to increase the numbers of students studying abroad; study abroad may be viewed as a fun thing to do and therefore worthy of only minimal support and little oversight.

Someone trying to affect change on campus will need to clearly identify these obstacles and begin to formulate a list of clearly defined objectives and develop strong arguments to overcome them. To be an effective agent of change, one needs a clear understanding of institutional possibilities: Which obstacles have a chance of being removed, and who might be a partner in removing these obstacles? There may be institutional characteristics, which on the surface, appear to have little to do with education abroad, but, which can be used positively to foster change. For example, faculty may be actively involved in advising and recommending programs, without such advising being well known or understood by the institution; to obtain transfer credit for study abroad, the institution may apply the same flexible guidelines as to domestic transfer credit; the institution may provide four years (or nearly) of housing for its undergraduates—a guarantee that is dependent on a certain number of students not being in residence each quarter or semester.

It is therefore important for education abroad professionals to know the policies and values of an institution, and understand how they affect development and implementation of education abroad opportunities. It is equally important to keep in mind that institutions of higher education can be both dynamic and conservative. The problem is often that they are conservative when we would wish them to be dynamic, and dynamic when we wish they would be conservative.

What are some of the institutional characteristics which may influence the growth and development of education abroad? The following is a summary of key issues:

- What is the focus of study abroad and why is it so? Does the institution administer its own programs, does it belong to consortia, does it just advise, and allow, students to go overseas on a wide variety of programs. Why is this the approach and who supports it? Or is it more the case that it has always been this way?
- Who provides the advising? How involved are faculty or has it been delegated completely to professional staff? Does it matter if this is the case?
- How does the institution define education abroad (if it does)? As a purely academic-classroom activity or involving experiential and service learning? Students are increasingly adventuresome in more than just their destinations; the diversity of their experiences overseas is remarkable: mainstream study abroad programs, internships, volunteer work, ser-

vice learning, intensive language programs, independent research, collaborative research with faculty. Is it possible to paint a full picture of the ways that students at a particular institution pursue their goals overseas?

- Is the diversity of the home student population reflected in education abroad programs? Are older students, disabled students, married students, ethnic students, lesbian, gay and bisexual students encouraged to pursue education abroad?

- What types of programs does the institution sponsor or support? Is there encouragement for academic year programs over quarter or semester programs? Does the institution support the concept of reciprocal exchange programs? Has there been a discussion as the value of one experience over another and if so who is involved in this debate? For many years, one debate within education abroad has been between the “island” program versus the “full immersion” program. This is a simplistic way of looking at the issue as many programs combine elements of both. What is the academic reasoning behind an institution developing one type of program over another?

- How does the institution evaluate and validate its programs? In other words, is there data not just on who goes and where they go, but why they go and what was the affect of the overseas sojourn? If such information is gathered, how is it used? If not collected and kept, why not? What is the process for developing new programs? Is there a mechanism in place that allows for a comprehensive survey of faculty and students—and which incorporates their views along with the academic goals of the institution—in the development of new education abroad programs? How flexible is the structure to allow for change?

Education abroad professionals are genuinely motivated to encourage more students to spend time overseas. To effectively achieve this laudable goal requires an understanding of one’s institutional culture, and also the skills to effectively work within this culture to develop and sustain education abroad programs.

Hitting the Ground Running: The Impact of A Pre-Departure Class on Study Abroad Participants

*by Andrea Poehling, Assistant Director of International Programs
University of Wisconsin-Madison School of Business*

The first day of class in London three years ago, a group of students participating in our business—focused study abroad program did not know the answer to the British professor's basic questions about the European Union, the region's geography or the Euro. Our professor who was observing the class was appalled. We had conducted a mandatory orientation program in the U.S. prior to departure that addressed general study abroad issues such as health, safety and credit transfer. However, this orientation only prepared students for the mechanics of studying abroad; it did not increase their global awareness. We were troubled; if students at one site weren't fully prepared for life abroad, chances are it was also a problem at other sites. So we created a mandatory one—credit course for all outbound students called **International Perspectives**.

The overall course objectives were threefold: first, to provide students with general background on international business and current events; second, to provide students with knowledge specific to their host country; finally, to give students the tools necessary to adapt to a culture different from their own. We recently completed the third semester of the course and are preparing for the fourth.

International Perspectives includes orientation, peer advising, panels, regional briefings and culture shock preparation. It meets weekly during the second half of each semester in two hour blocks. Students are assessed in the following ways:

- Four weekly reports on news articles about the host country.
- Four country briefings, which pose questions about history and politics; education; daily life and culture; economics, the environment and population.
- A final paper summarizing what was gained from the class and detailing what the student will continue to investigate.

Initially, students were less than enthusiastic about International Perspectives, but in the end, they appreciated the course. The final evaluations were filled with begrudging comments like "I expected this to be a waste of time, but I have to admit that I learned a lot."

In general, students considered the independent work the most beneficial. In addition to learning about the issue at hand, students acquired habits and supplemental information they later deemed essential. As a result of the article summaries, students acquired the habit of reading a newspaper or online news source daily. While researching the country briefings' required (and oft-considered boring) questions, students came upon topics they found more interesting. One student researched his genealogy on his own; another was captivated by the story behind the Mexican flag.

We adapt the course each semester based on what we learn along the way. The quality of the article summaries varied tremendously, and reading them inspired changes to the curriculum. Several students exceeded expectations by referencing more than one article for a single assignment or by following a single theme for all four summaries, like one savvy student who focused his independent work on London's club industry, as he aspires to a career in entertainment. But not all summaries were top quality. Some students obviously found an article—often of dubious relevance—at the last moment and restated minute details simply to meet the one page length requirement. I struggled to ascertain the relevance of Madonna's first internet broadcast concert (from London) or weekly updates on the surgical separation of twin babies (in England) to an undergraduate's preparation for study abroad. Our syllabus now suggests that students use assignments either to gain a broad-based understanding of the region or to focus on a particular topic of interest, and it also requires students to discuss the relevance of the topic in addition to summarizing the article.

While many of the students found the country briefing assignments tedious, they ultimately realized that by completing the briefings, they learned basic information about the host country. Working on the briefings raised practical matters that students had not previously considered, including tipping, weather and public transportation. A wildly popular feature of the class was interviewing students from the host country, a requirement for completing several briefings. Students were astounded by what they learned,

and many expressed that the impending study abroad experience felt “real” and concrete for the first time. In several cases, the interview spawned new friendships.

Before International Perspectives, orientation included only a cursory overview of culture shock. However, the new course’s cultural sensitivity training was profoundly influential. Many students assumed they would easily adapt to the new culture, either because of personal attributes or because of their destination. As one student said, “England isn’t that much different than here.” The presenter’s visual aids, stories of international students in the U.S. and personal experiences as a British national living abroad gave a realistic and personalized look at culture shock. The session struck a chord. One student wrote shortly after arriving in Hong Kong, “At first I was basically overwhelmed, but after only a single day I feel like I am starting to get settled in. The people here are incredibly nice and I’m having a great time already. I think that I might be in the ‘honeymoon stage’ according to our International Perspectives class.”

Although International Perspectives has successfully prepared our students for the transition to studying abroad, some problems with course design remain. The greatest challenges are keeping the course relevant to all members of a group whose interests span 13 countries on three continents and providing an overview of worldwide current events. We invited three guest speakers to each provide a 45 minute summary of the economic and political events that shape Asia, Latin America or Western Europe, the regions where we send students. Admittedly, this was a tall order. The lectures were met with mixed reviews, as some students found the material too basic, while for others it was too focused. Far too many students complained about being briefed on a location far from where they would study. We struggle with how to instill the worth of learning about issues happening around the world, and not just in the country of interest. In the future, we will more carefully explain why the lectures are important.

The final paper was a tool for students to reflect upon what they had learned in International Perspectives and to provide focus for final preparations. Students cited the value of specific lectures or assignments, often stating that a topic they once considered amorphous had suddenly become very relevant. One Spain-bound student wrote about her increased understanding of the Basque separatist movement, and implications for her life while in Madrid. A student headed for Singapore not only learned about laws and punishment there, but also the influence

they might have on a society. We may consider collecting the final paper after the study abroad program ends, which will allow students to report both on the value of the overseas experience and the impact of the class.

Our students are not the only ones who have benefited from International Perspectives. Our partner universities have told us, anecdotally, that they appreciate hosting students who are better prepared for living in the host city and adapting to a new culture, and who also can adjust to different academic expectations. I also benefited a great deal from International Perspectives. Given that most students e-mail me for information rather than stop by my office, it was enlightening to see students on a weekly basis. I was constantly reminded of the value of international education and the exciting journey the students were embarking upon. I have used the feedback from our host partners to refine the course and improve our site-specific handbooks.

International Perspectives has proved to be a valuable asset to our curriculum. Our overseas partners host students who have an increased global perspective. My office has improved its services. Outbound students now think about the host country months in advance of the program and are thus better prepared for studying and living abroad. Students view International Perspectives as a bonus: they make preparations they knew they should be doing, but might not otherwise have done. And now students can speak with confidence about the European Union on their first day of class in London.

Study, Service and the Self-Transformed

by *Humphrey Tonkin*

President Emeritus, University of Hartford

In Zimbabwe, I have also become accustomed to being motionless. Being motionless usually feels good, as when I sat with Amai Kyandere on the kitchen hut floor waiting for the water to boil. Sometimes even waiting for a bus that may never come can feel good. It has to do with acceptance, allowing for a slower pace and understanding that nothing is really predictable.

These are the words of an American undergraduate, Perrin Elkind, newly returned from study in Africa. Her story, *Tonderai: Studying Abroad in Zimbabwe* (Fort Bragg, CA: Lost Coast Press, 1998), a moving account of how study in a very different culture can deepen understanding of the self and the world, is a model of what can be achieved at the edges, the frontiers, of American higher education. It serves as a kind of testimony to the flexibility of a system that can expand to include life experiences such as these within its capacious formal structures. These structures are challenged daily as more and more students like Perrin Elkind set out on journeys through mind and space in search of themselves and the world.

If we are to encourage such journeys, we should look anew at the options for foreign study and at the changing patterns of study abroad by American students. More of them are on the move, from a wider range of institutions (thanks in part to growing flexibility on the part of sending institutions and accrediting agencies), and with a much greater range of destinations. They are also going, on average, for shorter periods.

The shift from Europe is significant in percentage terms. The once dominant idea of study abroad as a kind of European finishing school has been replaced, at least in part, by a more eclectic pattern with less emphasis on immersion in traditional western culture and greater emphasis for example on discovering the Americas (the most dramatic increase in numbers relates to Latin America) and on engaging with other, more distant parts of the world (and not just the Europeanized environment of Australia and New Zealand, but the countries of Africa and of east, southeast and south Asia). Such travel patterns put strains on the sending mechanisms—offices of study abroad and engaged faculty members. The need for advanced preparation is made all the more acute by

the shortness of the foreign visits themselves: If a student takes all of his or her time abroad going through the initial stages of adaptation, the time left beyond the threshold stage when the full benefits of the experience accrue, dwindles to nothing. Add to this the fact that the cognitive gap between home and abroad is often large, and it is clear that orientation programs must be planned carefully and reentry programs developed to receive students back into familiar surroundings.

Above all, the programs themselves must be of high quality. Running unusual programs in exotic and inaccessible places requires special skills, a kind that may not be available to individual institutions. Such programs are best left to the experts. The School for International Training (SIT) for example, under whose auspices Perrin Elkind visited Zimbabwe, includes among its offerings programs in over 10 African countries (totals for all U.S. students going to Africa are up by a factor of six over the past 15 years), and in such countries as Thailand, Viet Nam, Nepal, Indonesia and most recently, Mongolia. SIT is also about to start a program in Cuba. Drawing on its years of expertise in foreign study and in work in difficult environments, the School specializes in offering programs in countries and subjects not easily handled by conventional U.S. institutions. Many of these programs involve various forms of hands-on experience, stressing fieldwork, independent study and self-help.

Equally adventurous in its way, though offering programs of a different kind, is the International Partnership for Service Learning (IPSL), which operates semester long and summer programs in some 10 foreign countries in Europe, the Americas and Asia. These programs are roughly evenly divided between conventional study, generally in a host institution such as the University of Montpellier in France, Ben-Gurion University in Israel and Trinity College in the Philippines, and community service in literacy programs, grass-roots community organization, legal defense programs, social work services and a host of other activities. Classroom work and community service are linked in a regular seminar under the leadership of an experienced mentor who helps students process their experiences in the field and relate their classroom learning to their community work.

There is plenty of evidence that prolonged study abroad, particularly when it involves a degree of immersion in a culture very different from one's own, is a transforming experience for many. Leaders of study programs abroad point to the ways in which such experiences challenge received assumptions, teach values and allow students to look at their home-country lives in a different way. We do not need reminding that in the world of tomorrow, with more and more people occupying tighter and tighter physical, intellectual and emotional space, and with increased mobility and easier communication leading to more and more overlap and layering of cultures, young people (and old ones too) need such perspective. The SIT programs are taking students to some of the more remote parts of the world, giving them an opportunity to observe and participate in environments that are rapidly changing and may never again present the kinds of exotic variety that they now display. The programs of the Partnership are approaching this process of change in a different way, by giving students an opportunity actually to participate in mitigating some of the effects of the deprivation and dislocation that can be variously described as longstanding or as products of modernization.

The service learning movement, of which the Partnership is one of the most interesting manifestations, has grown in strength in recent years, in part in response to an expanding realization on the part of educators that uniting theory and practice benefits both sides of the equation: Students learn to derive theory from practice, and to test theory through practical observation. The net result is that a generation of students less adapted to the traditional ways of acquiring knowledge through passive absorption learns in a new way, and perhaps in the process advances its own moral development and the ethic of service to fellow human beings. Service learning has its roots in part in such organizations as Campus Compact whose initial aim was to persuade more students at conventional liberal arts colleges and universities to get involved in volunteer work in the communities around their institutions. But, while it builds on the ethic of community service, its goals are at once deeper and more ambitious: It seeks to make community service not an adjunct but an integral part of formal study. Many of the member institutions of Campus Compact now have their service learning programs, in which they encourage faculty members to develop teaching programs linked to the community and assist them in making the connections.

Community service, too, can be a transforming

experience. Many students, growing up in middle-class homes in suburban neighborhoods, have had little to do with the world revealed to them when they embark on programs taking them into social-service organizations, hospitals and inner-city schools, and they can derive deep satisfaction from combining their own studies with the well-being of their communities. They can also learn new ways of looking at the world, and through the formal learning process, share their experiences with others. Furthermore, while so much of classroom learning is based on competition, community service revolves around cooperation: Such service puts students in situations in which they maximize their productivity by working effectively with others.

It is perhaps worth emphasizing that the idea behind service-learning, of linking the classroom with the larger world, theory with practice, is an idea of worldwide potency. While we can find some of its roots in the long-established American belief in volunteer service, an idea fostered and promoted by enlightened liberal arts institutions over many years—or in the conjunction of education and practice that lies behind the land-grant colleges of the 19th century—it has many genealogies in many traditions across the world. In 1998, a group of educators and representatives of non-governmental organizations from the United States and 15 countries around the world met at the Wingspread Conference Center in Racine, Wisconsin, to review the progress of service learning initiatives in the United States and abroad. A report published by the IPSL the following year (Howard A. Berry and Linda A. Chisholm, *Service Learning in Higher Education Around the World*, New York: IPSL, 1999) described service learning programs in these countries and 15 others—programs linked with teaching (in Indonesia, Israel, Ecuador, the Czech Republic, for example), health care (in Japan, Jamaica, Liberia, France...), community development (the Philippines, Mexico, Kyrgyzstan, Korea...) and so on. These programs include those of individual professors or institutions and also nationwide and region-wide efforts. Service learning, in short, has become an important element in the higher education systems of many countries, and in the academic programs of numerous individual institutions. "I would like not only to study at my desk, but also to go to the place, to touch and feel," writes Miyuki Araki in the IPSL report (p. 22). "Service learning gives me first-hand experience of team work and brings me in contact with people, especially children," adds Ifeoma Nnaji of Nigeria; "I consider this vital because I want to be a doctor."

One reason for convening the Wingspread conference was to explore international cooperation in service learning. When service learning and study abroad are brought together, they form a powerful combination. Students find themselves studying in settings very different from those of their home country, which call forth all the adaptation skills that we associate with study abroad: Learning a new culture while attending to the ordinary needs of daily living, participating in a dialogue with those around them in a different idiom or a different language. But this challenge to their sense of self is not simply a journey of self-discovery, not simply an adaptation that, once embarked upon, benefits them and them alone: It is a means to an end. Students in service-learning programs adapt to their surroundings not simply to advance their own agenda but to enter into a partnership, a compact, with a community needing their services. So there is a collectively recognizable goal and purpose to their adaptation, and the effort that they expend on it has its rewards not only for them but also for the people they serve. The willingness to serve and the desire to do it well are powerful motivators, hastening an adaptation that once a threshold has been crossed, allows students to benefit most fully from the cultural experience. One reason (or so I believe, without benefit of research) why international service learning is so effective is the fact that students are put in positions in which they have to adapt fast, and in which strong supportive mechanisms are in place to hasten the adaptation.

A few years ago, asked to speak to an audience of specialists in international service learning about my own sense of why such learning works, I enumerated a series of points that perhaps bear repeating. Abstract learning, I declared (and as I have suggested above), is easier when it is rooted in practical experience, and the experience itself is enriched when it is linked directly with learning. There are those who argue that we sacrifice objectivity when we allow the practical or the here-and-now to intrude into the classroom, but the objectivity that we allegedly sacrifice may be the objectivity of the status quo, the ideology of the powerful. A classroom in which real-life experiences are analyzed, and in which guidance is provided for dealing with such real-life experiences, may be a messier place than the antiseptic environment of clinical objectivity, and it may wreak havoc with test-taking and unambiguous competition for grades—but, as my very examples imply, education is never value-free. I might add that it doesn't always work, and a system that encourages tempered self-worth may be a better teaching environment than one that simply sorts, rewards and punishes. Teach-

ers working in a service-learning environment may become better teachers of students (as opposed to machines for the unerring separation of sheep from goats) and better observers of societies and cultures.

Far from value-free, education is in fact a journey with maps and compasses: Namely the values of the teacher, and the collective and individual values of the students themselves. The best way to learn the values of sharing and service is by deriving them from concrete, unambiguous situations where the human need to cooperate is made incontrovertibly clear. Perhaps I should add my belief that the right way to learn self-worth is by observing one's ability to better the self-worth of others.

But, of course, there is more to *international* service learning than this, since participants find themselves living in another country, in a minority. The very rendering of service raises a host of complex issues, beginning with a sense on the part of students that they are simply doing what Americans so often do—trying to make other people more like themselves, and exercising their sense of generosity by bestowing it on those they regard as less fortunate. But such delusions of social beneficence are rapidly countered by the discovery of value systems that reshuffle the priorities or build other assumptions into family and community. With good guidance, particularly from in-country specialists, students learn to serve on other terms than their own, and it is this perhaps more than anything else, that they take with them when they leave. Living in another culture and critically absorbing its values may be the best way to prepare young people for the multicultural and globalized world of today and tomorrow—a world in which, despite the rather frequent assertions of our leaders, we cannot expect to live by one standard and have others live by another.

There is a further value to be associated with international service learning: When the students leave their hosts to return home, they leave something behind. The International Partnership, for example, is not simply engaged in providing students with a collection of opportunities: It is also embarked on helping a range of institutions work better and deliver better services—an orphanage in Kingston, Jamaica, a kindergarten in Guadalajara, a literacy program in Quito and so on. One measure of the Partnership's success is the success of the agencies it serves, and so it takes these connections very seriously. It is significant that many of the students who pass through its programs develop lasting friendships with those they serve and with their fellow-workers. Many return to their host countries at a later

date. Some go into the master's program in International Service run jointly by the Partnership and universities in Britain, Jamaica and Mexico. As for their hosts, they perhaps develop a new awareness of what it means to be an American, and some of our better values perhaps rub off on them.

Recently, Linda Chisholm, of the Partnership, prepared a manual, *Charting A Hero's Journey* (New York: IPSL, 1999), designed through a series of readings and exercises, to assist students in keeping journals and in reflecting on their experience abroad or in community service, or in the combination of the two that is the Partnership's particular mission. This wonderfully practical and intelligent volume contains excerpts from published journals spanning 200 years—journals which tell us both that the anxieties of travel and of service have always been with us, and that others went before us, into an often far more mysterious world. James Boswell and Dr. Johnson led the way, trudging through the Highlands, but Jane Addams, Mary Kingsley, Octavio Paz and others told their stories too, and do so again in Linda Chisholm's book. Of all the excerpts, I think I like the ones by Langston Hughes, who at one point observes, acerbically, "Six months anywhere is enough to begin to complicate life. By that time, if you stay in one place, you are bound to know people too well for things to be any longer simple."

That is what Perrin Elkind discovered. And she returned transformed.

Partner or Perish—Study Abroad in the 21st Century

by Jack Van de Water

Dean of International Programs, Oregon State University and Assistant Vice Chancellor for International Programs, Oregon University System

Introduction

These are days of rapid transition in the wide world of study abroad and international exchange programs. We are involved with a proliferation of new programs as “global education” becomes a more mainstream term in higher education.

This rapid expansion of programs has an unusual characteristic to it, at least at most institutions. That characteristic is the negative correlation between increasing programs and increasing budgets. It seems that the more interest there is in study abroad programs, the wider the gap grows between the number of programs offered and the resources committed to coordinating them. This gap reflects the broader issues of public support for higher education combined with the problem of translating institutional rhetoric in support of international education into an increased funding priority on the campus.

The new realities

As we deal with more programs and a stagnant budget, we need to recognize some new realities. The days of expanding programs from a campus base are coming to a close. Universities cannot afford to duplicate programs around the world. That is not cost-effective now and it will become less so as we try to respond to the increasingly diverse nature of student interests. A 21st century university needs to have international program opportunities in all major parts of the world. This requires an infrastructure beyond the capabilities of a single institution. The name of the game from now on is Partner or Perish.

We can see the shape of the future already. The trend is to pool resources across universities to accomplish common goals for study abroad and exchanges. Oregon might serve as an example in this regard. We have every type of program model, from a short-term program in a particular academic department, to a college based program, to a university-wide program, to a system-wide program, to a regional consortial program, to a national consortial program and finally, to an international consortial program. It is only by pooling resources that we can respond to our students needs and interests. There is no way any one university in Oregon could afford to duplicate what is possible through inter-institu-

tional cooperation. The Oregon example is no longer atypical.

U.S. universities seem particularly poorly placed to be leaders in this Partner or Perish world of the future. We relish competition at every level, we cherish our institutional independence and will go to some length to avoid collaboration, even when it might be of obvious self-interest. Despite these traditions, this is another unusual characteristic of study abroad in the U.S. We are running ahead of our colleagues in recognizing the necessity of cooperation and the advantages of pooling resources. This is especially true of state-wide networks. California, New York, Texas, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Georgia, North Carolina and Oregon are in various stages of evolution but they all share the same basic goals. We are:

- Becoming more cost-effective through cooperation
- Pooling students who share common interests
- Diversifying opportunities through merging or sharing programs
- Sharing administrative costs
- Increasing program quality
- Reducing program proliferation and duplication
- Facilitating cooperation and communication with partner universities abroad
- Enhancing ability to attract external funding.

A new trend in regard to inter-institutional cooperation is public-private partnerships. This might be called another new reality. The pressure on resources at the campus level is such that “outsourcing” has become a common term to refer to various types of linkages with providers of programs and services from the private sector to the campus. Here in the Northwest, several public universities have contracted for years with AHA International, a private, not for profit organization, to provide on site administration, financial management and logistical support for a network of study abroad programs.

Another form of public-private partnership involves breaking down the traditional barriers between private and public universities. These universities share most of the same goals and the same challenges related to study abroad and exchanges but they have

seldom collaborated. This is changing too as common interests become more evident and public and private universities become more alike than different. In Oregon, the public university system has formal agreements with four private colleges to enroll the private college students in the network of international programs established by the state system. Once the old stereotypes are overcome and personal relationships developed, it is quite easy to work with neighbors, rather they be public or private.

Cooperation beyond the local campus involves changing some traditional behavior. It seems strange to say, but it involves cross-cultural understanding. Our universities are famous for their diversity. What works on one campus is not necessarily going to work for a partner. Partners need to get to know one another so they can understand their cultural differences and adjust to them. Good communication is the key among partners. There is no substitute for visiting partners and getting acquainted with the local culture and colleagues who work within that environment. Cooperation and compromise go together in the process of forming good working relationships among diverse partner universities.

Another new reality in the Partner or Perish world is technology. New technologies have made it possible to think of new ways of cooperating. Traditional barriers related to space and distance are disappearing. A student can receive information, be advised and apply online. The combination of applying new technologies and working closely through a consortial framework has many advantages. The personal contact at the key points in the process, such as interviews and orientation, can be maintained while more bureaucratic matters are handled through electronic networks. All kinds of creative ideas for new program models are emerging as new technologies become more affordable and more sophisticated. Technology can create a sense of close collaboration over long distances in a way that was not possible a few years ago. Technology also serves to blur the traditional lines separating public and private institutions and, in the process, makes cooperation with off-campus partners of all kinds more realistic. We should remember, however, that it is not the solution to all aspects of study abroad and exchange program coordination, and it will never be a substitute for actually living and studying within a new cultural environment.

Conclusion

International education professionals often lead the way in the Partner or Perish world. That seems appropriate as our careers are chosen because we

value understanding others and adjusting to different ways of thinking and acting. Those same values are what make a good partnership among universities work effectively. If you have not entered the Partner or Perish world, you should recognize that it is the future of study abroad and exchanges and you are well positioned to contribute to it.

New Study Abroad Destinations: Trends and Emerging Opportunities

by Carl U. Zachrisson
International Education Consultant

Overview—Current student destinations

The number of United States undergraduates studying abroad for academic credit continues to grow each year by double-digit percentages. The *Open Doors* survey of the Institute of International Education shows an increase in overall numbers from 70,727 in 1989-90 to 129,770 in 1998-99. As seen below, the past decade has seen a shift in the region of study away from Europe and toward Latin America, Asia, Africa and Oceania.

Distribution of U.S. undergraduates

Region of study	1989-90	1998-99
Europe	76.7%	62.7%
Latin America	9.4%	15.0%
Asia	5.0%	6.0%
Oceania	1.9%	4.9%
Africa	1.3%	2.8%
Middle East	2.7%	2.8%
North America	0.8%	0.1%

The figures in parentheses throughout this article are the 1998-99 totals of undergraduates studying abroad for credit as reported by the U.S. institutions surveyed by IIE for *Open Doors 2000*.

Europe (81,367) continues to draw the largest mass of U.S. students with 78,018 American undergraduates flocking to Western Europe while only 3,349 ventured further east on the continent to study. However, the total Eastern European numbers increased from 1993-94 to 1998-99 by 29%. Russia (1,196) remains at the top of the list, but its numbers have shrunk slightly in the past five years while the second-ranking Czech Republic (999) has tripled its numbers in five years. Hungary (448) and Poland (310), the only other Eastern European countries with more than 100 students, are also growing.

Latin America/Caribbean (19,464) is the second most-frequented region for study abroad, and the 1998-99 numbers increased impressively in one year from 7% to 15% of the entire U.S. study abroad contingent. Total numbers of U.S. students in Latin America have nearly doubled since 1993-94.

In Central America, Mexico (7,363) and Costa Rica (3,499) are the only two Western Hemisphere coun-

tries in the top 15 study abroad destinations. In the past five years, Belize (576) has overtaken Guatemala (355) on the Central American list, followed by Honduras (287) and Nicaragua (165).

In South America, Ecuador (1,273) remains the leading destination with nearly twice as many students as five years ago. Second-ranking Chile (966) is followed by Argentina (731) which displaced Brazil (594) in third place. Fifth place Peru (310) has seen its numbers grow from 20 in 1993-94 with an impressive 64% growth in 1998-99; it is definitely a destination to watch. Venezuela (263) and Bolivia (101) complete the South American list of countries with over 100 students.

The total Caribbean numbers increased from 1993-94 by an astounding 191%. The Dominican Republic (687) and the Bahamas (499) are likely to be soon overtaken by fast-growing Cuba (499) that saw its 1998-99 numbers increase by 172%. Jamaica (377) moved down the list from the first place rank it enjoyed in the early 1990s. Barbados (162) and Trinidad & Tobago (102) were the remaining Caribbean countries with more than 100 U.S. students.

Asia (7,781), the third most important destination for U.S. undergraduates, attracted only a slightly larger percentage of students than a decade earlier. However, the total numbers of U.S. undergraduates in the region increased by 13.8% over 1997-98 and 56% over 1993-94.

East Asia (5,729) contains the only two Asian countries to rank in the top 15 world destinations: #11 Japan (2,485) and #12 China (2,278). They both saw modest growth in 1998-99. The Republic of Korea (479) and Hong Kong (289) grew at more impressive double-digit rates, while Taiwan (165) remained level.

The total South/Central Asia numbers (1,098) increased from 1993-94 by 86%. The leading destinations were India (707), showing modest growth over the previous year, and Nepal (296) that grew at 25% in one year. The third ranking country in the sub-region, Sri Lanka (67), grew at 179%.

The total Southeast Asia numbers (954) increased from 1993-94 by 89%. Thailand (374) continued to lead the sub-region both in absolute numbers and with its 77% growth rate over the previous year. Stu-

dent growth led CIEE's Council Study Center at Khon Kaen University to augment its summer and fall semesters with a new spring semester, beginning in 2002, to focus on Comparative Community Studies in Globalization. Second place Indonesia (201), where some programs have been suspended, is likely to be overtaken by the Philippines (129) and Singapore (124) whose numbers are growing at twice the Indonesian rate. Fifth place Vietnam (95) moved slightly down from its peak numbers, but its numbers have nonetheless doubled from those of five years earlier and are likely to grow substantially in this decade. The growth would be facilitated by the possible establishment of a cooperative Center for Southeast Asian Studies to enrich and expand the curricular options in Vietnam.

Oceania (6,353) has seen its total numbers increased from 1993-94 by 143%. English speaking Australia (5,368) and New Zealand (803) account for almost all of the increase and have made successful efforts to attract and serve visiting students.

Africa (3,672) is the fifth most frequented world region, having more than doubled its portion of U.S. study abroad students in the past decade. Its numbers of study abroad students grew by 19.6% over the previous year, and 149% since 1993-94.

East Africa (1,248) saw only a modest growth of 3%, while Kenya (561) saw its 1998-99 numbers diminish by 7% from the previous year. Zimbabwe (325) and Tanzania (240) continued to show modest growth.

West Africa numbers (900) increased 27% in one year and are up by 205% since 1993-94. Ghana (627), the sub-regional leader and the second most important destination on the continent after South Africa, grew at 29% over 1997-98 and more than five fold since 1993-94. Senegal (154) grew modestly as the only other West African country with more than 30 students.

The total North Africa numbers (402) increased from 19% over 1998-99 and by 83% over 1993-94. The growth was entirely accounted for by Egypt which grew by 38% over the previous year while Morocco (126) shrank slightly.

In Central Africa, the only significant destination, Cameroon (57) increased its number of U.S. undergraduates in 1998-99 by 12% over the previous year and 81% since 1993-94.

The Middle East (3,578) saw the U.S. undergraduate population in Israel (3,302) increase by 66% in 1998-99 over the previous year, making it the ninth most frequented country in the world by U.S. under-

graduates. The second ranking Middle East destination, Turkey (126), fell by 17%. Jordan (70), Lebanon (28), Bahrain (12), the Palestinian Authority (10) and the United Arab Emirates (10) all saw their 1998-99 numbers increase. The shifting political situation in the region produces high volatility in the numbers of students in Israel and other countries in the region such as Lebanon.

Factors influencing new directions

The shifts in numbers noted above are driven by both student interest and institutional opportunities that are made available to them. The growth of interest in studying outside Western Europe has reflected the increasing diversity of participants in study abroad. Growing numbers of students interested in exploring their roots may be drawn to do so in Latin America or Africa rather than Western Europe. A second factor affecting the shifts in numbers has been the broadening of the overseas curricula from the traditional area studies focus on language and culture to include offerings in business, natural sciences and other subjects not formerly offered in the typical non-European study site. Thirdly, the development of internships and other program enhancements has attracted a broader range of undergraduate interests. Fourth, the increasing number of programs requiring less than a full academic year commitment has broadened the appeal of new venues. Fifth, instruction in English has made broader range of sites available, especially in countries whose languages are less commonly studied. Sixth, as the awareness of the need for global education has become more widespread, overseas experience in developing economies is increasingly perceived as a positive addition to a resume. The brochure for the University of California Education Abroad Program launched in the Philippines this year illustrates these key points.

The factors affecting the individual countries noted above as having particularly impressive growth in their numbers of American undergraduates are those with an educational infrastructure which can support study abroad programs. Mexico and South Africa are good examples. On the other hand, growth in Vietnam is hampered by an insufficiently developed infrastructure to support U.S. study abroad programs. The fast-growing countries also have a perceived satisfactory level of public order and are not subject to currently negative political assessments or actions by the U.S. government. Unserved North Korea and growing Cuba provide an interesting contrast at this time. The role of perceptions of personal danger can

be seen in the volatility of the numbers of students going to certain countries noted above in the Middle East and Africa and elsewhere.

Consortia have played a significant role in the development of study opportunities in many new venues. IIE's *Academic Year Abroad 2000-2001* lists 50 consortia of academic institutions sponsoring study abroad programs in one or more sites, and the number is much higher if one defines "consortium" to include all of the public university systems with joint programs. The Council on International Educational Exchange (CIEE) has played a pioneer role in consortial development of Council Study Centers at host institutions in almost all of the countries cited above with significant numbers and growth. At the other end of the higher education spectrum, the increasing participation in study abroad at the community college level has given rise to numerous consortial efforts in recent years such as the California Colleges for International Education (CCIE).

Finally, special funding plays an important role in the development of non-traditional study sites. For nearly a decade, the undergraduate scholarships of the National Security Education Program (NSEP) have provided essential support for sophomores, juniors and seniors at two year and four year institutions to study abroad outside Western Europe. The inclusion of community college students and the emphasis on less commonly taught languages has helped broaden the scope of study abroad although NSEP scholars tend to reflect the general preference for destinations like Russia, Japan or China over the less frequented areas. The NIS Regional Language Programs, administered by the American Council of Teachers of Russian (ACTR) and the American Council for Collaboration in Education and Language Study (ACCELS) have also been important in the support of study in Eastern Europe, Russia and Eurasia. Private sector support from such sources as the Ford Foundation, the Freeman Foundation and many others has also played a leading role in developing institutional capacity and providing funds to enable educational exchange.

The increase in the portion of study abroad students going to non-Western European destinations has shifted significantly in the past decade, but all indications are that the trend will intensify in the decade ahead as student perceptions and institutional leadership support the development of quality programs in less-frequented locales. The richness of the curricular and co-curricular offerings will continue to be dependent on the human and financial resources that can be organized to provide effective support for the venture.

Afterward

by Bill Gertz

*Executive Vice President, American Institute For Foreign Study
Stamford, CT*

Special thanks to Marty Tillman for pulling together this important AIFS Foundation publication.

Marty has a special knack of enlisting the best and brightest in the study abroad field and allowing them to write about what they know best. The result is a collection of articles which contribute to our understanding of the changing landscape of study abroad.

With few exceptions, “the more things change, the more they remain the same.” A recent e-mail flurry of SECUSSA-L on program “quality” was reminiscent of old style, late night SECUSSA reception discussions of the late 1970’s and early 1980’s.

This is not necessarily a bad thing. Burning issues those days included diversity, program quality, faculty involvement and pre-departure knowledge to

name a few. Amazingly, these are still in the forefront of the 21st century vision. Only technology is really “new,” and as Clay Hubbs points out “we have a long way to go to marshal the power of technology to enhance the academic and intercultural components of study abroad.” In other words, technology is changing the way information is delivered but does not affect core challenges faced by students, faculty and advisors involved in study abroad.

It was a pleasure reading these essays from study abroad folks who have been at it a long time. I know Marty from his Lisle days, Gail from IIE, John from University of Tennessee and Clay from my CIEE days in the late 1970’s. They have their collective fingers on the pulse, and it is great to have their wisdom all in one place.

American Institute For Foreign Study Foundation

American Institute For Foreign Study Foundation

Founded in 1967 with the assistance of the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy, the American Institute For Foreign Study Foundation is an independent, not-for-profit 501(c)(3) public charity. The Foundation raises funds for scholarships for U.S. students wishing to study abroad. It cosponsors a special scholarship program for students from the state of Georgia with the Coca-Cola Foundation, using matching funds from the Georgia HOPE scholarship program. The Foundation is designated by the United States State Department as the J-visa sponsor for the program below.

Academic Year in America

More than 1,000 high school students from around the world are placed with host families throughout the U.S. The students attend American high schools for five or 10 months and share their language, culture and customs with their host families and new friends. A recent cooperative agreement with the state of

Georgia facilitates this exchange, supported by the Coca-Cola Foundation.

Host families and schools earn scholarships toward a variety of AIFS programs, including American Youth Abroad.

American Institute For Foreign Study

The American Institute For Foreign Study, Inc. (AIFS) and its family of companies organizes cultural exchange programs throughout the world for more than 50,000 students each year. Since its founding in 1964, more than one million students and teachers have participated in AIFS programs worldwide.

College Division

In affiliation with 18 international universities, AIFS annually organizes study abroad programs for more than 5,000 American students during the academic year and summer. For details call (800) 727-2437 or visit the web site www.aifsabroad.com.



AMERICAN INSTITUTE
FOR FOREIGN STUDY
FOUNDATION

River Plaza • 9 West Broad Street • Stamford, CT 06902-3788 • (203) 399-5000