

Henk Dekker
Marga Oostindie
Dan Hester

15	<i>International Political Socialization Through an International Joint Study Program</i>	231
15.1	Abstract	231
15.2	International Political Socialization	232
15.3	Study Abroad Programs	233
15.3.1	Types	233
15.3.2	Motives	234
15.3.3	Goals	235
15.3.5	Participation	238
15.3.6	Effectiveness Research	239
15.3.7	Effects	240
15.4	Research Design	242
15.5	Effects	244
15.5.1	Effects on US Students	244
15.5.2	Effects on the NL Students	246
15.6	Perceptions	248
15.7	Conclusion	249
15.8	References	251

15 *International Political Socialization Through an International Joint Study Program*

15.1 Abstract

International joint study programs (IJSP) will be an increasing part of the future political education curriculum. The question is whether or not IJSPs have their intended impacts on participants' international political competence levels. In this chapter, a Dutch/US IJSP is the object of study. This IJSP included a group of 26 students from the University of Groningen in

the Netherlands (14 students) and from Harvard University in the United States (12 students). The effects were measured through two types of analysis: test questions and questions about perceptions of influence. The pre- and post-test indicated that this IJSP had a considerable impact on the intended effects in the cognitive domain for both groups. The most obvious unintended effect was a weakened nationalism level among US students and a strengthened nationalism level among Dutch students. The perceptions of both the Dutch and US student participants indicated that the program's impact on cognitions was even greater than that "proved" by the knowledge "tests" results.

15.2 International Political Socialization

The aim of international political socialization research is to find an answer to the questions: when, how, and as a result of what do which people acquire what international political knowledge/beliefs, opinions, attitudes, values, behavioral intentions and behavioral patterns, and what is the relationship of these cognitions, etc., to (inter)national political systems? Attention is often focused on political socialization with respect to one foreign country; to a group, community, or commonwealth of countries; to organizations for international political cooperation; and/or to relations between countries.

"Popular" topics in international political socialization research are images of foreign countries and peoples, including national stereotypes and prejudices (for example, what do Netherlanders know, think, and feel about the US and Americans?) and attitudes toward international cooperation (for example, what value do Europeans attach to the European Community, and when, how, and under what influences have they developed these values?).

Several publications have claimed that studying, living, and having contacts abroad are potentially strong influential factors for international political socialization because the individual learns through direct experience. In this chapter, we present a study of the effects of just such an organized international joint study program (IJSP). The question is whether or not such a program has an actual impact on participants' international political competence.

An answer to this question is relevant for policy-making in this field. Many countries offer financial support to encourage students to participate in an IJSP or another type of study abroad program (SAP). Examples are the "In-

tegrated Study Abroad Program" (German Academic Exchange Service), the "STIR-program" (Dutch Ministry of Education and Sciences), and the Swedish "Internationalizing Higher Education Scheme." The European Community intends to promote the "European dimension in education" through student study visits as well. Four such "action-programs" are "Comett", "Erasmus", "Lingua", and "Youth for Europe." Examples from the US are the "President's International Youth Exchange Initiative" and the "Samantha Smith Program." An important policy question is: Do these programs have the desired results?

Secondly, such an answer is relevant for refining interactive political socialization theory (Dekker, 1991). The central components of this theory are the individuals being socialized, the agencies of socialization (including various socializers), and the dominant and peripheral sub-systems of the society. Relationships among these components influence one another. It is an interactive theory because political socialization is seen as a process of interaction between the individual and his/her particular situation. Individuals are not seen as passive "victims" but rather as active subjects who can influence the situation and/or its impact on him/herself objectively and/or subjectively. Until now, using IJSPs as an international political socializer received very little research attention.

15.3 Study Abroad Programs

Before preparing our research design, we asked ourselves in which ways previous study abroad programs (SAPs) and/or international joint study programs (IJSPs) tested their effects or results. We consulted a wide variety of sources for answers to this question. Roger Meyer's, who assisted us, findings were reported separately (Meyer, masters thesis, University of Groningen, 1989).

The results of this literature survey are presented in this section. In the first five sections, we presented some findings about SAPs as such (types, motives, goals, ways of organizing, participation). The sixth and seventh sections deal with the effects of such programs.

15.3.1 Types

There are two basic types of SAPs: organized programs and independent or "wild" programs, whereby a student goes to study in another country on a completely individualized basis. There is no organizational preparation or

connection with a school or university. An organized SAP is an arrangement negotiated between individual schools or universities (or specific departments therein), whereby students are given an opportunity to spend part of their educational time at an educational institution abroad (see Baron and Smith, eds., 1987, p. 1).

Despite the great variety of such programs, according to Opper (1986), organized SAPs share certain characteristics. They use negotiated arrangements between a "sending" or "home" institution and a "receiving" or "host" institution. These arrangements make some provision for organizational infrastructures. These can be orientation sessions on prospective host cultures, intensive foreign language training, or academic advisory services.

They ensure integration of periods abroad within a participant's "overall educational program" (although the degree and manner in which this is accomplished may vary from one program to the next). They facilitate regular and recurrent movements of students abroad, in contrast to one-time events.

15.3.2 Motives

Motives for study reported in the literature (for example, Meijerink, 1984) for internationalization of education are also quite varied.

For example, there is the economic motivation. Since transnational corporations and international institutions need an internationally oriented staff, they prefer school or university training instead of having to organize and/or to pay for such training themselves.

Secondly, there is improvement of students' career prospects. The expectation is that international students have a better chance for appropriate employment than students without such experience. Employers often consider international education as a mark of an excellent education.

In the third place, organized study abroad is socially and politically motivated. More favorable opinions and attitudes with respect to international cooperation (e.g., European integration) can develop. Strong nationalistic feelings, ethnocentrism, and prejudices about other peoples and countries are factors that work in opposition to such cooperation. The expectation is that international experiences will decrease uncooperative attitudes. SAPs may contribute to better communication between peoples, resulting in mutual understanding, peace and security, and economic growth and prosperi-

ty. More favorable opinions and attitudes toward the host countries are intended and expected as well. In the report of the Commission on International Education of the American Council on Education (1986), the following comment in 1982 from the editor of *Science*, appears:

"I have repeatedly encountered scientists who have spent a year or more in the United States. Their friendliness has been most heart-warming. These people have often been successful in science and, in addition, have reached important positions in their homelands. All too frequently, around the world the United States is lied about or criticized unfairly. Our scientist friends quietly help to limit the damage from such propaganda. They are some of the best ambassadors of goodwill for this country" (Abelson, ed., November 19, 1982).

Fourth, there is a pedagogic motivation. In some publications, a SAP is considered helpful for individual development and "personal maturity."

And, finally, there is the didactic motivation. An expected benefit is that a person who knows something about another country from having studied there and who has become "cross-culturally aware" is a valuable resource for educating others. For example, exchange students can play a role in enriching the school's or university's curriculum. These students can contribute to discussions about the host country, assist foreign students in school, a

15.3.3 Goals

Some goals for organized study abroad, taken from the relevant literature, include the following; knowledge and insight into international dimensions of subject areas; understanding of other countries' scientific theories and research; and familiarity with the social, political, and cultural systems of other countries.

In the domain of attitudes, the following effects are intended: openness toward foreign countries and foreigners; adaptation to cultural differences; overcoming parochialism; interest in international cultural, social, economic, and political developments and global affairs; tolerance toward people in other countries as well as minorities in one's own country; cross-cultural awareness; and willingness to seek a job in another country.

Cross-cultural awareness is mentioned frequently. Hanvey (cited by Wilson, 1985, p. 6) distinguished four levels. The first level is a readiness to respect and to accept others and the capacity to participate. He said:

"A two-week trip to Europe as a tourist [from the US] rarely leads to real cross-cultural awareness, but rather is a tasting party of a smorgasbord of delights and irritations, because of missing respect and participation" (Ibid.).

The second level is awareness of significant and subtle cultural traits that contrast markedly with one's own. Level three is a new awareness which, through intellectual analysis, becomes believable. Through their immersion in another culture, some exchange students may have begun to understand how another culture feels from the viewpoint of an insider. This is level four of cross-cultural awareness.

"So the exchange student living in a midwestern town [in the US] finds the lack of public transportation frustrating and the dependence on fast food irritating at first, but eventually accepts the American love affair with automobiles and McDonald's french fries as all right for Americans. At level four, he may get hooked on the french fries, but even so, is glad to buy real French bread back home in Paris" (Ibid.).

Some specific skills are also expected to develop; for example, an enhancement of foreign language proficiency, a sharpening of intercultural communicative abilities in general, and travel skills.

The most important goals (in the view of SAP directors) are enhancing foreign language proficiency, training students to function in an international/European environment, developing the individual's personality, increasing the likelihood of a better position in the professional sector, and learning facts about other cultures and countries. Studying academic content not available at home institutions and raising students' general academic level were not at the highest priority level (Baron and Smith, 1987).

Prior to their departure, two important goals for students going abroad are improving knowledge of a foreign language and making acquaintances in another country (Ibid.). Dutch graduate university students, interviewed after a SAP, agreed with the following goals related to their field of study: more knowledge about theories (45%); more knowledge about practice (39%) and research experiences (28%); and more knowledge about research methods (36%) and experience in research practice (26%). The other goals named were: understanding the culture of a host country (46%), living in another country (26%), meeting people in the host country (26%), growing

personally (23%), increased language proficiency (22%) and learning more about the host country (19%) (Meijer, 1989).

15.3.4 Ways of Organizing Study Abroad Programs ;

The following differences in the way SAPs are organized appear in the literature. In the first place, there are differences in the respective preparation level of individual students. Some sending institutions offer no preparation. Others offer their students foreign language courses; introductions to cultural, social, economic, and political developments in the host countries; and/or introductions in European, international, and/or global studies. Courses of study organized for individuals or for groups also differ. Some educational institutions send (or host) individual students to (or from) other institutions; others send (or host) groups of students.

There are also differences in the curricula of host institutions. Some offer students regular courses; others offer special courses (in combination with regular courses) for foreign students.

The composition of the participant group also varies. Some programs are for foreign students alone; others are for foreign and one's own students, in one group (e.g., an IJSP). Some institutions offer students housing and others a homestay, living with a foreign student and his/her family.

Some programs have or lack an organized follow up. Wilson (1985) observes that students who lived overseas often have difficulties in "passing on" the experience. Students who had spent the summer in Japan were asked to list examples of what they considered silly questions and stereotypical comments about their exchange experience and to describe their responses to these questions and comments. Analysis of the questionnaires led to the development of four categories of questions and comments: confusion between the Chinese-Japanese; generally neutral questions; stereotypical questions; and anti-Japanese comments. The categories which emerged from the responses were: telling the facts; speaking positively; using humor; feeling angry/frustrated; and recognizing cultural relativism. More than half of the questions and comments which students listed were in the first mode, telling the facts. Exchange students have "role involvement" in the subject (i.e., they know from first-hand experience). In the study, the mode of response with the most potential for helping exchange students act as "bridges between cultures" and for encouraging "cross-cultural awareness" was "recognizing cultural relativism." In answer to the question "Do

Japanese wear normal clothes?", an American exchange student gave the following answer:

"They wear a lot of the same clothes Americans wear. Sometimes people, especially older people, wear Japanese kimonos, but mostly just for festivals. Our clothes are not right or correct or normal. You were just raised differently and not knowing any other way makes you think you're normal. What if you were born in Japan or elsewhere?"

An IJSP is a special kind of SAP. Such a program is organized by two (or more) institutions for a group of students from both institutions for a certain period of time.

15.3.5 Participation

Up to now, only a limited number of European students have participated in a SAP. Estimates vary from 2-5% of university students. Many European students who did study abroad took a course in the US instead of a course in another European country. Obstacles for student participation in a SAP include: high costs, language barriers, and housing difficulties; a maximum of allowed years for study at one's own university; differences in objectives and contents of the same academic program in different countries; no academic recognition for diplomas and study periods in a foreign country; international differences in course/program titles; and no academic assistance or support.

There are relationships between interest in a SAP, social economic background, and prior international experiences (Bundesministerium, 1985). Klineberg (1976) reported that 55% of his respondents spent at least a month abroad prior to the period they participated in the SAP under study. Baron and Smith (1987) found that 71% of their respondents spent at least a month abroad before the SAP; 25% of the students lived or worked abroad; and 27% studied abroad. Meijer (1989) found that one third of Dutch graduate university students participating in a SAP in 1986/1987 were repeaters.

15.3.6 Effectiveness Research

Most of the research on effects of SAPs was done in the US (e.g., Smith, 1955; McGuigan, 1958; Leonard, 1964; Bicknese, 1974; Nash, 1976; James, 1976; Hensley and Sell, 1979; Marion, 1980; Hansel, 1986; and Murray, 1988). Only a few studies were done in Europe (e.g., Rahn, 1980;

Baron and Smith, 1987; Dekker and Oostindie, 1987 and 1988; and Meijer, 1989).

Research projects into the effects of SAPs can be divided in two categories. The first consists of studies in which the effects of the SAP are the dependent variable in the research design. In the second category, the SAP is (one of) the independent variable(s).

In studies of the first category, the basic research question is which type of SAP is most effective in reaching one's educational goals. One or more of the following elements are used as independent variables: the participants themselves; their motives and goals for travelling abroad (Klineberg, 1976; Koester, 1985; James, 1976; Baron and Smith, 1987; and Meijer, 1989); their prior international experiences (Klineberg, 1976; Baron and Smith, 1987; Hansel, 1986; and Meijer, 1989); their personal and social variables (such as age, gender, nationality, and personal relationships); their knowledge, opinions, and attitudes prior to the program (Smith, 1955; Leonard, 1964; Hensley and Sell, 1979; James, 1976); and their foreign language proficiency. In the next case, we find the preparation program (Morgan, 1975; Klineberg and Hull, 1979; Grove and Torbiörn, 1988; Bachner and Blohm, 1988; Dekker and Oostindie, 1988; Meijer, 1989) and the SAP itself, such as its goals, content, strategies for teaching and learning, structure, staff, and duration (Bicknese, 1974; Hansel, 1986); housing (Klineberg, 1976; Marion, 1980); host country (Klineberg, 1976; Marion, 1980); interaction with people from the host country (Klineberg, 1976; Hofman and Zak, 1969; James, 1976; Meijer, 1989); and the presence, absence, or content of a follow up program. These findings hope to give empirical support to the development of a *theory of learning through international educational experiences* and to the development of curricula in this field.

In studies of the second category, in which SAPs are (one of) the independent variable(s), the influence of the SAP on other, dependent variables (such as students' careers and students' international political competence) are investigated. The ultimate goal for this category of studies is contributing to the development of a theory (for example, in the field of the sociology of work) or, in our case, to refining a *theory of political socialization* (Dekker, 1991).

15.3.7 Effects

Some of the research findings on SAPs in general and IJSPs in particular are as follows:

- *Effects on international political knowledge*

Meulema (1991) found that pupils in the Netherlands who have had contacts with other Europeans have more knowledge about politics in the EC. In earlier studies (Dekker and Oostindie, 1986, 1987, 1988, 1989, and 1990), we found an increase in knowledge of politics of the US among Dutch pupils after a Netherlands/US JSP. Nine out of ten Dutch graduate university students in Meijer's study (1989) reported that their knowledge about the host country increased "much" or "very much" through study abroad. They learned most about others' "way of living" and the "language."

- *Effects on international political attitudes*

Dekker and Oostindie (1987, 1988, 1990) found an increasing interest in US politics among Dutch secondary school pupils after a Netherlands/US JSP. Meijer (1989) found great attitudinal changes with respect to the host country and to people from other countries (among more than a third of the respondents). There are publications which advocate travelling abroad as an effective way to diminish stereotypes and prejudices with respect to foreign countries and peoples. However, findings from several studies show that making observations about and having contacts with people in the foreign country are not in themselves enough to change existing stereotypes and prejudices (Allport, 1979; Vassiliou, et al., 1972; Amir, 1976; Schäfer and Six, 1978; Hagendoorn, 1992). Since selective perceptions may stem from having a preconceived negative attitude, quite the opposite can result. Also, one's observations about another country can be emotionally unpleasant because the traveller is often confronted with the unknown or with information that fails to tally with knowledge/beliefs acquired earlier. The result can be a defensive reaction against this threat, ending in a strengthening of one's own beliefs (Neubauer, 1981).

The most positive effects are expected to result from cooperative international contacts between individuals (with equal status) to reach common goals. In such forms of contact, participants are forced to discuss

different points of view and to work and enjoy free time in new cross-national subgroups. Especially in the case of competition between cross-nationally contrived groups, the chance for overcoming national differences, rivalries, and/or stereotypes is estimated to be high. In education, groups can be cross-nationally composed through organized SAPs, in general, and organized IJSPs, in particular. McCrady and McCrady (1976) found changes in American students' descriptive stereotypes through classroom study supplemented with direct exposure to national groups living in their own environment.

Another expectation is that travelling abroad will diminish extreme nationalism. However, Armitage (1987, p. 95) found no verification for this hypothesis: "the more often a student has been to foreign countries, the weaker his nationalism will be." The majority of the 14-16-year-old respondents in the UK and the FRG made frequent visits to foreign countries "because tourism is now more or less institutionalized in Europe, foreign travel does not constitute a differentiating element for explaining the strength of an individual's nationalism vis-à-vis internationalism" (Ibid.). Wilson concluded that:

". . . awareness and appreciation of host country and culture characteristics, foreign language appreciation and ability, understanding other cultures, and international awareness are the characteristics in which exchange students show the most growth as compared to non-traveled students" (1985, p. 5).

"Understanding another culture" is defined as "interest in learning about other people and cultures and the ability to accept and to appreciate their differences." "International awareness" means "an understanding that the world is one community; a capacity to empathize with people in other countries; an appreciation of the common needs and concerns of people of different cultures." The average increase on "understanding other cultures" and "international awareness" was less than half that of "awareness and appreciation of host country and culture characteristics." This finding was significant when compared to effects on non-traveled students.

- *Effects on international political behavior or intentions*

Meulema (1991) found that pupils in the Netherlands who have had contacts with other Europeans are more willing to vote for the European Parliament.

15.4 Research Design

The object of the study presented here is an IJSP offered to a group of 26 students from the University of Groningen in the Netherlands (14 students) and from Harvard University in the US (12 students). The program consisted of three parts: a preparation program at the students' home university; a political science course about the EC political system and the Dutch national, provincial, and local political system (organized by the University of Groningen for three weeks); and a political science course about the federal, state, and local political system of the US (organized by the Close Up Foundation in Washington, DC, and Harvard University in Cambridge/Boston, MA, for three weeks).

The ultimate goal of the program was directed at "comparative politics" (i.e., participants should be able to find for themselves an answer, based on empirical data, to two questions: What are the similarities and differences between the political system of the US, the European Community, and the Netherlands? and What is the democratic level of development in these three political systems? The criteria for democratic development were freedom of speech, press and assembly; equality of distribution of power; distribution of [im]material values; and popular political involvement and participation.) To reach this goal, the program had the following specific objectives (regarding the US, EC, and NL):

1. Knowledge and insight into:
 - Political structures and processes
 - Foreign policies
 - Political socialization, structures, processes and effects
2. A well-founded opinion about:
 - Political structures and processes
 - Foreign policies
 - Political socialization
3. Attitudes:
 - Interest in political systems and foreign policy

The European part of the program took place from June 17 to July 7, 1988. The American part started on July 23 and ended on August 13, 1988. Program activities included on-site seminars, lectures, workshops, excursions, guided tours, and homestays.

Our research problem asked whether or not this IJSP was an influential international political socializer. The answer to this problem was sought indirectly through a pre- and post-test of the students' knowledge, opinions, and interests and through participants themselves estimating the role of the program in their own international political socialization. Participants filled out three, partially identical questionnaires: one before the program (but after initial preparation), one at the end of the European part, and one at the end of the American program. The questionnaire was developed in the following way:

1. The goals of the program were identified through analysis of organizational documents and interviews with program administrators. The goals thus obtained were then ordered into three categories: knowledge, opinions, and attitudes.
2. A selection was made from the goals on the basis of interviews with program administrators and their priorities.
3. The three categories of goals were operationalized, using questions previously tested for reliability.

The goals selected were already presented above. Besides the questions derived from program goals, the questionnaire asked about other, unintended (though expected) effects (political attitudes), personal data, and the students' own political socialization processes and agencies. In sum, respondents answered 131 questions.

The data obtained were processed and indices made for each of the studied effects. For example, knowledge of federal political structures in the US had four questions to test any change in this knowledge. A respondent could score 10 points (= the maximum score for each index). The weight given to the correct answers to the different questions varied according to the program administrators' priorities. To avoid mistakes, each questionnaire was processed twice with two researchers working independently. After results of both researchers were compared, different results required reprocessing and agreement.

All 14 NL and 12 US students were asked to participate in the research. The number of US students who were willing to fill out the complete questionnaires decreased, however, from 12 (at the beginning of the program) to 9 students (at the end of the European part).

Since all the data obtained are quantitative in nature, a quantitative criterion is a logical choice for their assessment. This criterion comprises a minimum boundary. The knowledge level, presence of opinions, and attitude levels are judged to be changed if the number of answers lies above this boundary. There are two minimum boundaries. The first one is an absolute minimum boundary, indicating a sufficient level of knowledge, presence of opinions, and level of attitudes. This indicates clear attainment of the goals. The second one is a relative minimum boundary, indicating significant changes in the level of knowledge, presence or absence of opinions, and level of attitudes. This means attaining the goals only relatively.

The absolute minimum boundary is a score of 6; a goal is seen as realized if the index score is 6 or more. The relative minimum boundary for a "change" ("more knowledge") is a change in the index score of at least 0.5 to 1.5. There is a "great change" ("much more" knowledge) if the change in the index score is at least 1.6 to 2.5. For a "remarkably great change" ("remarkably much more" knowledge), the change in the index score should be 2.6 or more.

15.5 Effects

15.5.1 Effects on US Students

Which objectives of the IJSP were realized and which were not? And which of the other expected changes in attitudes occurred? (Table 1, S. 243)

First, we present data relating to US students. None of the ten knowledge goals of the NL/European part of the program were realized before the program began (but after the preparation program at the home university). After the program, two goals were accomplished. Although not reaching a satisfactory level, there is a change in knowledge with respect to two other goals, a great change with respect to three goals, and a remarkably great change with respect to three other goals (Table 1). Four of the five opinion goals were realized before the program. After the pro-

Table 1: US students' knowledge of political structures, processes and foreign policy of the NL and the EC (before, I, and after, II, the European part of the IJSP).

Scores	I N = 12	II N = 9	Change
<i>Goals: Knowledge of:</i>			
NL political structures			
bstate level	3.17	6.26	+ 3.09
provincial level	0.75	2.56	+ 1.81
local level	0.42	3.50	+ 3.08
NL political processes			
state level	0.98	4.50	+ 3.52
provincial level	1.67	2.22	+ 0.55
local level	0.00	2.22	+ 2.22
NL foreign policy	0.33	1.33	+ 1.00
EC political structures	2.24	6.43	+ 4.19
EC political processes	1.48	5.57	+ 4.09
EC foreign policy	0.92	2.78	+ 1.86

Table 2: US students' opinions on political structures, processes and foreign policy of the NL and EC (before and after the European part of the IJSP).

Scores	I N = 12	II N = 9	Change
<i>Goals: An opinion on:</i>			
NL political structures	7.50	9.44	+ 1.94
NL political processes	1.67	7.78	+ 6.11
NL foreign policy	7.13	8.22	+ 1.09
EC political system	8.33	10.00	+ 1.67
EC foreign policy	7.29	8.61	+ 1.32

Table 3: US students' interest in politics, in general, and foreign policy, in particular, of the NL and EC (before and after the European part of the IJSP).

Scores	I N = 12	II N = 9	Change
<i>Goals: Interest in:</i>			
NL politics	6.87	6.16	- 0.71
NL foreign policy	8.06	7.89	- 0.17
EC politics	7.13	8.19	+ 1.06
EC foreign policy	7.51	8.12	+ 0.61

Table 4: US students' other political attitudes (before and after the European part of the IJSP).

Scores	I N = 12	II N = 9	Change
<i>Goals:</i>			
Positive NL attitude	5.88	6.22	+ 0.34
Nationalism	9.17	7.78	- 1.39
Internationalism	4.58	4.44	- 0.14

gram, all opinion goals were realized (Table 2). All four interest goals were realized before the program (Table 3). Positive attitudes toward the Netherlands reached a satisfactory level after the program. Only one of the other attitudes changed, namely, a lower level of nationalism (Table 4).

Table 5: NL students' knowledge of political structures, processes, and foreign policy of the EC and US (before, I, and after, II/III, the IJSP).

Scores	I N = 14	II or III N = 13/14	Change
<i>Goals: Knowledge of:</i>			
EC political structures	4.82	6.77	+ 1.95
EC political processes	1.96	5.46	+ 3.50
EC foreign policy	1.96	2.81	+ 0.85
US political structures			
federal level	2.87	4.59	+ 1.72
state level	4.32	6.73	+ 2.41
local level	1.57	4.29	+ 2.72
US political processes			
federal level	1.55	3.71	+ 2.16
state level	0.71	0.00	- 0.71
local level	0.64	0.36	- 0.28
US foreign policy	5.21	6.39	+ 1.18

15.5.2 Effects on the NL Students

Before the start of the program (but after the preparation program at the home university), none of the ten program knowledge goals were realized. After the program, three goals were realized. Although not reaching a satisfactory level, there was a growth in knowledge with respect to one other goal, a great change with respect to two goals, and a remarkably great change with respect to two other goals (Table 5). All five opinion goals

were realized before the start of the program (Table 6). Two out of four interest goals were in place before the program. After the program, all four interest goals were realized (Table 7). After the program, changes in two other political attitudes included in the study were observed: a higher level of internationalism, and a much higher level of nationalism (Table 8).

Table 6: Presence of NL students' opinions on political structures, processes, and foreign policy of the EC and the US (before and after the IJSP).

Scores	I N = 14	II or III N = 13/14	Change
<i>Goals: An opinion on:</i>			
EC political system	8.57	10.00	+ 1.43
EC foreign policy	8.79	8.71	- 0.08
US political structures	7.86	10.00	+ 2.14
US political processes	10.00	9.29	- 0.71
US foreign policy	8.71	8.94	+ 0.23

Table 7: NL students' interest in EC and US politics, in general, and foreign policy, in particular (before and after the IJSP).

Scores	I N = 14	II or III N = 13/14	Change
<i>Goals: Interest in:</i>			
EC politics	5.24	6.59	+ 1.35
EC foreign policy	4.89	6.18	+ 1.29
US politics	6.99	7.19	+ 0.20
US foreign policy	8.31	7.95	- 0.36

Table 8: NL students' other political attitudes (before and after the IJSP).

Scores	I N = 14	II or III N = 13/14	Change
<i>Attitudes:</i>			
Positive US attitude	3.00	2.51	- 0.49
Nationalism	3.85	5.83	+ 1.98
Internationalism	7.12	7.92	+ 0.80

15.6 Perceptions

The answer to the question whether or not the studied IJSP was successful in improving participants' knowledge was found in a more direct way when we asked participants to indicate the role of the program in their international political socialization process. Two questions were asked, namely:

- "Everyone obtains information about political events and topics in the European Community [NL or US] via different channels (persons, groups, media, experiences). Via what channels have you obtained your knowledge and insight in political events and topics in the European Community [NL or US] up to now? You may fill in more than one circle." and
- "Which five channels (persons, groups, media, experiences) have contributed in your opinion the most to your knowledge and insight into political events and topics in the European Community [NL or US] up to now? You may fill in five circles."

Table 9: Most influential socialization agents with respect to knowledge/insight into political events and topics in the NL, EC, and US (NL and US participants).

Politics in the:	NL	EC	US	US
Students from the:	US	NL	US	NL
II N=	9		9	
III N=		14		14
<i>Program parts</i>				
Preparation	-	-	-	-
NL program	1			
EC program		(2)	1	
Washington, DC, program				2
Cambridge, MA, program				-
Direct contacts with NL students	2		2	
Direct contacts with US students			(3)	-
<i>Other:</i>				
travel experiences	(3)			
national newspaper	(3)	(2)		3
sophisticated magazines			(3)	
television		1		1
radio		3		

Key: 1 = first position; 2 = second position; 3 = third position; () = shared with other socialization agents

In combination with all these questions, a list of 35 possible channels (i.e., "socializers") was offered, including "television, national newspaper, state or local newspaper, friends, father, mother, travel experiences, preparation for this program, this program in Europe, this program in Washington, DC, this program in Cambridge, MA, direct contacts with Dutch students in this program, direct contacts with American students in this program." (See Table 9.)

With respect to knowledge/insight into politics in the NL, the US students considered the program in the Netherlands as the most influential channel. Direct program contacts with Dutch students took up the second position. In third position were travel experiences and the national newspaper.

With respect to politics in the EC, the Dutch students considered the European part of the program as the second-most-influential socialization agent (together with the national newspaper). Television was in first position and radio in third. The US students considered the European part of the program to be the most influential channel. The direct contacts with Dutch students in this program took second place. In the third position were direct program contacts with US students and sophisticated magazines.

With respect to knowledge/insight into politics in the US, the Dutch students considered the Washington, DC, part of the IJSP as the second-most-important socialization agent. Television was in the first place and national newspaper in third.

15.7 Conclusion

The conclusion of this research (see Table 10) is that this IJSP had a considerable impact on intended effects (in the cognitive domain) for both US and NL participants. After the program, US students attained two goals and NL students three out of ten. Although not reaching a satisfactory level, there is a (large) growth in knowledge with respect to eight and five other goals respectively. The most obvious change in the domain of attitudes is a weakened nationalism among US students and a strengthened nationalism among NL students.

Table 10: Overview of IJSP effects on NL and US students.

Effects	NL students		US students	
	I N=14	II/III N=13/14	I N=12	II/III N=9
<i>Knowledge:</i>				
NL state structures:				
provincial structures			-	+
local structures			-	-
NL state processes			-	-
provincial processes			-	-
local processes			-	-
NL foreign policy			-	-
EC political structures	-	+	-	+
EC political processes	-	-	-	-
EC foreign policy	-	-	-	-
US federal structures	-	-		
state structures	-	+		
local structures	-	-		
US federal processes	-	-		
state processes	-	-		
Table 10 (cont.)				
local processes	-	-		
US foreign policy	-	+		
<i>An opinion about:</i>				
NL political system			+	+
NL political processes			-	+
NL foreign policy			+	+
EC political system	+	+	+	+
EC foreign policy	+	+	+	+
US political structures	+	+		
US political processes	+	+		
US foreign policy	+	+		
<i>Interest in:</i>				
NL politics			+	+
NL foreign policy			+	+
EC politics	-	+	+	+
EC foreign policy	-	+	+	+
US politics	+	+		
US foreign policy	+	+		
<i>Other attitudes:</i>				
Positive NL attitude			-	+
Positive US attitude				
Nationalism	-	-	+	+
Internationalism	+	+	-	-

Key: I = before the program; II = after the European part; and III = after the whole program.

Index score is lower than 6 (-) or 6 or more (+).

The perceptions of both the NL and US student participants indicate that program influence on cognitions is even greater than that which was "proved" in these knowledge "tests." Dutch participants thought that the European and Washington, DC, parts of the program had a very strong impact on their knowledge and insights. US students said that the NL and European program were the two channels which contributed most to their knowledge and insight into NL and EC politics.

These two ways of measurement have resulted in two different, although both positive, conclusions. One of the explanations for differences in findings could be that the test questions do refer to objects other than those in the perception questions: "political structures, processes, and foreign policy" versus "political events and topics." Another explanation is that these questions do not refer to the same type of knowledge. The test questions relate to factual knowledge, while the perception questions offer the opportunity to include other, higher types of cognitions, as well. A final explanation is that respondents were inclined to give socially desirable answers to the perception question because they appreciated the work of the IJSP administrators.

15.8 References

- Allport, G. (1979). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Amir, Y. (1976). "The role of intergroup contact in change of prejudice and ethnic relations" in P. Katz (ed.) *Towards the elimination of racism*. New York, NY: Pergamon.
- Armitage, P. (ed.) (1987). *The Anglo-German project. The study of the European Community in schools*. Final report. Reading: Bulmershe College of Higher Education.
- Bachner, D. and J. Blohm (1988). "Orienting US student sojourners to Japan: content, approach and implications" in Mestenhauser, Marty, and Steglitz (eds.), Op. cit.
- Baron, B. and A. Smith (eds.) (1987). *Higher education in the European Community. Study abroad in the European Community*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

- Bicknese, G. (1974). "Study Abroad Part 1: A comparative test of attitudes and opinions. Study Abroad Part 2 : As the students see it: the junior year abroad reassessed", pp. 325-345 in *Foreign Language Annals*, Vol. 7.
- Claussen, B. and H. Müller (Hrsg.) (1989). *Politische Sozialisation Jugendlicher in Ost und West*. Bonn: Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung.
- Claussen, B. and H. Müller (eds.) (1990). *Political socialization of the young in East and West*. Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Peter Lang.
- Coelho, G. (ed.) (1962). "Impacts of studying abroad", pp. 1-87 in *Journal of Social Issues*.
- Commission on International Education (1986). *What we don't know can hurt us. The shortfall in international competence*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Dekker, H. (1988). "Organized study abroad: a new challenge for teacher training" in J. Voorbach and L. Prick (eds.) *Research and developments on teacher education in the Netherlands*. The Hague: SVO/ATEE.
- Dekker, H. (1991). "Political socialization theory and research", pp. 16-58 in Dekker and Meyenberg (eds.), Op. cit.
- Dekker, H. and R. Meyenberg (eds.) (1991). *Politics and the European younger generation. Political socialization in Eastern, Central and Western Europe*. Oldenburg: BIS.
- Dekker, H. and M. Oostindie (1986, 1987). *Close Up International: Goals, processes and effects. Report of an evaluation research*. Parts 1 and 2. Arlington, VA: Close Up Foundation. Utrecht: M-50.
- Dekker, H. and M. Oostindie (1988). *International learning through an organized study abroad program. Goals, processes and effects of an organized study program in the United States*. Report of an evaluation research. Arlington, VA: Close Up Foundation.
- Dekker, H. and M. Oostindie (1989). "Politische Sozialisationseffekte eines internationalen Jugendaustausch-Programms", pp. 271-286 in Claussen and Müller (Hrsg.), Op. cit.

- Dekker, H. and M. Oostindie (1990). "Political socialization effects of an international youth exchange program, pp. 111-132 in Claussen and Müller (eds.), Op. cit.
- Grove, C. and I. Torbiörn (1988). "A new conceptualization of intercultural adjustment and the goals of learning" in Mestenhauser, Marty, and Steglitz (eds.), Op. cit.
- Hagendoorn, L. (1992). "Determinants and Dynamics of National Stereotypes", pp. 105-123 in Meyenberg and Dekker (eds.), Op. cit.
- Hansel, B. (1986). *The AFS impact study: final report*. Research report No. 33. New York, NY: The AFS Center for the Study of Intercultural Learning.
- Hensley, T. and D. Sell (1979). "A study-abroad program. An examination of impacts on student attitudes", pp. 387-412 in *Teaching Political Science*, Vol. 6, No. 4.
- Hofman, I. and I. Zak (1969). "Interpersonal contact and attitude change in a cross cultural situation, pp. 165-171 in *Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 78.
- James, N. (1976). "Students abroad: expectations versus reality", pp. 599-607 in *Liberal Education*, Vol. 62, No. 4.
- Kelman, H. (1962). "Changing attitudes through international activities", pp. 68-87 in G. Coelho (ed.), Op. cit.
- Klineberg, O. (1976). *International educational exchange: an assessment of its nature and its prospects*. Paris: Mouton.
- Klineberg, O. and W. Hull (1979). *At a foreign university: an international study of adaptation and coping*. New York, NY: Praeger.
- Koester, J. (1985). *Profile of the US student abroad*. New York, NY: Council of International Educational Exchange.
- Leonard, E. (1964). "Attitude change in a college program of foreign study and travel", pp. 173-181 in *The Educational Record*, Vol. 45.
- Marion, P. (1980). "Relationships of student characteristics and experiences with attitude changes in a program of study abroad", pp. 58-64 in *Journal of College Student Personal*, Vol. 21, No. 1.

- McCrary, R. and J. McCrary (1976). "Effects of direct exposure to foreign target groups on descriptive stereotypes held by American students", pp. 233-239 in *Social Behavior and Personality*, Vol. 4, No. 2.
- McGuigan, F. (1958). "Psychological changes related to intercultural experiences", pp. 55-60 in *Psychological Reports*, Vol. 4.
- Meijer, R. (1989). *De grensoverschrijdende studie. Een verkennend onderzoek naar het hoe, wat en waartoe van een studieverblijf in het buitenland*. Groningen: Andragogisch Instituut, Rijksuniversiteit.
- Meijerink, M. (1984). "De grenzeloze universiteit", pp. 612-619 in *Wending*.
- Mestenhauser, J., G. Marty, and I. Steglitz (eds.) (1988). *Culture, learning, and the disciplines. Theory and practice in cross-cultural orientation*. Washington, DC: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs.
- Meulema, G. (1991). "Political socialization in the Netherlands with respect to the European Community", pp. 277-301 in Dekker and Meyenberg (eds.), *Op. cit.*
- Meyenberg, R. (1991). "Political socialization in the Federal Republic of Germany with respect to the European Community", pp. 301-318 in Dekker and Meyenberg (eds.), *Op. cit.*
- Meyenberg, R. and H. Dekker (eds.) (1992). *Perceptions of Europe in East and West*. Oldenburg: BIS, University of Oldenburg.
- Morgan, E. (1975). "Study abroad: a process of adaptation and change", pp. 207-215 in *International Review of Education*, Vol. 21, No. 2.
- Murray, J. (1988). "The impact of study abroad experience on American undergraduate education" in *Current Issues in Catholic Higher Education*, Vol. 9, No. 1.
- Nash, D. (1976). "Personal consequences of a year study abroad", pp. 191-203 in *Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 47.
- Neubauer, W. (1981). "Probleme der Entwicklung einer transnationalen Identität", pp. 159-178 in H. Lehmann (Hrsg.). *Die europäische Integration in den interdisziplinären Lehrerbildung*. Bonn: Europa Union Verlag.

- Opper, S. (1986). "Organized study abroad: some preliminary findings of an international evaluation", pp. 9-12 in *The Joint Study Program Newsletter of the Commission*, Delta, Vol. 2.
- Rahn, H. (1980). "Aid to study abroad: experiences and implications", pp. 150-164 in *Western European Education*, Vol. 2, 1979-1980.
- Schäfer, B. and B. Six (1978). *Sozialpsychologie des Vorurteils*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Smith, H. (1955). "Do intercultural experiences affect attitudes?", pp. 469-477 in *Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology*, Vol. 51.
- Vassiliou, V., H. Triandis, G. Vassiliou, and H. McGuire (1972). "Interpersonal contact and stereotyping", pp. 89-117 in H. Triandis (ed.) *The analysis of subjective culture*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Wilson, A. (1985). "Exchange students as bridges between cultures", pp. 5-8 in *Intercom*, Vol. 106.

