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Preface

The European Community Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students (ERASMUS) was established by the Council Decision of 15 June 1987. The first phase of the Programme covered the academic years 1987/88 - 1989/90, the second phase being based on the amended Council Decision of 14 December 1989. The Programme is open to all types of higher education institution and all subject areas.

A central element of the ERASMUS Programme is the furthering of student mobility within the European Community. The student mobility programmes established under the Programme offer university students a chance to undertake a substantial period of study (minimum 3 months) in another Community Member State fully recognized by the home institution as an integral part of their degree. The Inter-University Cooperation Programmes (ICPs) set up under ERASMUS can also incorporate other activities such as teaching staff mobility, development of new curricula, and intensive programmes. Collectively, the ICPs constitute the European University Network established under ERASMUS.

In 1989, the European Community Course Credit Transfer System (ECTS) was introduced as an experimental pilot project designed to test the European potential of credit transfer as an effective means of academic recognition.

Furthermore, ERASMUS offers the possibility to academic and administrative staff of undertaking preparatory or study visits to other higher education institutions within the Community, and provides support for a wide range of complementary activities seeking to improve the climate for academic cooperation within the Community.

Since the inception of ERASMUS, great importance has been attached to ensure thorough monitoring and evaluation of the Programme's progress. The Task Force Human Resources, Education, Training and Youth of the Commission of the European Communities has therefore commissioned or supported the preparation of a number of studies on various aspects of the Programme's development.
Some of these studies, though designed primarily for use within the services of the Commission of the European Communities, are now being published in the ERASMUS Monograph series, in order to make them accessible to a wider public. Each in its own way contributes to the overall evaluation process of the Programme in more than just a historical sense. These evaluations of academic recognition matters, of the development of specific subject areas, of the role of language training, of accommodation matters etc. are of relevance to those working with or having an interest in ERASMUS. The full list of studies appears elsewhere in the present volume.
Objectives and Methods of the Survey

In 1987, the Commission of the European Community inaugurated an Action Scheme for the Mobility of Students (ERASMUS). Supplementary grants, aiming to bear the additional costs for studying a period in another EC Member State, are predominantly awarded to students taking part in Inter-University Cooperation Programmes (ICPs), where two or more departments from institutions of higher education cooperate in the provision for regular exchange of students, and the ICPs are also awarded support for part of the institutional costs involved.

In order to monitor the successes and problems of the ERASMUS Programme in general or those specifically relevant to individual ICPs, the ICP coordinators are asked as part of their contractual obligation to provide a written report. In 1987/88 and in 1988/89, ICP coordinators were expected to write a report according to guidelines sent in advance.

In 1989/90, this open way of reporting was substituted by a report form which partly called for short statements and partly asked to tick applicable categories of response. ICP coordinators were asked to provide information on a 31-page form "ERASMUS Inter-University Cooperation Programme (ICP) Grant: Programme Coordinator's Report Form, Academic Year 1989/90". Sixteen pages of the form referred to student mobility, four pages to staff mobility and two pages each to curriculum development and intensive programmes, while the remaining pages were reserved for general descriptions, financial matters and recommendations regarding the ERASMUS Programme as a whole.

As regards student mobility, programme coordinators were initially asked to describe the profile of the programme: the participating institutions and departments, field of study, duration of the study period in the host country, timing of the period abroad in the overall course programme, the possible inclusion of a
work placement in the host country, and size of the programmes in terms of the "flows" of students between the participating institutions.
The form predominantly focused on the various educational and administrative arrangements for the study period of the ERASMUS students:
- ways of informing students about study opportunities abroad;
- criteria and procedures for selecting participating students;
- curricular integration of the study period in the host country (mandatory or optional component of the course programme, joint elements of course programmes at home and abroad, participation in regular courses abroad or specific courses provided for students from other countries, etc.);
- preparation (provision of materials, meetings, language courses, preparatory courses, counselling etc.);
- issues of foreign language proficiency (preparation, language of instruction abroad, students' foreign language proficiency);
- academic and administrative support provided by the host institution; and
- ways of assessment of student performance during the study period abroad and upon return.

Furthermore, a substantial proportion of questions encouraged the programme coordinators to assess the programme and its impacts in terms of:
- perception of problems encountered by students while abroad;
- perceived impacts of study abroad on the students as well as on the participating institutions; and
- extent of recognition granted.

In this context, programme coordinators were not merely asked to provide a factual account, but also to explain the major goals of the programme, to describe changes realized during the respective year and their underlying rationales. Finally, coordinators were asked to describe the degree of similarity or reciprocity of the arrangements at the various participating institutions and the possible reasons for differing arrangements.

This study is based on the information provided by coordinators on student mobility issues with 1,241 ICP coordinators providing information. Most questions on student mobility are standardized and allow a statistical analysis, with differences of responses examined according to subject area, participating countries and departmental units, etc. In addition (or sometimes alternatively to the information provided by the coordinators), some data on the participating students available from technical data sheets by the NGAAAs were included in the data set.
Of the 1,348 Inter-University Cooperation Programmes (ICPs) which were originally awarded support for student mobility 1989/90, 37 programmes withdrew or eventually did not realise any of the envisaged student mobility. In the framework of the remaining 1,311 student mobility programmes 17,804 students were awarded a grant for a study period abroad (see R. Kreitz and U. Teichler. *Student Mobility within ERASMUS 1989/90*, Kassel: Wissenschaftliches Zentrum für Berufs- und Hochschulforschung, 1993). Seventy coordinators (5.3%) did not send back the report form or reported in a way which could not be included in the statistical analysis (incomplete responses, use of an outdated report form, etc). Thus, this subsequent analysis is based on the information provided on 1,241 ICPs with 17,129 ERASMUS grantees.

According to the coordinators' estimates, within these 1,241 programmes 3,032 students went abroad without an ERASMUS grant. The ratio of students without to students with an ERASMUS student mobility grant was 0.18. The ratio was highest in engineering and business studies (0.36 each), the lowest in mathematics (0.09), communication/information science (0.08) and in natural science (0.06). Belgium (0.44) and Ireland (0.41) had a high ratio of students without to students with a grant while in Greece (0.01) and Italy (0.08) students rarely went abroad within an ICP without an ERASMUS student mobility grant.

As Table 1.1 shows, the distribution according to subject area of the 1,241 ICPs for which information was provided does not differ significantly from that of all 1,311 ICPs actually supported in 1989/90. This indicates that the few missing report forms do not distort the findings.

This study aims to demonstrate the major findings. Special attention is placed on differences by field of study for two main reasons. First, exact information according to home and host country is not available, as ICP coordinators were asked to provide information on the programme as a whole, with the result that responses could not be attributed to single home and host countries. Therefore, it was considered necessary to score responses for each ICP to all the home and host countries involved in that ICP. For example, "Italy" in a home country table includes information on all ICPs in which Italian institutions of higher education send students abroad. Secondly, characteristics of programmes turned out to be mostly determined by the fields of study. In case other factors, such as for example duration of the study period abroad or size of the ICP, play an important role, the respective data is also presented.

---

1 The data has to be treated cautiously, since coordinators were only asked for their estimate of the numbers of students having been abroad within the whole ICP (i.e. student mobility between all partners) without an ERASMUS grant.
Table 1.1
All Student Mobility ICPs and Coordinators' Reports Received, by Field of Study (absolute numbers and percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field of Study</th>
<th>All Student Mobility ICPs*</th>
<th>Coordinators' reports received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural sciences</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art and design</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business studies/management sciences</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/teacher training</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering/technology</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography/geology</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages/philological sciences</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics/informatics</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical sciences</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication/information sciences</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other areas of study</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framework agreements in various areas of study</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1311</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source: Teichler, Kreitz, Maiworm: Student Mobility within ERASMUS 1989/90, based on data on Student Mobility 89/90 by NGAAAs (National Grant Awarding Authorities)

In addition to the questions which allowed multiple responses, a couple of other questions had to be treated as multiple response as well, because sometimes within single ICPs considerable differences in measures, problems, etc. existed between partners. The totals in these tables are therefore greater than 100 percent.
Furthermore, when responses by ICP coordinators are compared to those of students, the responses by the ICP coordinators are weighted according to the number of participating students. For this purpose the data on student mobility 1989/90 provided by the National Grant Awarding Authorities (NGAAs) was combined with the data provided by the coordinators.

A further limitation of this study has to be mentioned. With the exception of the sections of the report form in which the coordinators discussed major problems and recommended improvements, information is provided only on the responses to "closed" and "quantifiable" questions. Within the limitations of time and resources, it proved impossible to analyse those "open" sections in which the ICP coordinators explained the rationales and described the changes over time.

The study was conducted by a research team at the Centre for Research on Higher Education and Work of the Comprehensive University of Kassel (Federal Republic of Germany). Friedhelm Maiworm, Wolfgang Steube and Ulrich Teichler, the head of the research team, carried out the study and wrote this report. Formal checks of the responses, the coding of open questions, help in the analysis and the data processing were done by Skarlatos Antoniadis, Angela Antona, Erik Bjurström, Martin Eidmann, Bernhard Krede, Isabelle Le Mouillour and Sabine Stange. Kristin Gagelmann took over many responsibilities in administering the survey and Paul Greim in the processing of this text. Irene Magill was responsible for all the proof reading. The study was eased by substantial support from the Task Force for Human Resources, Education, Training and Youth, and from the ERASMUS Bureau. Many experts in charge of academic or administrative aspects of ERASMUS programmes in various Member States of the European Community provided valuable advice and support for all stages of the project.

The data processing and statistical analysis was undertaken with the help of the Siemens BS2000 computer of the University of Kassel and on IBM personal computers of the Centre. Programme packages SPSS-X served the statistical analysis and the provision of tables.
Profile of the Programmes

2.1 Subject Areas

As already explained in the introductory chapter, we assume that the small number of ICP Coordinators' Report Forms not submitted, incomplete or otherwise not suitable for inclusion does not substantially affect the representativeness of the data set on which this report is based. It was also reported in the introductory chapter that the subsequent information on the profile of the programmes was predominantly based on administrative reporting about the participating students and fellowships awarded rather than on information provided in the Report Forms by the ICP coordinators.

As Table 2.1 shows, the largest number of inter-university cooperation programmes was in the field of languages and philological sciences (253 programmes). The next most "significant" fields - in terms of numbers of ICPs - were engineering and technology (180 programmes), business studies and management science, social sciences (114 programmes each), and natural sciences (106 programmes). All in all, nearly two thirds of the programmes were administered within these "large" five subject areas.

About 17 percent of the ICPs were in the three subject areas law (81 programmes), humanities (69 programmes), and medical sciences (64 programmes). The remaining 20 percent of the ICPs were in the other nine subject areas according to the classification used within the ERASMUS Programme, including "framework agreements in various areas of study" and "other areas of study".
Table 2.1
Distribution of Inter-University Cooperation Programmes by Field of Study (absolute numbers and percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field of Study</th>
<th>Absolute</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural sciences</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art and design</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business studies/management sciences</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/teacher training</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering/technology</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography/geology</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages/philological sciences</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics/informatics</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical sciences</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication/information sciences</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other areas of study</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framework agreements in various areas of study</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1241</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Number of Participating Countries

The size of an ICP network, as measured by the number of partners will influence many academic and administrative aspects of student exchange. The number of EC Member States participating in each ICP network indicates both the range of options and the complexity of cooperation.

As Table 2.2 shows, more than 60 percent of programmes were cooperations between only two EC Member States: in about 20 percent of the programmes three EC Member States, and in 9 percent four EC Member States cooperated.
Only 10 percent of the ICPs were networks comprising partners from more than four partner countries.

Table 2.2
Number of EC Member States Involved in the Inter-University Cooperation Programmes (absolute numbers and percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of EC Member States</th>
<th>Absolute</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>61.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1241</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3  Number of Partners

On average, 3.3 partners cooperated within an ICP. As Table 2.3 shows, in almost all fields there were an average of between 2.9 and 3.6 partners. Only ICPs in business studies (4.2) and in geography and geology (4.0) tended to be larger, as far as the number of partners involved was concerned.
Table 2.3
Average Number of Partners per Inter-University Cooperation Programme by Field of Study (ratio and absolute numbers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field of study</th>
<th>Absolute Number of ICPs</th>
<th>Ratio Partners per ICP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural sciences</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art and design</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business studies/ management sciences</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/teacher training</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering/technology</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography/geology</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages/philological sciences</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics/informatics</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical sciences</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication/information sciences</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other areas of study</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framework agreements in various areas of study</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1241</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4 Number of Students

Within the 1,241 inter-university cooperation programmes, 17,135 students went abroad who were awarded an ERASMUS grant. Around 45 percent of these students were enrolled in the two "largest" fields of study in terms of participation in the ERASMUS programme: business studies (23 %) and languages (22 %). A further 10 percent of the students were enrolled in engineering and 9 percent each in social sciences and law. One quarter of the
students went abroad in the remaining 11 fields of study (including "other areas of study") or within framework agreements between various areas of study.

As Table 2.4 indicates, the average size of the ICPs in terms of the number of students varied considerably by the field of study. The average number of students in ICPs ranged from more than 30 in business studies and in ICPs comprising framework agreements in various areas of study, to about 20 in the ICPs in law, to seven students in ICPs in natural sciences, agricultural sciences, medical sciences, and mathematics.

### Table 2.4
Average Number of Students Participating Within the Inter-University Cooperation Programmes by Field of Study (mean)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field of Study</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural sciences</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art and design</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business studies/management sciences</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/teacher training</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering/technology</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography/geology</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages/philological sciences</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics/informatics</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical sciences</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication/information sciences</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other areas of study</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framework agreements in various areas of study</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5 Duration of Study Periods Abroad

The average duration of the study period abroad (according to data provided by the NGAAAs) was 6.0 months. As Table 2.5 shows, the average duration was
longest in business studies (7.2 months) while students in law and engineering spent on average 6.7 months abroad. Study periods abroad were the shortest on average in ICPs in art and design (4.9 months), architecture (4.8 months), communication and information science, and education/teacher training (4.5 months each).

Table 2.5
Average Duration of the Study Abroad Period in the Inter University Cooperation Programmes by Field of Study (in months, mean)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field of Study</th>
<th>Average Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural sciences</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art and design</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business studies/management sciences</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/teacher training</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering/technology</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography/geology</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages/philological sciences</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics/informatics</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical sciences</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication/information sciences</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other areas of study</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framework agreements in various areas of study</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.6 Timing of the Study Period Abroad

The third and fourth year of study was the most common stage for spending a study period abroad in the framework of the ERASMUS programme. ERASMUS students studied 3.1 years on average prior to their stay abroad. Table 2.6 shows that the curricula in the fields of study obviously had some influence on the timing of the study period abroad. Students in business studies went abroad slightly
earlier - they studied 2.6 years on average in their field prior to their study period abroad - than students in the other fields. Students in agricultural sciences and medical sciences studied the longest prior to the stay abroad (3.7 and 3.9 years on average).

**Table 2.6**

*Years of Study Prior to the Study Period Abroad by Field of Study (in years, mean)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field of Study</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural sciences</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art and design</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business studies/management sciences</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/teacher training</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering/technology</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography/geology</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages/philological sciences</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics/informatics</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical sciences</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication/information sciences</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other areas of study</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framework agreements in various areas of study</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3

Academic Arrangements of the Programmes

3.1 Information on Study Abroad Opportunities

Information on study abroad opportunities tends to be disseminated by various methods. According to the ICP coordinators, four methods were employed in their ICPs on average out of the seven addressed in the report form (see Table 3.1). In most ICPs, oral information - through special information meetings (86%) or by announcements in lectures (80%) - was most common. Posters were used in 69 percent and brochures or other written material in 64 percent of the programmes surveyed. Other ways of information were less often used. Only 2 percent of the programme coordinators did not respond to the respective question.

As Table 3.1 shows, meetings were the most common method of information in all fields with the exception of ICPs in geography and geology, in which announcements in lectures were more common (94%). The frequency of methods employed varied substantially according to field of study. Meetings were most common in business studies (96%) and played a role least often for ICPs in medical sciences (73%). If we exclude fields of study represented in only a few ICPS, we note a range in the use of brochures from 80 percent in law to 38 percent of the ICPs in architecture, in announcements in lectures from 94 percent in geography and geology to 59 percent in art and design, and in the use of articles from 43 percent in business studies to 11 percent in art and design. The data change only marginally if weighted according to the number of students involved in the respective ICPs.
### Table 3.1
Dissemination of Information on Study Abroad Opportunities Within the ICP, by Field of Study (percent, multiple reply possible)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major field of study</th>
<th>Agr</th>
<th>Arc</th>
<th>Art</th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Edu</th>
<th>Eng</th>
<th>Geo</th>
<th>Hum</th>
<th>Lan</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Mat</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Nat</th>
<th>Soc</th>
<th>Com</th>
<th>Oth</th>
<th>Fra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brochures</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posters</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisements</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Announcements in lectures</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not ticked</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>(44)</td>
<td>(114)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>(180)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(69)</td>
<td>(253)</td>
<td>(81)</td>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>(64)</td>
<td>(106)</td>
<td>(114)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Agr** = Agricultural sciences  
**Arc** = Architecture, urb. and reg. planning  
**Art** = Art and design  
**Bus** = Business studies, management sciences  
**Edu** = Education, teacher training  
**Eng** = Engineering, technology  
**Geo** = Geography, geology  
**Hum** = Humanities  
**Lan** = Languages, philological sciences  
**Law** = Law  
**Mat** = Mathematics, informatics  
**Med** = Medical sciences  
**Nat** = Natural sciences  
**Soc** = Social sciences  
**Com** = Communic. and information sciences  
**Oth** = Other areas of study  
**Fra** = Framework agreements in various areas of study

Question B4.1: How is information on study abroad opportunities within the ICP disseminated?
3.2 Selection of Students

In most programmes, processes of selection were employed in order to decide about the participants of study periods abroad within the ERASMUS Programme. Six percent of the ICP coordinators reported that students were selected on a "first come, first served" basis, 8 percent reported that no selection was needed and 2 percent did not respond to the question.

Academic achievement of the students were taken into consideration in all programmes selecting systematically (84 %). Also, aspects of the students' motivation and personality (73 %) and their proficiency in the host country language (71 %) were taken into account in most cases. Active preparation for the study abroad period was a criterion for the selection of the students in 34 percent of the programmes, while other criteria played a lesser role.

As Table 3.2 shows, selection differed according to field of study. Systematic selection was least often employed in education and teacher training (61 %) and most often in law (91 %). The inclusion of motivation and personality into the selection criteria varied by field of study to a lesser extent (60-80 %) than that of the proficiency in the host country language (53-91 %). The humanities and social science departments put a stronger emphasis on the latter than mathematics and natural science departments. The fact that host country language proficiency was given different emphasis as a criterion for student selection in different fields of study cannot be explained from the information available. It might indicate a different status for foreign language knowledge and proficiency in each subject area, but it could also reflect the importance placed on students' foreign language proficiency in particular subject areas. The choice of a particular host country for the study abroad period might have some influence - the respective host country language may already be well known (e.g. usually taught in secondary school) or proficiency in the host country language might not be necessary, since students are not instructed in the host country language during their study abroad period. It is finally worthwhile mentioning that active preparation for the study abroad period was taken into account in selecting students in ICPs in education and teacher training, geography and geology as well as in the few ICPs grouped as other fields.

The longer the period abroad lasted, the more emphasis was placed on academic achievement and on host country language proficiency as criteria for the selection of the students. In ICPs where students went abroad for a period not longer than three months, academic achievements were reported to be a criterion by 77 percent of the coordinators as compared to 84 percent in programmes with
Table 3.2
Criteria for Selection of Students, by Field of Study (percent, multiple reply possible)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major field of study *)</th>
<th>Agr</th>
<th>Arc</th>
<th>Art</th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Edu</th>
<th>Eng</th>
<th>Geo</th>
<th>Hum</th>
<th>Lan</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Mat</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Nat</th>
<th>Soc</th>
<th>Com</th>
<th>Oth</th>
<th>Fra</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No selection needed</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First come, first served</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic achievement</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host country language proficiency</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active preparation for study abroad</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-eligibility for other support schemes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial need</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other selection criteria</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not ticked</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>(44)</td>
<td>(114)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>(180)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(69)</td>
<td>(253)</td>
<td>(81)</td>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>(64)</td>
<td>(106)</td>
<td>(114)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(1241)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*) Explanation see Table 3.1

Question B5.1: In selecting students for study abroad which criteria did you apply at your university?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Joint selection mechanisms within the ICP</th>
<th>Agr</th>
<th>Arc</th>
<th>Art</th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Edu</th>
<th>Eng</th>
<th>Geo</th>
<th>Hum</th>
<th>Lan</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Mat</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Nat</th>
<th>Soc</th>
<th>Com</th>
<th>Oth</th>
<th>Fra</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diff. ICPs at your institution</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff. ICPs at any institution</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various joint selection mechanisms</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not ticked</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>(44)</td>
<td>(114)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>(180)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(69)</td>
<td>(253)</td>
<td>(81)</td>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>(64)</td>
<td>(106)</td>
<td>(114)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(1241)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Agr = Agricultural sciences              | Geo = Geography, geology |
| Arc = Architecture, urb. and reg. planning | Hum = Humanities |
| Art = Art and design                    | Lan = Languages, philological sciences |
| Bus = Business studies, management sciences | Law = Law |
| Edu = Education, teacher training       | Mat = Mathematics, informatics |
| Eng = Engineering, technology           | Med = Medical sciences |

| Nat = Natural sciences                  | Soc = Social sciences |
| Com = Communic. and information sciences | Oth = Other areas of study |
| Fra = Framework agreements in various   |                   |
| areas of study                          |                   |

Question B5.3: Is there a joint selection mechanism of some kind?
a duration from four to six months, and 86 percent in programmes with a study abroad period of seven months and longer. The percentage of ICPs where host country language proficiency was taken into account in selecting students ranged from 60 percent (duration up to 3 months) to 70 percent (duration 4 to 6 months) and finally to 78 percent (duration 7 months and longer).

In more than half of all ICPs some kind of cooperation existed with regard to the selection of students for participation in the programme, either between the partners in the ICP, between different ICPs at the same institution, or between different ICPs at any of the other participating institutions. In 11 percent of ICPs several of these joint selection mechanisms were reported.

In one quarter of all ICPs the cooperating partners solely employed joint selection mechanisms of some kind. The questions leave open whether cooperation was established regarding joint criteria or joint decisions on the individual students to be sent and received. As Table 3.3 shows, joint selection (within the whole ICP network) between the partners was most common for ICPs in education (46%), communication and information sciences (42%), while it played a minor role in languages (15%) and agricultural sciences (10%).

Around 16 percent of the ICP coordinators stated that cooperation in the selection of students for participation in the ERASMUS Programme existed between departments which were involved in the different ICPs of their institution. For a considerable number of ICPs (11%) several joint selection mechanisms were applied by the partners within the network (i.e. the single partners participating in the ICP either applied different mechanisms of selection or combinations were used). In the majority of these cases, the coordinators reported that selection "between the partners in one ICP" and "between different ICPs at one institution" took place within their ICP.

3.3 Curricular Integration

A substantial number of ERASMUS students spent some period of study abroad as a compulsory part of their curricular requirements: 21 percent of the ICP coordinators reported that the study period abroad was a mandatory component of the course programme either for all participants in the whole network (13%) or for all participants in part of the network (8%; in some of the ICPs surveyed the status of the study period abroad within the course programme was not the same for all participating institutions). In general terms, if a programme requires students to go abroad, the number of students going abroad is likely to be large: for example, half of the ERASMUS students 89/90 went abroad within the frame-
work of ICPs where a study abroad period was mandatory at least at some of the participating departments. As Table 3.4 shows, all partners of ICPs in law (21%), business studies (18%), and communication/information sciences (17%) most often required students to spend a period of study abroad.

Ten percent of the coordinators reported that the study period abroad was a mandatory component of a sub-specialization within the course programme either for the whole network or for part of it (5% each). This is almost exclusively true for those ICPs in which some other departments require all students to go abroad.

In most ICPs, curricular integration of the study abroad period into the programme at home was agreed upon and formalized to the extent that the majority of courses ERASMUS students had to take abroad were mandatory. As Table 3.5 shows:

- 23 percent of the ICP coordinators ticked the statement "The ICP is a more or less jointly agreed course programme at all or at least several of the participating departmental units".
- 39 percent stated that "Most of the course units to be taken abroad were prescribed in advance".
- 40 percent ticked the statement "Certain elements of study at the host institution are prescribed or recommended, but there is nonetheless a predominant element of individual choice".
- Finally, 10 percent stated "Study at the host university is very predominantly optional and the choice of which courses to follow is therefore left largely to the participating students".

As some of the ICP coordinators ticked more than one response in order to point at the different modes within the respective ICP, the percentages add up to more than 100 percent. Predominantly prescribed programmes (the first two categories) were most common, as Table 3.5 shows, in framework agreements, medical sciences, business studies, and engineering.

In an additional question, ICP coordinators were asked about various aspects of academic activities of ERASMUS students during the study period abroad. The responses to this question, weighted according to the number of students involved, are presented in Table 3.6.

Around 57 percent of ICPs (affecting 62% of the students) expected students to take more or less the same course load as host institution students, while 25 percent of ICPs (affecting 26% percent of students) provided fewer courses than customary in the regular course programme at the host institution. The figures do
Table 3.4
Status of the ICP Within the Overall Degree Course, by Field of Study (percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major field of study</th>
<th>Agr</th>
<th>Arc</th>
<th>Art</th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Edu</th>
<th>Eng</th>
<th>Geo</th>
<th>Hum</th>
<th>Lan</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Mat</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Nat</th>
<th>Soc</th>
<th>Com</th>
<th>Oth</th>
<th>Fra</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>(44)</td>
<td>(114)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>(180)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(69)</td>
<td>(253)</td>
<td>(81)</td>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>(64)</td>
<td>(106)</td>
<td>(114)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(1241)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agr = Agricultural sciences  
Arc = Architecture, urb. and reg. planning  
Art = Art and design  
Bus = Business studies, management sciences  
Edu = Education, teacher training  
Eng = Engineering, technology  
Geo = Geography, geology  
Hum = Humanities  
Lan = Languages, philological sciences  
Law = Law  
Mat = Mathematics, informatics  
Med = Medical sciences  
Nat = Natural sciences  
Soc = Social sciences  
Com = Communic. and information sciences  
Oth = Other areas of study  
Fra = Framework agreements in various areas of study

Question B6.2: Is participation in the ICP compulsory or optional?
Table 3.5
Degree of Curricular Integration Within the ICP, by Field of Study (percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major field of study</th>
<th>Agr</th>
<th>Arc</th>
<th>Art</th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Edu</th>
<th>Eng</th>
<th>Geo</th>
<th>Hum</th>
<th>Lan</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Mat</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Nat</th>
<th>Soc</th>
<th>Com</th>
<th>Oth</th>
<th>Fra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jointly agreed course programme</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescribed courses</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescribed courses for certain elements</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominantly optional study</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not ticked</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>(44)</td>
<td>(114)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>(180)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(69)</td>
<td>(253)</td>
<td>(81)</td>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>(64)</td>
<td>(106)</td>
<td>(114)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agr = Agricultural sciences  
Arc = Architecture, urb. and reg. planning  
Art = Art and design  
Bus = Business studies, management sciences  
Edu = Education, teacher training  
Eng = Engineering, technology  
Geo = Geography, geology  
Hum = Humanities  
Lan = Languages, philological sciences  
Law = Law  
Mat = Mathematics, informatics  
Med = Medical sciences  
Nat = Natural sciences  
Soc = Social sciences  
Com = Communic. and information sciences  
Oth = Other areas of study  
Fra = Framework agreements in various areas of study

Question B6.3: How would you describe the degree of curricular integration within the ICP? Please select the category which fits best.
Table 3.6
Academic Activities of Students at the Host University, According to the ICP Coordinators, by Field of Study
(percent, weighted by participating students, multiple reply possible)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major field of study</th>
<th>Agr</th>
<th>Arc</th>
<th>Art</th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Edu</th>
<th>Eng</th>
<th>Geo</th>
<th>Hum</th>
<th>Lan</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Mat</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Nat</th>
<th>Soc</th>
<th>Com</th>
<th>Oth</th>
<th>Fra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same courses</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some restrictions</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer courses</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course on earlier level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special courses</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual study</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not ticked</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(229)</td>
<td>(410)</td>
<td>(533)</td>
<td>(3942)</td>
<td>(281)</td>
<td>(1742)</td>
<td>(389)</td>
<td>(584)</td>
<td>(3780)</td>
<td>(1450)</td>
<td>(298)</td>
<td>(471)</td>
<td>(790)</td>
<td>(1511)</td>
<td>(118)</td>
<td>(76)</td>
<td>(525)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agr = Agricultural sciences  
Arc = Architecture, urb. and reg. planning  
Art = Art and design  
Bus = Business studies, management sciences  
Edu = Education, teacher training  
Eng = Engineering, technology  
Geo = Geography, geology  
Hum = Humanities  
Lan = Languages, philological sciences  
Law = Law  
Mat = Mathematics, informatics  
Med = Medical sciences  
Nat = Natural sciences  
Soc = Social sciences  
Com = Communic. and information sciences  
Oth = Other areas of study  
Fra = Framework agreements in various areas of study

Question B6.4: Do visiting students participate in a full load of regular courses for the corresponding study period at the host university, or is their study programme different from that of the host university students?
not add up to 100 percent - one reason being that a substantial number of ERASMUS students spent most of their time abroad on individual study. More or the less the same course load was most common in framework agreements for various fields (affecting 82% of the students going abroad in the framework agreement ICPs) and business studies (77%) and least common in agriculture (37%) and "other" fields of study (25%). On the other hand, individual study prevailed in agriculture (68%) as well as in geography and geology (61%). Coordinators of ICPs involving Greece, compared to coordinators of ICPs without Greek partners, seldom stated that students took about the same course load abroad as at home; instead, individual study prevailed in these ICPs.

Some students took courses abroad which were provided for the host institution students of earlier years of study; 8 percent of the ICP coordinators (of ICPs involving 14% of the students) reported this practice. This was most common in geography and geology, languages and philological fields, and in "other fields".

Some 22 percent of the coordinators stated that special courses for foreign students - in almost all cases in addition - were offered at some or all participating departments (involving 30% of participating students). This was most common for ICPs in geography and geology, education and teacher training, languages and philological sciences as well as "other" fields comprising about half of the students in these fields.

The additional provision of special courses was more likely the greater the number of students going abroad within an ICP, while the role of individual studies decreased considerably in ICPs with a larger number of participants and in those ICPs where the study period abroad was mandatory within the whole ICP network.

 Asked whether common textbooks were used, common course requirements were established, schemes for adaptation of grades existed and even joint or double degrees were awarded, only 13 percent of the coordinators of the ICPs responded that none of these joint elements was practised. A further four percent did not respond.

In more than half of the ICPs (54%), schemes for adaptation of grades and joint assessment or marking systems had been developed and introduced. This affected about two thirds of all ERASMUS students who went abroad within these ICPs. In 24 percent of the programmes, which comprised about one third of the participating students, we note common course requirements (which apply for about 60 percent on average of all course requirements in those ICPs). Joint degrees for the participating students were reported for only 16 percent of the ICPs, but in these ICPs more than one quarter of the students on these courses
## Table 3.7
### Joint Elements of Course Programmes, by Field of Study (percent, multiple reply possible)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major field of study</th>
<th>Agr</th>
<th>Arc</th>
<th>Art</th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Edu</th>
<th>Eng</th>
<th>Geo</th>
<th>Hum</th>
<th>Lan</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Mat</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Nat</th>
<th>Soc</th>
<th>Com</th>
<th>Oth</th>
<th>Fra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course requirements</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment system</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No joint elements</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not ticked</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>(44)</td>
<td>(114)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>(180)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(69)</td>
<td>(253)</td>
<td>(81)</td>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>(64)</td>
<td>(106)</td>
<td>(114)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agr = Agricultural sciences  
Arc = Architecture, urb. and reg. planning  
Art = Art and design  
Bus = Business studies, management sciences  
Edu = Education, teacher training  
Eng = Engineering, technology  
Geo = Geography, geology  
Hum = Humanities  
Lan = Languages, philological sciences  
Law = Law  
Mat = Mathematics, informatics  
Med = Medical sciences  
Nat = Natural sciences  
Soc = Social sciences  
Com = Communic. and information sciences  
Oth = Other areas of study  
Fra = Framework agreements in various areas of study

**Question B6.5:** What kind of joint elements of course programmes, instruction and certification have been introduced between the departmental units participating in your ICP?
took part in a study period abroad. Finally, common textbooks were used in 10 percent of the programmes.

Joint elements varied considerably by field of study, as Table 3.7 shows: schemes for adaptation or harmonization of grades and joint assessment and marking systems were common in more than 60 percent of ICPs in communication and information sciences, framework agreements in various areas of studies, social sciences, humanities, and mathematics, while they were least common in ICPs in engineering, agricultural sciences, art and design, and medical sciences;

- common course requirements ranged from about 40 percent of ICPs in architecture and framework agreements to none in ICPs in communication and information sciences; and

- joint or double degrees played a considerable role in business studies (34 % of the respective ICPs, involving more than half of the students in business studies) and in engineering (26 %).

3.4 Work Placements

Placements in commercial, industrial or public organisations formed part of the study period abroad in 29 percent of the ICPs - in almost all cases for the whole network. These ICPs comprised more than 40 percent of all ERASMUS students. Generally, as the data weighted by student numbers in the ICPs show, placements were more common in the fields of study with large student numbers participating. As Table 3.8 shows, they were most common in business studies (63 % of the respective ICPs), agriculture (60 %), education and teacher training (54 %), and engineering (46 %).

Placements were more likely to take place in ICPs in which the three "large" countries, France, Germany, and United Kingdom participated. This is linked to the fact that the majority of the large ICP networks in business studies involve these countries.

In 64 percent of the ICPs providing work placement abroad, placement was compulsory; assessment which counted towards the final degree was practised in 50 percent and no assessment was customary in 14 percent. 34 percent of these ICPs provided work placement on an optional basis, assessment was customary in 23 percent of these ICPs.
### Table 3.8
Placement in a Commercial, Industrial or Public Organisation During the Period Abroad, by Field of Study (percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major field of study</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agr = Agricultural sciences  
Arc = Architecture, urb. and reg. planning  
Art = Art and design  
Bus = Business studies, management sciences  
Edu = Education, teacher training  
Eng = Engineering, technology  
Geo = Geography, geology  
Hum = Humanities  
Lan = Languages, philological sciences  
Law = Law  
Mat = Mathematics, informatics  
Med = Medical sciences  
Nat = Natural sciences  
Soc = Social sciences  
Com = Communic. and information sciences  
Oth = Other areas of study  
Fra = Framework agreements in various areas of study

Question B6.6: Do students participating in the ICP spend a period on placement in a commercial, industrial or public concern?
The four fields most frequently providing work placement tended to provide it as a compulsory element of the course programme:
- in 81 percent of the respective ICPs in business studies (66 % with assessment);
- in 73 percent in engineering (63 % assessed);
- in 60 percent in education and teacher training (42 % assessed); and
- in 53 percent in agriculture (all assessed).

Nearly half of the students who carried out a placement seemed to receive a payment from the host organisation. This can be estimated by weighting the ICP coordinators' responses according to the number of students involved.

In three quarters of the ICPs in which placements were part of the study period abroad, the host institution played a strong role in monitoring and supervising the students during their placement period (1 and 2 on a scale from 1 = "very strong role" to 5 = "no role at all"). In contrast, the home institutions seldom played (less than half of them) an important role in monitoring their students.
Services Provided by the Participating Institutions

4.1 Preparation at the Home Institution

It is generally assumed that preparation for the study abroad helps students reduce feelings of uncertainty and ensures the acquisition of knowledge necessary to ease integration and to cope with academic requirements abroad. Therefore, the preparatory provisions might be viewed as one of the most important features of the Inter-university Programmes. According to the ICP coordinators' reports, as Table 4.1 shows,

- the partners in 80 percent of all ICPs (covering 87% of all 'network' students) organized preparatory meetings for those students who planned to study abroad;
- 73 percent of all partners (covering 79% of the students) provided written material;
- 56 percent provided preparatory courses which were compulsory for the ERASMUS students (affecting 65% of the students);
- 46 percent offered optional courses (affecting 45% of the students);
- 45 percent expected students to prepare themselves (affecting 44% of the students); and
- 19 percent made use of other ways of preparation (affecting 21% of the students).

The data indicate that ICPs sending large numbers of students abroad were more likely to organize preparatory measures.
Table 4.1
Ways of Preparation, by Field of Study (percent, multiple reply possible)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major field of study</th>
<th>Agr</th>
<th>Arc</th>
<th>Art</th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Edu</th>
<th>Eng</th>
<th>Geo</th>
<th>Hum</th>
<th>Lan</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Mat</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Nat</th>
<th>Soc</th>
<th>Com</th>
<th>Oth</th>
<th>Fra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provision of written material</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory courses</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional courses</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-study</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other ways</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not ticked</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n)</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question B7.1: What methods do the sending universities within your ICP adopt to prepare students for the period abroad and to which topics does this preparation relate?
In looking at the proportions of ICPs providing the most organized ways of preparation, we note that
- 56 percent offered mandatory courses; and of the rest
- 26 percent offered at least optional courses; thus, overall 82 percent of the ICPs offered preparatory courses;
- 13 percent arranged at least organized preparatory meetings for their students to prepare them for their study period abroad. If we add these three ways of preparation we note that in total 95 percent of the ICPs offered at least some kind of organized preparation in courses or meetings;
- a further 3 percent provided at least written material or made use of other preparatory methods;
- 1 percent did not offer any preparatory provisions at all, but rather expected that students prepare themselves; and
- 1 percent did not provide any information about preparatory provisions.

The provision of preparatory language courses varied considerably according to the subject area of the ICPs. Coordinators of law (93 %), business studies (82 %) and of smaller fields classified as "other areas" (100 %) reported most often that participating institutions provided optional or mandatory courses for students' preparation. Lower proportions were found in communication/information (50 %) and languages and philological fields (70 %). Provision of written material was highest in education/teacher training and social sciences (86 % each), while ICP coordinators in agriculture (61 %), medical sciences (63 %), fine arts and mathematics (64 % each) and humanities (65 %) indicated provision of written material least frequently.

Preparatory provisions varied only moderately according to the duration of the study period abroad. A significant difference can only be observed regarding mandatory courses. 61 percent of the ICPs sending students abroad for more than six months provided mandatory preparation courses compared to 52 percent of the ICPs sending students abroad for three to six months. This difference, however, is mainly due to the influence of large ICPs in business studies which sent students abroad for the longest periods (7.2 months on average) and provided mandatory courses most often (75 %).

ICPs involving "larger" EC Member States (in terms of ERASMUS student numbers) are more likely to provide mandatory courses for preparation. 65 percent of the ICPs with British, 63 percent with French and 61 percent with German home institutions provided mandatory courses, while the respective proportions of ICPs involving sending institutions from Belgium, Greece, the Netherlands or Portugal ranged from 38 to 51 percent.
In comparing preparatory measures noted by ICP Coordinators in 1989/90 to the responses of ICP students surveyed in 1988/89 in the biennial in-depth survey, we note that:

- the provision of preparatory meetings was twice as high as the students' demand for it;
- the provision of optional courses reported by coordinators was 1.4 times as high as students' participation in such courses;
- the provision of written material was also 1.4 times as high as its use by students; and
- the provision of mandatory courses was a 1.3 times as high as students' participation in it.

In contrast, the proportion of students preparing solely through self-study was 1.5 times as high as the number of ICPs not providing any preparatory meetings or written material. These findings suggest that not all help offered by the institutions was taken up by the students. The comparison undertaken above, however, might inflate this gap for two reasons. First, preparatory measures in 1989/90 might have been more extensive than in 1988/89. Second, ICP coordinators' responses in some cases apply to some, but not all partners.

ICP coordinators were asked to specify the preparatory measures offered by the participating institutions under four different headings. In aggregating the responses we note, as Table 4.2 indicates, that preparation (courses, meetings or at least written material) was provided regarding:

- practical matters of living and studying in the host country in 85 percent of the ICPs;
- academic issues in 67 percent of the ICPs;
- society and culture of the host country in 64 percent of the ICPs; and
- foreign language in 75 percent of the ICPs (in this case mandatory or optional courses only, because ICP coordinators were not asked about meetings and written materials in respect of foreign language instruction).

Preparatory foreign language courses were provided in 75 percent of the ICPs, courses on academic preparation in 29 percent, on society and culture of the host country in 23 percent, and practical matters of living and studying abroad in 15 percent. As Table 4.2 shows, meetings on practical preparation were arranged by 72 percent of all ICPs. Less than half of all ICPs arranged preparatory meetings on society and culture of the host country (40%) or on academic learning abroad (38%).

Preparatory arrangements regarding practical matters of living and studying abroad varied more markedly by field of study than preparatory provisions in
other areas. ICP coordinators in business studies, education and teacher training, law, social sciences and in framework agreements reported most often that written material and meetings were provided for student preparation, while agriculture programmes provided least preparation in this area. ICPs in business studies, education and teacher training, languages and "other areas of study" most often offered preparatory orientation on culture and society of the host country.

Table 4.2
Areas of Preparation by Ways of Preparation (percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Provision of written material</th>
<th>Meetings</th>
<th>Mandatory courses</th>
<th>Optional courses</th>
<th>Self-study</th>
<th>Other ways</th>
<th>Total (Excluding self-study and other ways)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practical matters of living/studying in host country</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society and culture of host country</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic preparation</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic preparation</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other themes for preparation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question B7.1: What methods do the sending universities within your ICP adopt to prepare students for the period abroad and to which topics does this preparation relate?

* Not asked about in the report form.

As Table 4.3 shows, provision for academic preparation was most often reported by ICP coordinators in geography, communication and information sciences, education and teacher training, and law. Academic preparation was provided less often in art and design and "other areas of study". The highest proportion of ICPs providing mandatory courses for academic preparation can be observed in law (37 %) and business studies (32 %); mandatory courses of that kind were very unusual in art and design (2 %) and humanities (7 %). Table 4.4 indicates that 40 percent of the ICP coordinators reported that mandatory or optional prepar-
Table 4.3
Areas of Preparation, by Field of Study (percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major field of study</th>
<th>Agr</th>
<th>Arc</th>
<th>Art</th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Edu</th>
<th>Eng</th>
<th>Geo</th>
<th>Hum</th>
<th>Lan</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Mat</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Nat</th>
<th>Soc</th>
<th>Com</th>
<th>Oth</th>
<th>Fra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practical matters of living/studying in host country</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society and culture of host country</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic prep.</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language prep.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other themes for preparation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not provided</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not ticked</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>(44)</td>
<td>(114)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>(180)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(69)</td>
<td>(253)</td>
<td>(81)</td>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>(64)</td>
<td>(106)</td>
<td>(114)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agr = Agricultural sciences
Arc = Architecture, urb. and reg. planning
Art = Art and design
Bus = Business studies, management sciences
Edu = Education, teacher training
Eng = Engineering, technology
Geo = Geography, geology
Hum = Humanities
Law = Law
Lan = Languages, philological sciences
Mat = Mathematics, informatics
Med = Medical sciences
Nat = Natural sciences
Soc = Social sciences
Com = Communic. and information sciences
Oth = Other areas of study
Fra = Framework agreements in various areas of study

Question B7.1: What methods do the sending universities within your ICP adopt to prepare students for the period abroad and to which topics does this preparation relate?
Table 4.4
Methods for Academic Preparation, by Field of Study (percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written material</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses: mandatory</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses: optional</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-study</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other methods</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not ticked</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>(44)</td>
<td>(114)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>(180)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(69)</td>
<td>(253)</td>
<td>(81)</td>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>(64)</td>
<td>(106)</td>
<td>(114)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agr = Agricultural sciences      Geo = Geography, geology      Nat = Natural sciences
Arc = Architecture, urb. and reg. planning  Hum = Humanities       Soc = Social sciences
Art = Art and design          Lan = Languages, philological sciences     Com = Communic. and information sciences
Bus = Business studies, management sciences  Law = Law           Oth = Other areas of study
Edu = Education, teacher training    Mat = Mathematics, informatics  Fra = Framework agreements in various
Eng = Engineering, technology    Med = Medical sciences  areas of study

Question B7.1: What methods do the sending universities within your ICP adopt to prepare students for the period abroad and to which topics does this preparation relate?
atory courses on academic issues were part of the regular course programme in the home institution. The proportion of recognized courses was higher for mandatory than for optional courses. Preparatory courses were most often part of the regular course programme in business studies and law.

Preparatory provisions regarding practical matters varied most markedly according to the duration of the study period abroad: courses, meetings and materials were more likely to be provided if the duration of the study period abroad was longer than half a year. A similar, though smaller difference can be observed in preparatory provisions regarding the culture and society of the host country. In contrast, the duration of the study period abroad did not affect provisions for academic preparation.

Provision of courses for foreign language preparation were more likely to differ according to home and host country than according to field of study. Detailed information, however, cannot be provided because most ICP coordinators provided information on the dominant modes of preparation in the whole ICP network rather than on preparatory measures at each participating institution.

Altogether we note that ICPs involving German, British and French partners provide preparatory courses most often. Preparatory courses were least often found in ICPs involving Dutch institutions and also below average in ICPs involving Spanish and Belgian partners.

4.2 Language of Instruction and Language Training Abroad

According to the ICP coordinators, students of 65 percent of the flows within ICPs are taught exclusively in the host country language during their study period abroad. In a further 23 percent of the flows, the host country language was used for instruction:
- in addition to a third language (11 % of the flows);
- in addition to the home country language (10 %); and
- in addition to both the home country and a third language (2 % of the flows).

In only 12 percent of the flows, students were not taught in the host country language at all, but:
- in a third language (5 % of the flows);
- only the home country language (4 % of the flows); or
- in the home country language and a third language (3 % of the flows).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language of Instruction During the Study Period Abroad per Flow, by Field of Study (percent)</th>
<th>Agr</th>
<th>Arc</th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Edu</th>
<th>Eng</th>
<th>Geo</th>
<th>Hum</th>
<th>Lan</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Mat</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Nat</th>
<th>Soc Com</th>
<th>Oth</th>
<th>Fra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only host</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only home</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only third language</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host and home</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host and third</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home and third</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosts, home, and third</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Question B8.1: What is the language of instruction abroad for students within the ICP?
ERASMUS students in 1988/89 reported instruction in the language of the host country (71% solely and 19% partly in the host country language) slightly more often. In weighting the ICP coordinator responses according to the number of students participating, however, we note an almost identical pattern.

As Table 4.5 shows, teaching solely in the host country language was most common in the humanities (83%), business studies, framework agreements (79%), mathematics (75%), engineering (70%), and law (69%). There is no single factor to explain the differences by field of study, but factors which play a role are:

- the importance of the host language for studying the respective field (for example literature);
- the number of participating students; and
- the different distribution of widely known host country languages across the fields of study.

Information provided does not allow an exact analysis of the individual languages spoken. We only note that the use of the host country language for the instruction of incoming students was most likely in ICPs in which German, French, British, Irish, and Spanish institutions participated. On the other hand, it was least common in ICPs with Dutch, Danish, and Belgian partners.

There was a correlation between the length of the study period abroad and the use of the host country language for instruction. The ICP coordinators indicated, as Table 4.6 shows, that:

- in flows up to four months the host country language was at least partly used in 82 percent of the student flows, and in 52 percent of these exclusively;
- in flows between four and six months the host country language was used in 86 percent of the instruction, of which almost 60 percent exclusively; while
- in 94 percent of flows in which the duration was seven months and longer the language of instruction abroad used to be the host country language, of which almost 80 percent exclusively.

As already mentioned in the previous chapter, considerable efforts were made to prepare students linguistically prior to their study period abroad. The ICP coordinators also reported that substantial efforts to improve students' language competence were made during the study period abroad:

- 65 percent of the coordinators stated that students in their ICP were offered language training during their study abroad, predominantly on an optional basis (40%); and
- 47 percent of the coordinators stated that the students were provided with language courses immediately on arrival in the host country and prior to commencement of studies (27% optional).

Table 4.6
Language of Instruction During the Study Period Abroad for the Various Student Flows, by Duration (percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Duration in months</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 or less</td>
<td>4-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only host</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only home</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only third language</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host and home</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host and third</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home and third</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host, home, and third</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(804)</td>
<td>(2285)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question B8.1: What is the language of instruction abroad for students within ICP?

The longer the duration of the study period abroad, the more likely were foreign language courses in the host country. Notably (Table 4.7):

- language courses during study abroad were arranged in 71 percent of the ICPs where the duration of the study period abroad was seven months and more as compared to 56 percent of ICPs with a duration of up to three months; and
- language courses immediately upon arrival were reported by 57 percent of the coordinators of ICPs in which the study period abroad lasted seven months or more compared with 31 percent for ICPs with a duration of up to three months.
Table 4.7
Timing of Foreign Language Preparation Within the Inter-University Cooperation Programmes, by Duration of the Study Period Abroad (percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration in months</th>
<th>3 or less</th>
<th>4-6</th>
<th>7 and more</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No special course provided</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course prior to departure</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course just after arrival</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course during study abroad</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not ticked</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(n)</em></td>
<td>(229)</td>
<td>(541)</td>
<td>(470)</td>
<td>(1240)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question B8.3: What foreign language preparation do students participating in the ICP receive?

4.3 Assistance Provided by the Host Institution

Assistance, guidance and advice provided by the host institution is a factor in successful study abroad and can be crucial during the first days and weeks abroad. ICP coordinators were asked the extent to which host institutions in the respective ICPs provided assistance and advice to incoming students.

They were given 13 areas covering academic issues, foreign language, host culture and society, and practical and personal matters abroad. While foreign language, academic and personal matters were referred to in an aggregate way, specific aspects of assistance and advice regarding practical matters of living and studying abroad (orientation about the host institution, the host country's higher education system, registration, course selection etc., accommodation, matters regarding students' financial support, work placement, and other practical matters) and culture and society of the host country (the host country in general, the local community, communication with host country nationals, and finally cultural, sports and recreational activities) were surveyed in more detail.

Only 9 (1%) of the ICP coordinators stated that there was no support provided by the host institutions. For most areas mentioned above, a high proportion of ICP coordinators reported that a substantial amount of assistance and advice was provided to students:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major field of study</th>
<th>Agr</th>
<th>Arc</th>
<th>Art</th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Edu</th>
<th>Eng</th>
<th>Geo</th>
<th>Hum</th>
<th>Lan</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Mat</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Nat</th>
<th>Soc</th>
<th>Com</th>
<th>Oth</th>
<th>Fra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial matters</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical matters</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic matters</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work placement</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language training</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host country</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local community</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal matters</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social contacts</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture, sports etc.</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agr = Agricultural sciences  
Arc = Architecture, urb. and reg. planning  
Art = Art and design  
Bus = Business studies, management sciences  
Edu = Education, teacher training  
Eng = Engineering, technology  
Geo = Geography, geology  
Hum = Humanities  
Lan = Languages, philological sciences  
Law = Law  
Mat = Mathematics, informatics  
Med = Medical sciences  
Nat = Natural sciences  
Soc = Social sciences  
Com = Communic. and information sciences  
Oth = Other areas of study  
Fra = Framework agreements in various areas of study

Question B9.1: What kind of support/advice is provided to the students by the host university within the ICP (multiple reply possible)?
- 99 percent regarding practical matters of living and studying abroad;
- 93 percent regarding culture and society of the host country;
- 89 percent regarding academic matters;
- 64 percent regarding language training; and
- 53 percent regarding personal matters.

With respect to the individual aspects addressed in the coordinator's report form (see Table 4.8), we note that assistance and advice were most common regarding university registration, course selection, etc., academic matters and accommodation. On the other hand, no assistance and guidance at all (5 on a scale from "1 = very considerable" to "5 = none") was most often stated regarding students' financial support (25 %) and work placement, if applicable (14 %).

In comparing the responses by ICP coordinators to those by the ERASMUS ICP students surveyed in 1988/89, we observe a more cautious rating on the part of the students. While the coordinators most often stated substantial support provided by the host institution, the students more often observed modest support. Apart from that general point responses regarding the various items were similar. Most students also reported that they were provided assistance and advice regarding university registration, academic matters and accommodation, while least support was provided on financial matters.

The amount of assistance and advice provided by the host institution varied considerably according to the subject area of the ICPs. In comparing the average level of support across all 13 aspects, we note that the highest level of support was provided by the few ICPs categorized as "other areas of study" (77 %) followed by education and teacher training (74 %), and framework agreements in various areas of study (70 %). On the other hand, the mean percentage of substantial assistance and advice was relatively low in the case of ICPs in architecture (53 %), communication and information sciences (57 %) as well as art and design (57 %).

Coordinators of ICPs involving Denmark as a host country most frequently indicated substantial support by the host institution for incoming students (71 % as compared to 64 % on average). Altogether, differences by host country seemed to be small, but we have to bear in mind, as already stated above, that information was not provided on individual host countries.
4.4 Accommodation

Life and study in another country for a short period is substantially eased if the host institution helps finding accommodation. The majority of ICP coordinators reported that students were provided accommodation. Some of the remaining host institutions provided temporary accommodation or assisted the students' search for accommodation. In Table 4.9, the ICP coordinators' responses are weighted by the number of students going abroad in respective ICPs. According to the ICP coordinators:

- 65 percent of the ERASMUS students 1989/90 were provided with accommodation by the host institution;
- 8 percent were provided with temporary accommodation;
- 7 percent were assisted by the host institution in their own search for accommodation; and
- 21 percent of the students did not receive any support; according to the coordinators most of them (19%) did not need any support, because they had made their own arrangements.

In comparison, a somewhat smaller number of students going abroad in 1988/89 stated that they were provided with accommodation (57 %), while a few more reported that they were assisted in their own search (11 %). The proportion of students not supported at all in provision or search was 21 percent as well, but only about 15 % of the students 1988/89 stated that they had informed the host institution in advance that they did not need any support because they had made their own arrangements. We do not know whether support by the host institution as regards accommodation increased between 1988/89 and 1989/90 or whether the institutional support is viewed somewhat more positively by ICP coordinators than by students. The 1990/91 ICP student in-depth survey being carried out at the moment might answer this.

Table 4.9 also shows that students of the host institution play an important role in helping their fellow students with regard to accommodation. On the basis of the information provided by ICP coordinators, we estimate that 23 percent of the ERASMUS students provided with regular accommodation were assisted by host institution students - either solely or in cooperation with staff from the host institution. According to the ERASMUS students surveyed, this figure was only 11 percent in 1988/89. According to the ICP coordinators, a further 9 percent of ERASMUS students 1889/90 were assisted by host institution students in finding accommodation or in searching for accommodation.
### Table 4.9
Role of Host Institution's Staff and Students in Finding Accommodation, by Field of Study (percent, weighted by number of Students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major field of study</th>
<th>Agr</th>
<th>Arc</th>
<th>Art</th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Edu</th>
<th>Eng</th>
<th>Geo</th>
<th>Hum</th>
<th>Lan</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Mat</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Nat</th>
<th>Soc</th>
<th>Com</th>
<th>Oth</th>
<th>Fra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff - regular accommodation</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stud. - regular accommodation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff and stud. regular accommodation</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff - temporary accommodation</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stud. - temporary accommodation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff and stud. temporary accommodation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(to be continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Table 4.9)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major field of study</th>
<th>Agr</th>
<th>Arc</th>
<th>Art</th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Edu</th>
<th>Eng</th>
<th>Geo</th>
<th>Hum</th>
<th>Lan</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Mat</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Nat</th>
<th>Soc</th>
<th>Com</th>
<th>Oth</th>
<th>Fra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff - assistance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stud. - assistance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff and stud. -</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own arrangements</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(219)</td>
<td>(403)</td>
<td>(453)</td>
<td>(3880)</td>
<td>(281)</td>
<td>(1630)</td>
<td>(348)</td>
<td>(568)</td>
<td>(3683)</td>
<td>(1408)</td>
<td>(291)</td>
<td>(430)</td>
<td>(669)</td>
<td>(1443)</td>
<td>(102)</td>
<td>(49)</td>
<td>(479)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agr = Agricultural sciences
Arc = Architecture, urb. and reg. planning
Art = Art and design
Bus = Business studies, management sciences
Edu = Education, teacher training
Eng = Engineering, technology
Geo = Geography, geology
Hum = Humanities
Lan = Languages, philological sciences
Law = Law
Mat = Mathematics, informatics
Med = Medical sciences
Nat = Natural sciences
Soc = Social sciences
Com = Communic. and information sciences
Oth = Other areas of study
Fra = Framework agreements in various areas of study

Question B10.2.2: What role does (do) the host university(ies) staff and students play in finding students' accommodation?
Table 4.10
Percentage of Incoming Students Provided with University Accommodation, According to the ICP Coordinators, by Field of Study (mean)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major field of study</th>
<th>Agr</th>
<th>Arc</th>
<th>Art</th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Edu</th>
<th>Eng</th>
<th>Geo</th>
<th>Hum</th>
<th>Lan</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Mat</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Nat</th>
<th>Soc</th>
<th>Com</th>
<th>Oth</th>
<th>Fra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of incoming students in halls of residence</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>75.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agr = Agricultural sciences  
Arc = Architecture, urb. and reg. planning  
Art = Art and design  
Bus = Business studies, management sciences  
Edu = Education, teacher training  
Eng = Engineering, technology  
Geo = Geography, geology  
Hum = Humanities  
Lan = Languages, philological sciences  
Law = Law  
Mat = Mathematics, informatics  
Med = Medical sciences  
Nat = Natural sciences  
Soc = Social sciences  
Com = Communic. and information sciences  
Oth = Other areas of study  
Fra = Framework agreements in various areas of study

Question B10.2.1: What percentage of incoming students are provided with accommodation in halls of residence at the host university(ies)?
As Table 4.9 shows as well, the provision of regular accommodation by the host institution ranged from more than 80 percent for students in communication and information sciences and mathematics/informatics to about 50 percent for students in art and design and in business studies.

The most common form of institutional support for accommodation is the provision of university accommodation, i.e. halls of residence run by the institution of higher education or by agencies. The ICP coordinators reported that on average 65 percent of the ERASMUS students within the ICPs were provided with university accommodation. In contrast, only 51 percent of ICP students surveyed in 1988/89 stated that they lived in halls of residence.

As Table 4.10 shows, the proportion of students living in university accommodation ranged from about three quarters in framework agreements in various areas of study, natural sciences, engineering, and mathematics to less than half in geography and geology as well as in art and design. The longer the study period abroad, the more likely it was for students to live in university accommodation.

As will be shown in the subsequent section, the ICP coordinators rated accommodation as one of the most serious problems encountered by the students. In addition, they reported great efforts on the part of the host institution staff and students in helping incoming students finding accommodation.

4.5 Problems Encountered by Students While Abroad

Living and studying in a foreign environment may pose various kinds of problems. In order to examine the extent to which students faced problems in the view of the programme coordinators, the ICP coordinators were provided with a list of 19 possible problems. On a scale from 1 = "very serious problems" to 5 = "no problems at all" they were asked to state whether students encountered significant problems regarding:

- living and organizing conditions of study in the host country (administrative matters, financial matters, guidance concerning non-academic matters, accommodation, finding place to concentrate on studies outside the classroom, not enough time available for travel);
- study at the host institution (academic level of courses, differences in the teaching and learning methods between home and host institution, readiness on part of teaching staff to meet and help foreign students, differences in class or student project group size, guidance concerning academic programme);
- foreign language issues (taking courses in a foreign language, taking examinations in a foreign language, communication in a foreign language outside the classroom);
- communication (interaction among/with host country students, not enough or too much contact with people from the home country);
- lifestyles of nationals in host country; and finally
- climate, food, health etc.

The same list of problems was presented to the ICP students 1988/89 in a survey conducted by the authors (see F. Maiworm, W. Steube, U. Teichler. Learning in Europe: The ERASMUS Experience. London: J. Kingsley 1991). Although one year had elapsed between the student survey and the coordinators' report and although the student cohorts were not identical, it is still relevant to compare students' experiences 1988/89 with the statements of ICP coordinators 1989/90.

Altogether, 53 percent of the coordinators stated that students within their ICPs encountered problems of living and organizing the conditions of study in the host country while 22 percent stated problems of study and foreign language problems. One third did not rate any of the 19 possible problems as serious (scale points 1 or 2). These aggregate percentages should be viewed with some caution, however, because the number of items for each area differed.

Financial matters were most often reported (40 %) by coordinators as a serious problem which students encountered abroad, as Table 4.11 shows. Other single problems which were considered relatively often as serious by coordinators were accommodation (27 %), taking examinations or courses in a foreign language (19 % and 12 %), differences in teaching and learning methods between home and host country (15 %), not enough time for travel (12 %), and administrative matters (11 %). Coordinators reported problems less frequently with regard to social contacts, lifestyles of nationals in host country, climate, food, health etc., and concerning academic or non-academic guidance of students.

In comparing the perception of coordinators 1989/90 with experiences reported by ICP students 1988/89, we note that ICP coordinators more frequently stated serious problems than did the students regarding financial matters (40 % weighted as compared to 21 % on the part of the students) and accommodation (35 % and 22 % respectively). In most of the cases, ICP coordinators and students responded similarly. On the other hand, students considered too much contact with people from students' own country as a serious problem (26 %) far more frequently than coordinators (10 % weighted). Students also saw more problems regarding guidance on academic matters (18 %) or non-academic matters (12 %) during their period abroad than perceived by coordinators (respectively 3 % and 2 %). As already shown in previous surveys on study abroad programmes, stu-
dents tend to point out problems which academic or non-academic staff could solve, while those responsible for the programmes are more likely to emphasize problems they could solve themselves at most to a limited extent.

In the ICP coordinators' reports about serious problems encountered by students abroad varied considerably according to subject area:
- foreign language problems were most often stated by coordinators of education/teacher training and geography programmes;
- financial problems by architecture and art coordinators; and
- problems related to differences in teaching and learning methods were more frequently reported in ICPs concerned with art/design and education/teacher training.

In general, 88 percent of architecture and 84 percent of business studies coordinators mentioned at least one of the 19 possible problems as a serious one for their students, while only about half of the ICP coordinators from agriculture, mathematics, natural sciences, and communication and information sciences stated that serious problems were encountered by their students.

Differences between home and host countries were very small in most cases. Financial problems were more often stated by coordinators of ICPs in which Greece (53 %), Italy and Ireland (48 % each) were participating as home countries. Comparatively serious problems regarding examinations in foreign languages were reported by ICP coordinators with Greek partners. Accommodation problems were most frequently reported by coordinators of ICPs including Italy and the Netherlands.
Table 4.11
Students' Most Serious Problems During the Study Abroad Period, by Field of Study (percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major field of study*</th>
<th>Agr</th>
<th>Arc</th>
<th>Art</th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Edu</th>
<th>Eng</th>
<th>Geo</th>
<th>Hum</th>
<th>Lan</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Mat</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Nat</th>
<th>Soc</th>
<th>Com</th>
<th>Oth</th>
<th>Fra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taking courses in a foreign language</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking examinations in a foreign language</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic level of courses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences in teaching/learning betw. home and host univ.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness of teachers to meet/help foreign students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences in class or student project group size</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative matters</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial matters</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance concerning academic programme</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance concerning non-academic matters</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(to be continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major field of study*</th>
<th>Agr</th>
<th>Arc</th>
<th>Art</th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Edu</th>
<th>Eng</th>
<th>Geo</th>
<th>Hum</th>
<th>Lang</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Mat</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Nat</th>
<th>Soc</th>
<th>Com</th>
<th>Oth</th>
<th>Fra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finding place to concentrate on studies outside class</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate, food, health etc.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyles of nationals in host country</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction among/with host country students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough contact with people from your own country</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much contact with people from your own country</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating in foreign language outside the class</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough time available for travel</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question B10.1: What are the aspects of study abroad with which students typically encounter major problems during their study period abroad in the framework of your ICP (multiple reply possible)?

*) Explanation see Table 4.10
Recognition and Academic Impacts

5.1 Means of Assessment of Students

ICP coordinators were asked about the type of formal academic work the students were required to produce during their period abroad and how students' performance was assessed. According to the coordinators;

- students in 75 percent of the ICPs (81% of the ICP students 1989/90) had to produce tests, papers, essays, oral examinations etc. in the framework of courses at the host institution;
- in 46 percent of the ICPs written reports on studies at host institution were required (covering 44% of the students);
- 26 percent of ICP coordinators reported that students had to take comprehensive written tests, to write essays etc. on their whole programme of study abroad which were set by the respective host institution (affecting 33% of students);
- 24 percent of the ICPs certified the attendance in courses at the host institution without formal assessment (affecting 24% of students);
- 20 percent of the coordinators stated oral examinations as a type of formal academic work required from students (affecting 22% of the students); and
- 20 percent stated that other types of formal academic work were required.

The types of formal academic work students were required to produce varied according to the duration of the study period abroad. As Table 5.1 shows, examinations in the framework of courses at the host institution were the more frequent, the longer the study period abroad. Only 55 percent of coordinators of ICPs with an average study period abroad of up to three months reported this type of formal academic work, while 87 percent of coordinators of ICPs with
study periods abroad of at least seven months stated that students were examined in this way. In contrast, students going abroad in the framework of ICPs with short study periods abroad were most often expected to write a report on studies at the host institution in general (64 % as compared to 37 %).

Certificates of attendance without formal assessment or written reports, rather than tests and examination, were more common in ICPs with Danish, Greek or Portuguese partners. Examinations with a focus on the overall studies abroad were more frequent in ICPs with Irish partners.

Table 5.1
**Required Formal Academic Work During the Period Abroad, by Duration of the Study Period Abroad (percent, multiple reply possible)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration in months</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 or less</td>
<td>4-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate of attendance at courses</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tests, papers, essay, oral examination etc.</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written test, essay etc. on overall studies abroad</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral examination on overall studies abroad</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written report on studies at host university</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other type of formal academic work</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not ticked</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>208</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(n)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(229)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question B11.1: What type(s) of formal academic work are the students required to produce during their period abroad?

Students in ICPs in art and design, education and teacher training, and medical sciences were required to produce relatively "soft" formal academic work during their period of study abroad. On the other hand, ICPs in business studies, law and framework agreements most frequently required tests, papers, oral examinations etc. in the framework of courses at the host institution, as Table 5.2 shows.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major field of study*</th>
<th>Agr</th>
<th>Arc</th>
<th>Art</th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Edu</th>
<th>Eng</th>
<th>Geo</th>
<th>Hum</th>
<th>Lan</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Mat</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Nat</th>
<th>Soc</th>
<th>Com</th>
<th>Oth</th>
<th>Fra</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certificate of attendance at courses</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tests, papers, essay, oral examination etc.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written test, essay etc. on overall studies abroad</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral examination on overall studies abroad</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written report on studies at host university</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other type of formal academic work</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not ticked</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>(44)</td>
<td>(114)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>(180)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(69)</td>
<td>(253)</td>
<td>(81)</td>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>(64)</td>
<td>(106)</td>
<td>(114)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(1241)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Question B11.1: What type(s) of formal academic work are the students' required to produce during their period abroad?

*Explanation see Table 5.3*
In addition, ICP coordinators were asked about the approach to assessment of the study period abroad:

- 26 percent reported that the study abroad period was regarded as a complete package, which the students either pass or fail;
- 69 percent of the coordinators stated that students were given recognition (credit) for individual course units successfully completed while abroad; and
- 20 percent reported that other approaches were employed. This was notably true for programmes providing very short periods of study abroad.

About one fifth of the coordinators reported using more than one principle of performance assessment.

The assessment of the whole period as a complete package was most common in large ICPs and in ICPs where study abroad was a mandatory component of the course programme (42 %). Some 52 percent of large ICPs (more than 50 students going abroad) reported this kind of assessment, while only 25 percent of the ICPs with a smaller number of students assessed the study abroad as a complete package. Furthermore, ICPs providing for a relatively long period abroad were more likely to regard the study period abroad as a complete package in the assessment process.

As Table 5.3 shows, a substantial number of ICPs in business studies (39 % of the business ICPs, representing 52 % of the ERASMUS students in business studies) reported that the study abroad period was regarded as a complete pass/fail package. This finding is not surprising, because ICPs in business studies tend to be large. Overall assessment of the complete study programme was also common in law (35 % of the ICPs representing 40 % of the students) and in the small group of ICPs categorized as "other areas of study" (43 % of the ICPs and 42 % of the students).

On the other hand, assessment of students by individual course units successfully completed while abroad was most frequent in ICPs in languages and philological sciences (83 %), and in framework agreements (82 %). Coordinators of ICPs in art and design and in humanities indicated this kind of assessment least frequently.

In a survey conducted in 1984/85, 42 percent of the coordinators of Joint Study Programmes - the predecessors of the ERASMUS Programme - stated that they practised global recognition of study abroad, based solely on performance as certified by the partner institution (F. Dalichow and U. Teichler: Recognition of Study Abroad in the European Community. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 1986, pp. 32-33). Although we can-
Table 5.3
Assessment of Students' Performance During the Study Abroad, by Field of Study (percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major field of study</th>
<th>Agr</th>
<th>Arc</th>
<th>Art</th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Edu</th>
<th>Eng</th>
<th>Geo</th>
<th>Hum</th>
<th>Lan</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Mat</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Nat</th>
<th>Soc</th>
<th>Com</th>
<th>Oth</th>
<th>Fra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Complete period</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Individual course units</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Other approach</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 + 2 stated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 + 3 stated</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 + 3 stated</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 + 2 + 3 stated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agr = Agricultural sciences
Arc = Architecture, urb. and reg. planning
Art = Art and design
Bus = Business studies, management sciences
Edu = Education, teacher training
Eng = Engineering, technology
Geo = Geography, geology
Hum = Humanities
Lan = Languages, philological sciences
Law = Law
Mat = Mathematics, informatics
Med = Medical sciences
Nat = Natural sciences
Soc = Social sciences
Com = Communic. and information sciences
Oth = Other areas of study
Fra = Framework agreements in various areas of study

Question B11.2: How is the students' performance during their study abroad assessed?
not exclude the impact of a re-phrasing of the question we conclude that ERASMUS ICPs have not yet reached the level of mutual confidence among the partner institutions, with regard to quality of teaching, assessment and identity or complementarity of course programmes that was attained within Joint Study Programmes and which led to such a high percentage of global recognition.

5.2 Extent of Recognition

Different measures were employed to examine the extent to which ICP coordinators reported that study abroad was recognized by the home institution upon return. Identical questions were posed to ERASMUS students in 1988/89, and compared to these ICP coordinators tended to underestimate the limits of recognition, although we cannot exclude the possibility of changes between 1988/89 and 1989/90. A survey undertaken in the mid-eighties on study abroad programmes in the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Sweden and the USA had already shown that programme directors tend to underestimate problems of recognition (cf. S. Oppen, U. Teichler and J. Carlson. The Impact of Study Abroad Programmes on Students and Graduates. London: J. Kingsley, 1990). For example, only 19 percent of the coordinators of Joint Study Programmes expected that some or all of their students had to prolong the length of their degree course due to the study period abroad, while 27 percent of the students expected a prolongation (U. Teichler and W. Steube. "The Logics of Study Abroad Programmes and Their Impacts," Higher Education, Vol. 21, 1991, pp. 344-345).

First, the degree of recognition was taken into account (i.e. the degree to which the academic study successfully undertaken at the host institution was recognized or otherwise considered equivalent). Table 5.4 shows that ICP coordinators reported that 90 percent of successful study abroad was accepted by the home institution upon return (affecting 89 % of the participating students). ERASMUS students of the preceding year, however, reported only 77 percent recognition according to this measure.

Secondly, the degree of correspondence was addressed (i.e. the extent to which study at the host institution actually corresponds to the amount of typical study at the home institution during a corresponding period). The second question was considered necessary because students might take less (or in a few cases more) courses abroad than at home and therefore might have to face an additional workload at home even if all courses taken abroad were recognized. According to ICP coordinators (see Table 5.4), study abroad on average cor-
### Table 5.4
Degree of Recognition, Correspondence and Prolongation, by Field of Study (mean; percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major field of study</th>
<th>Agr</th>
<th>Arc</th>
<th>Art</th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Edu</th>
<th>Eng</th>
<th>Geo</th>
<th>Hum</th>
<th>Lan</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Mat</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Nat</th>
<th>Soc</th>
<th>Com</th>
<th>Oth</th>
<th>Fra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credit granted or otherwise considered equivalent</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correspondence to study at home</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of prolongation</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agr = Agricultural sciences  
Arc = Architecture, urb. and reg. planning  
Art = Art and design  
Bus = Business studies, management sciences  
Edu = Education, teacher training  
Eng = Engineering, technology  
Geo = Geography, geology  
Hum = Humanities  
Lan = Languages, philological sciences  
Law = Law  
Mat = Mathematics, informatics  
Med = Medical sciences  
Nat = Natural sciences  
Soc = Social sciences  
Com = Communic. and information sciences  
Oth = Other areas of study  
Fra = Framework agreements in various areas of study

Question B12.1: To what extent is the students' academic study at the host university granted credit or otherwise considered equivalent to studies at the home university?

Question B12.2: To what extent does the students' study at the host university actually correspond to the amount of typical study at the home university during a corresponding period?

Question B12.3: The study period abroad is likely to prolong the students total duration of study by:

1) i.e. expected prolongation of study as a proportion of length of study period abroad.
responded to 83 percent of study at the home institution (the valid responses affecting 87% of the students). According to the ERASMUS students of the preceding year, the respective ratio was 73 percent.

Thirdly, the degree of non-prolongation was asked for (the responses to the question about the expected prolongation of the overall duration of study due to the study period abroad provided the basis for this measure). ICP coordinators estimated that students have prolonged their studies by 1.4 months on average - i.e. 23 percent of the study period abroad (Table 5.4). Thus, the degree of non-prolongation was 77 percent according to the ICP coordinators' estimate (affecting 78% of the students) as compared to 47 percent reported by the ERASMUS 1988/89 students.

It is interesting to note that ICP coordinators in 1989/90 perceived the incidence of incomplete recognition to be only half as high as did students in the 1988/89 student survey. This may indicate a very substantial improvement in the situation (1988/89 was only the first full year of the programme) or it may reflect a very real difference in perception by students and staff of what "incomplete recognition" means; student responses, for instance, may well have reflected the inevitable uncertainty of being among the first groups going through the system.

On the basis of at least two of the three criteria the extent of recognition was considered by the ICP coordinators to be relatively high in art and design and in mathematics. On the other hand, it seemed to be relatively low in agriculture and law. As regards both home and host country, recognition seems most complete in ICPs involving Denmark and least complete in ICPs involving Greece.

The longer the period of study abroad the more likely were courses taken abroad recognized upon return (according to the ICP coordinators). The degree of correspondence was below average for ICPs in which short study periods abroad prevail. However, the degree of non-prolongation estimated by ICP coordinators did not vary according to the duration of the study period abroad.

5.3 Reasons for Incomplete Recognition and Efforts for Easing Recognition

Coordinators of those ICPs in which full recognition was not normally awarded were asked to state reasons for incomplete recognition: 41 percent of the ICP coordinators named - as a rule more than one - reason (Table 5.5).

Discrepancies of teaching and learning modes between the home and host institutions were referred to by 19 percent of the respondents while 16 percent named programme-related reasons (e.g. only a limited number of courses abroad were equivalent). Thus, the major difficulties were primarily attributed to prob-
lems inherent in study abroad programmes. However, achievement problems of the individual students were stated as well by 11 percent of the ICP coordinators, and language barriers were viewed as a major cause for incomplete recognition by 9 percent of the ICP coordinators.

Programme-related reasons for incomplete recognition were most frequently stated by coordinators in agriculture (26 %) and languages and philological sciences (25 %) and least often by coordinators of engineering, natural sciences (9 %), medical sciences (8 %), and mathematics/informatics (2 %). Discrepancies in teaching and learning modes were most frequently viewed as barriers to complete recognition in the case of framework agreements (35 %) and education and teacher training (32 %) and least frequently in mathematics (7 %) and engineering (10 %). As regards host country, we note that language barriers were most often named as reasons for incomplete recognition by coordinators of ICPs involving Greece and Germany. Discrepancies between teaching and learning modes were most often viewed as a barrier by coordinators of programmes involving Ireland, Germany and Italy.

In the face of existing difficulties in ensuring that study abroad fully corresponds to study at home, as far as the quality and the qualification to be achieved in the course programme are concerned, participating partners might adopt solutions to increase - or one might argue in some cases to inflate - the extent of recognition. Based on analyses of previous surveys and of reports submitted in 1987/88 by ICP coordinators, a typology of such strategies was drafted (U. Teichler. Recognition: A Typological Overview of Recognition Issues Arising in Temporary Study Abroad. Kassel: Wissenschaftliches Zentrum für Berufs- und Hochschulforschung der Gesamthochschule Kassel 1990). A question was posed in the Programme Coordinator's Report Form which allowed for the examination of the frequency of such strategies.

The "elitist strategy" was chosen most frequently, as Table 5.6 shows: a high degree of recognition was facilitated in 38 percent of the ICPs by means of selecting those students for participation in the ERASMUS programme who were most likely to be successful. This strategy was most often chosen in those fields of study which - except for foreign language studies - make up the highest percentages of students participating in the ERASMUS programme: business studies, law, engineering, natural sciences and social sciences. It was most often chosen by ICPs sending students abroad for more than half a year.

Secondly, 32 percent of the ICPs, according to the ICP coordinators, chose the "filling-up the options strategy": they expected their students to use their study abroad period predominantly for individual study, writing theses or taking
Table 5.5
Reasons for Incomplete Academic Recognition, by Field of Study (percent, multiple reply possible)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major field of study*</th>
<th>Agr</th>
<th>Arc</th>
<th>Art</th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Edu</th>
<th>Eng</th>
<th>Geo</th>
<th>Hum</th>
<th>Lan</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Mat</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Nat</th>
<th>Soc</th>
<th>Com</th>
<th>Oth</th>
<th>Fra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programme-related reasons</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrepancies between teaching/learning modes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language barriers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of guidance, supervision, etc.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical difficulties of living abroad</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement problems of the individual students</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons for not giving full recognition</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not ticked</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>(44)</td>
<td>(114)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>(180)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(69)</td>
<td>(253)</td>
<td>(81)</td>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>(64)</td>
<td>(106)</td>
<td>(114)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question B12.4: If students returning from abroad are not given full academic recognition, or the volume of studies undertaken abroad does not correspond to the total volume normally undertaken in a corresponding period at the home university (cf. question B12.2), what are the reasons for this?

*) Explanation see Table 5.4
# Table 5.6
Strategies for Increase of Recognition, by Field of Study (percent, multiple reply possible)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major field of study*</th>
<th>Agr</th>
<th>Arc</th>
<th>Art</th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Edu</th>
<th>Eng</th>
<th>Geo</th>
<th>Hum</th>
<th>Lan</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Mat</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Nat</th>
<th>Soc</th>
<th>Com</th>
<th>Oth</th>
<th>Fra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only specially talented students are selected</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students going abroad have higher total course load</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students who go abroad have a longer study period</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period abroad predominantly used for individual study</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are informed of partial recognition</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students should take less demanding courses</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower requirements of courses at host universities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not ticked</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>(44)</td>
<td>(114)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>(180)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(69)</td>
<td>(253)</td>
<td>(81)</td>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>(64)</td>
<td>(106)</td>
<td>(114)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question B12.5: Which of the following statements characterize your ICP as a whole?

*) Explanation see Table 5.4
courses which were considered equivalent to optional courses. In this way, the issue of correspondence of courses abroad to mandatory courses at home is circumvented as far as possible. In contrast to the "elitist strategy", this strategy prevails in fields of study covering relatively small numbers of ERASMUS students and was often chosen by ICPs sending students abroad for at most half a year. Programmes involving Italy, Greece and Portugal opted for this strategy most often.

Thirdly, 28 percent of the ICPs seem to choose the "overload strategy": students going abroad had a higher total course load than those not going abroad (e.g. because they had to make up for courses missed while they were abroad). This was most often stated by coordinators of ICPs in agriculture and in programmes involving Denmark.

Fourthly, 16 percent of the ICPs seem to pursue the "add-on strategy": students who go abroad have, as a rule, a longer period of study than is customary for students not going abroad.

While these four strategies try to ensure a higher extent of recognition without compromising standards, two measures which seem to compromise standards somewhat (which represent a "condoning strategy") were used by only 10 percent each of the ICP coordinators. In these ICPs, notably those involving the Netherlands and Belgium, students were recommended to take courses abroad considered to be less demanding than those usually taken at home (for example course intended for students in an earlier year of study). The yardstick for recognizing successful work abroad was slightly lower than for assessing course work at home.

According to the ICP coordinators' a further 9 percent of ICPs opted for a "limited-recognition strategy": rather than trying to circumvent problems of recognition, students were informed in advance that only part of the courses which they took abroad would be recognized. A further 16 percent of ICP coordinators did not respond, i.e. their ICPs either faced no problems of recognition or did not opt for any of the strategies noted above.

5.4 Certification of Studies Undertaken Abroad

Various ways of formal certification for study undertaken abroad have emerged over the years. A double degree, i.e. a degree awarded both by the home and the host institution upon completion of the course programme comprising a study abroad component, was envisaged in 11 percent of ICPs according to the coordinators. As Table 5.7 shows, double degrees were most common in business
Table 5.7
Formalized Written Certification for Students, by Field of Study (percent, multiple reply possible)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Double degree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint certificate</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home university</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcript of records</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other formalized certification</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No formalized certification</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not ticked</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agr = Agricultural sciences
Arc = Architecture, urb. and reg. planning
Art = Art and design
Bus = Business studies, management sciences
Edu = Education, teacher training
Ing = Engineering, technology
Geo = Geography, geology
Hum = Humanities
Lan = Languages, philological sciences
Law = Law
Mat = Mathematics, informatics
Med = Medical sciences
Nat = Natural sciences
Soc = Social sciences
Com = Communic. and information sciences
Oth = Other areas of study
Fra = Framework agreements in various areas of study

Question B12.6: What formalized written certification do students receive for their studies undertaken abroad in the framework of the ICPs?
studies (34%), engineering (24%) and in framework agreements (18%). Notably, programmes involving France, the United Kingdom, Germany and Spain succeeded most often in establishing joint degrees. Programmes requiring more than half a year of study abroad (22%) are much more likely to lead to a joint degree than those providing for at most six months abroad (5%), as indicated in Table 5.8.

Around 12 percent of Joint Study Programmes awarded a double degree to all participating students, and a further 12 percent awarded a double degree providing the examinations results fulfilled the requirements of both institutions (F. Dalichow and U. Teichler, op. cit., pp. 74-75). We deduce that ERASMUS programmes in 1989/90 had not yet reached an equivalent degree of cooperation and curricular integration.

Other ways of formal certification linked to the award of a degree were more frequent in ERASMUS programmes 1989/90:
- in 13 percent of the ICPs, students were awarded a joint certificate attesting to study abroad, in addition to the normal degree certificate of the home university; and
- in 31 percent of all ICPs, study abroad was attested on the degree certificate of the home university.

Table 5.8
Formalized Written Certification for Students, by Duration of the Study
Period Abroad (percent, multiple reply possible)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Duration in months</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 or less</td>
<td>4-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint certificate</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home university</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcript of records</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other formalized certification</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No formalized certification</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not ticked</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(229)</td>
<td>(541)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question B12.6: What formalized written certification do students receive for their studies undertaken abroad in the framework of the ICPs?
Altogether, almost half of all ICPs in 1989/90 certified study abroad within the framework of a degree certificate. In 1984/85, 50 percent of the Joint Study Programmes certified study abroad as part of, or linked to, the degree certificate.

Other forms of certification, in most cases undertaken during the course of study but in some cases also annexed to the degree certificate, were quite common:

- 48 percent of the ICP coordinators stated that the partners provided information on study abroad in a transcript of records; and
- 25 percent noted other ways of formalized certification.

Only 11 percent of ICP coordinators reported that there was no formalized certification. A further 3 percent did not respond to the question. We note a substantial number of ICPs in architecture and in art and design (20% each) which did not introduce any formalized certification.
General Outcomes

The ERASMUS programme aims to promote cooperation between institutions of higher education in the Member States of the European Community primarily by means of student mobility and additionally by means of teaching staff exchange, cooperation on curricular issues, etc. The outcomes of the ERASMUS programmes certainly will be found in this domains, but also might be broader.

Coordinators, first, were asked - by means of an open question - to state the most important outcomes of the ICP during the year under consideration. In response, 84 percent stated outcomes. They addressed most often the following areas:
- 35 percent cited academic matters,
- 28 percent improved cooperation within the ICP or among the actors at the individual institution of higher education,
- 24 percent successes regarding students' participation,
- 11 percent matters of recognition and finally
- 9 percent cited matters of administration.

Further issues were addressed less frequently. In addition, about half of the respondents made general remarks regarding outcomes which cannot be classified according to the specific matters named above.

Many ICP coordinators perceived a growing interest of students in participation (the coordinators' home country is named in brackets after the respective quotation):

"The students of the participating institutions have become very interested to take part in the ERASMUS programme." (NL)

"There is a certain kind of provincialism at our university that strongly promotes interest in student mobility." (P) "More and more students prefer to stay nine months abroad instead of six months." (D)
"In general, higher reciprocity and better understanding of each other were established." (I)

By far most often, coordinators praised the academic outcomes in terms of curricular development or on the part of the students. Thereby academic learning frequently was viewed as closely linked to linguistic, cultural and social learning:

"Student exchange in Europe is seen as a matter of course. That means that one does not go so much to a foreign country for adventure but much more for academic purposes." (NL)

"The creation of a bi-lingual core course." (UK)

"The knowledge increase of the participating students in different areas: linguistic, academic, human, etc." (E)

"Academic and human maturation of the grantees who beyond the curricular achievements discovered scientific approaches and new ways of thinking." (I)

"The confrontation with new methods and contents results in a knowledge progress even for teachers." (I)

More than ten percent of the coordinators stated explicitly that an improvement of recognition was achieved during the respective academic year:

"The arrangements made concerning recognition of the academic results made the student exchange very successful." (NL)

"The most comforting results are the demand from additional universities to participate in the double degree programme from next year on..." (F)

Some coordinators pointed out that most students seem to view participation in the ERASMUS exchange as a success not only in academic terms, but in many other respects as well:

"The social integration has been extremely successful and indeed makes it difficult to persuade the students to return to complete their degrees." (DK)

"The students came back with a totally new view of the visited society and university world (more realistic and objective)." (B)

Some coordinators addressed specific improvements in the management of the Inter-University Cooperation Programme. Others pointed out generally that cooperation improved and became more stable over time:

"Development and institutionalization of the existing contacts between certain European universities." (B)
"The signing of an agreement to exchange students over a five-year period." (UK)

A substantial number of coordinators finally pointed out in response to the open question that more and more teachers got involved in the ERASMUS programme. This led not only to increasing cooperation in research, but also to an improvement of the quality of teaching:

"The exchange was a step towards internationalization. Teachers realized the existence of ERASMUS and got motivated to participate. The teaching visits made it possible to create close ties between the departments and to establish bilingual cooperation." (I)

"Intensification of professional and research contacts and the exchange of research results." (B)

The last few comments already addressed "spin-offs" of the ERASMUS programme, i.e. outcomes beyond the ERASMUS-supported activities as such. ICP-coordinators were presented a list of outcomes of that kind in an additional question. Actually, 90 percent of the ICP-coordinators stated that the cooperation supported by the ERASMUS Programme has led to additional cooperation between the institutions participating in the inter-university cooperation programme:

- 55 percent of the coordinators reported that their ICP had led to research cooperation in the field(s) covered by the ICP;
- in 40 percent of the programmes, the ERASMUS supported ICP activities had led to exchanges of staff with the partner institution in the respective fields covered by the ICP for the purpose of teaching; and
- about one third of the coordinators indicated that the ICP had given rise to formal partnership agreements at central, institutional or departmental level (39 %), to agreements between other units at the institutions involved (35 %) or to student exchanges with partner institutions in the same field as the ICP but outside the framework of the ICP (32 %).

If we look at the individual fields of study with regard to these three items we note, as Table 6.1 shows, that:

- research cooperation ranged from 77 percent in geography and geology (even 86 % in the fields of study classified as "others"), and 75 percent in communication and information sciences to 36 percent in art and design, and 33 percent in law. It was by far the most common spin-off for ICPs in natural sciences (68 %), geography/geology, humanities (67 % each), and various other fields;
Table 6.1
Other Forms of Inter-University Cooperation Stimulated by ERASMUS-Supported Activities by Field of Study (percent, multiple reply possible)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major field of study</th>
<th>Agr</th>
<th>Arc</th>
<th>Art</th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Edu</th>
<th>Eng</th>
<th>Geo</th>
<th>Hum</th>
<th>Lan</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Mat</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Nat</th>
<th>Soc</th>
<th>Com</th>
<th>Oth</th>
<th>Fra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal partnership agreement</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreements between other departments, etc.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student exchanges outside the ICP</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student exchanges in other subject areas</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchanges of staff on teaching assignments</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchanges of staff in other fields</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research cooperation in the field of the ICP</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research cooperation in other fields (to be continued)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major field of study</th>
<th>Agr</th>
<th>Arc</th>
<th>Art</th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Edu</th>
<th>Eng</th>
<th>Geo</th>
<th>Hum</th>
<th>Lan</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Mat</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Nat</th>
<th>Soc</th>
<th>Com</th>
<th>Oth</th>
<th>Fra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inter-library loans services</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacts between administrative staff</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchanges of assistant teachers</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other forms of cooperation</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not ticked</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>(44)</td>
<td>(114)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>(180)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(69)</td>
<td>(253)</td>
<td>(81)</td>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>(64)</td>
<td>(106)</td>
<td>(114)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Agr** = Agricultural sciences  
**Arc** = Architecture, urb. and reg. planning  
**Art** = Art and design  
**Bus** = Business studies, management sciences  
**Edu** = Education, teacher training  
**Eng** = Engineering, technology  
**Geo** = Geography, geology  
**Hum** = Humanities  
**Lan** = Languages, philological sciences  
**Law** = Law  
**Mat** = Mathematics, informatics  
**Med** = Medical sciences  
**Nat** = Natural sciences  
**Soc** = Social sciences  
**Com** = Communic. and information sciences  
**Oth** = Other areas of study  
**Fra** = Framework agreements in various areas of study

**Question G3:** To what other forms of inter-university cooperation has the ICP given rise (or is it likely to give rise), over and above those supported by ERASMUS?
- exchanges of staff on teaching assignments with partner institutions in the fields covered by the ICP were most often mentioned by ICP coordinators in business studies (53% - slightly more often reported than research cooperation), medical sciences (52%), and education and teacher training (50%), least often in ICPs in natural sciences; and
- formal partnership agreements at central, institutional or departmental levels ranged from about 50 percent in communication and information sciences, mathematics, and geography/geology to about 30 percent in art/design and social sciences.

Inter-university cooperation over and above projects supported by ERASMUS was more likely to emerge, the more partners participated in an ICP. Coordinators from ICPs with only two partners on average ticked slightly more than three forms of spin-off cooperations, while coordinators from ICPs with six and more partners in the network on average ticked more than four.
Major Problems and Suggestions for Improvement

7.1 Frequency of Problems

At the end of the report form, coordinators were asked to summarize the major problems they encountered in the implementation of the ICP and to suggest improvements regarding the administrative procedures of the ERASMUS programme, priorities for the ERASMUS programme and for education cooperation in the European Community in general. Open questions were posed. This procedure evokes interesting comments, but does not allow detailed quantitative analysis.

About a third of all problems raised by the ICP coordinators were financial. 56 percent of the coordinators mentioned financial issues (each more than 30 percent in stating problems and in suggesting improvements). Criticisms of limited financial resources - most often for the students, but frequently for the programmes as well - were raised most frequently, but issues of priorities and distribution of the funds were referred to in more than one third of comments on financial issues.

Administrative matters as such were addressed slightly more frequently than financial matters. Altogether, 58 percent stated administrative issues, again more than a third each when asked about problems encountered and asked to suggest improvements. Six areas of administrative matters were addressed most often: all of them by more than ten percent of the ICP coordinators (a detailed quantification does not make sense because the issues are frequently closely linked to each other in the comments and suggestions):

- The overall EC policy and administration setting regarding the ERASMUS programme;
- the timing of the application procedure, of the award decision and of the transfer of grants;
- other issues regarding the application, award and reporting procedures;
- the management of the ICP and the cooperation among the partners;
- administrative conditions at the home institution or the home country;
- the administrative work load and generally the burden put on the ICP coordinator.

Two of these areas were most frequently addressed and appeared to elicit most concern from the coordinators: The timing of the application and award procedures and the burden put on the ICP coordinators.

The third group of problems stated and recommendations made refer to life and study of the students or various educational aspects of the programme:
- 16 percent of the coordinators were concerned about the participation of students, in terms of total number of students interested or terms of the profile of those interested in participation.
- 25 percent of the ICP coordinators mentioned academic issues, whereby questions of curricular discrepancies and coordination were clearly in the forefront, but issues of recognition, students' achievements, examinations procedures and discrepancies in the academic calendar were frequently stated as well.
- Almost 20 percent referred to problems of accommodation. Compared to that, all other administrative issues regarding living conditions abroad seem to be negligible.
- Finally, linguistic aspects figured among the major issues, addressed by 14 percent of the coordinators.

It should be noted that not all ICP coordinators addressed problems. 10 percent did not raise any problems in response to the questions discussed here at all, i.e. neither in response to the question on problems nor as response in the section open for recommendations. Actually, 22 percent had not stated problems or said explicitly that they did not face any problems. 33 percent had not made any suggestions for improvement. The questions had not been asked in a way that reference to problems and recommendations can be viewed as expression of general satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the ERASMUS programme as such or the administration of the ERASMUS programme in general.
7.2 Financial Issues

Among the various financial issues, the amount of money available for students clearly stood out. Exactly 25 percent of the ICP coordinators addressed this issue - obviously an extraordinarily high proportion in response to an open question addressing the whole range of administrative issues. In some cases, the total amount of support and the number of grants were meant, but clearly the grant awarded per student was considered too low in most of these comments. Statements of problems were frequent, and few suggestions for improvements were made, because the measures to be taken seem obvious.

Some examples of the general critique of low student grants might be quoted (the coordinators' country is named in brackets):

"The most significant weakness of the student exchange programme is the low grant, which - in addition to the lack of organization with a considerable number of institutions regarding the provision of accommodation and catering - constitutes an obviously insurmountable financial problem." (G)

"ERASMUS has given great hopes. We risk that the multiplication of the programmes (sign of their success) will lead to a diminution of the financial help, especially of the grants, which will compromise the whole programme." (F)

"The low grant that prevented possible exchange students from participation." (I)

One Irish ICP coordinator came forward with a explicit proposal regarding the desirable amount of the student grant:

"In my opinion, top priority should be given to bring up the student grant to 2,000 EC throughout the EC."

This coordinator had in mind a six month-period of study in another country.

Only one - a Spanish - coordinator explicitly favoured a smaller grant each for a larger number of students:

"The grants should be distributed directly by the university to the participating students in order to avoid any discrepancies between grant receiving and other participating students."

A considerable number of coordinators underscored their critique of the low award per student with the argument that the small grant discourages the students from participating:

"Lack of sufficient funds to attract Irish students to the ICP". (IRL)
"If you raise the grants for the students, even students with little money could participate in the programme." (I)

"The reduction of the financial support for the students is worrying. If a critical limit is exceeded, some students will not have enough money for living in a foreign country and, subsequently, the motivation to take part in an ICP will decrease." (NL)

Some coordinators argued that funds should be made available for extended study periods abroad. One French coordinator stated:

"With the academic curriculum being well known now we should take more care of the future of the students after the supported period. It is such a great pity that there is no help available for an eventual prolongation."

About 15 percent of the ICP coordinators considered the financial support for the institutions of higher education, i.e. for the ICPs and the participating departments, as too low. Again, this has to be viewed as a high proportion, if we take into account that the open questions referred to the whole range of administrative issues. Some general comments:

"In strict financial terms the programme is clearly under-resourced for what it seeks to accomplish, and the deficit is made up only by goodwill and idealism." (UK)

"Budgetary problems curtail development. Some members are likely to leave because of budgetary problems." (IRL)

In contrast, one Spanish coordinator suggested that limited financial support should be taken for granted:

"It should be made clear to all universities that ERASMUS only serves as a match that lights the fire of collaboration and exchange and in no way intends to act as the bank which finances all the expenses of the programme."

In this context, a substantial number of coordinators named areas of activities and expenditures for which more support was desirable:

"The reimbursement for travel and living costs for common meetings was too low." (NL)

"The secretarial, communication (telephone and fax), paper, copy, translations, supply costs are very high." (G)

"The administrative expenses amounted in fact to more than 20 percent." (DK)
"I would like to have the part of other administration costs to be augmented to one third of the total." (B)

"A certain amount of money should be given to the coordinators to cover the various, even little spendings." (D)

"Permit modest ERASMUS funds to be used to employ administrative assistants for the larger networks." (UK)

"It would be desirable if the programmes of ERASMUS would give financial help to the host universities in order to reimburse the extra administrative, technical and pedagogical costs which are caused by the reception of students." (B)

"It is imperative in the future that institutions, particularly those coordinating programmes, should be recompensed for indirect costs and staff time arising from administrative procedures." (UK)

The comments on financial issues, however, were by no means confined to the amount of money as such. As far as financial support for students was concerned, a substantial number of ICP coordinators criticized the distribution of awards on students. Some of those comments can be viewed as critique of the EC priority policies. As will be addressed below, views varied regarding the policy of favouring mobility to and from the small countries or regarding small or big ICPs. More frequently, though, differential support according to home country, host country, distances between the countries etc. was considered inappropriate. The number of coordinators noting students' complaints about visible "inequalities" of support was quite high. Again some examples:

"The inadequacy of the putative ERASMUS grant offered to the Irish students which obviated their participation." (IRL)

"Inequality of grants between member states leads to resentment between students." (UK)

"Disparities in the allocation of student mobility grants: it is not conducive to the development of a citizen's Europe of (generally better-off) students traveling from Germany to Ireland received twice the amount allocated to Irish students travelling to Germany within the same programme." (IRL)

"On the French side, one could complain about the unequal treatment, because the grants for their students are not as high as the ones provided to Italian students. This causes a problem of recruitment." (I)

In contrast, few coordinators suggested that the formulas regarding the amount grant should be even more finely tuned according to differential needs:
"The supplementary financial support for the student mobility is too low, especially for the students who go to London or to Paris." (NL)

"The economic problems faced by the students could be solved by the evaluation of the living costs in the different countries as well as the distance between the home and the host institution. This should lead to an increased grant if necessary." (G)

As regards the purposes and the distribution of institutional support, it was already mentioned above that various changes of priorities were recommended. In addition, some ICP coordinators just pleaded to allow more flexibility in the utilization of the ICP grant. As the grant is considered low anyway, programmes should be free just to use it for the most pressing needs emerging and changing over time.

In general, there were frequent arguments regarding the efficiency of the utilization of money. Many coordinators obviously believe that the administration of funds ought to be improved substantially. This does not apply only for the flexibility of institutional grants. Some coordinators also deplored the considerable loss of money for bank exchanges. A French coordinator stated:

"The essential point is to simplify the procedures of transferring the funds, to avoid a waste of time and money due to the conversion of one or two national currencies in ECU."

The most harshly criticized financial inefficiency is the late timing of provision of funds, which will be addressed in the section on administrative problems.

Finally, some ICP coordinators looked at the mid-term and long-term financial situation. As regards mid-term funding, some coordinators addressed the lack of continuity of funds from one year to the next. To quote one Irish coordinator:

"Lack of continuity in supporting elements of the programme, e.g. staff exchange, impedes progress and appears inconsistent."

One Spanish respondent named long-term prospects as the most serious administrative problem:

"The lack of financial security concerning the continuation of the programme in the next years".
7.3 Administrative Issues Regarding the Interaction between the Commission and the Institutions of Higher Education

More than 10 percent of the ICP coordinators addressed issues of the overall EC policy regarding the ERASMUS programme and its general administrative setting. This area obviously was viewed as important. However, it did not draw as much attention as for example the administrative processes of application and award.

One area of concern in this respect are the priorities of the ERASMUS programme. In this context, no dominant proposals for change can be observed. Some coordinators suggested to support the smaller programmes, other the larger programmes. Some suggested to give priority to the small EC Member States, whereas others saw too much emphasis placed on the small countries. Some suggested to extend support to teaching staff mobility, curricular development and intensive programmes, whereas others proposed to concentrate the funds more strongly on student mobility. Some examples might suffice to illustrate the extraordinarily diverse directions of proposals:

"Give priority to the realisation of 'intensive courses', for which more funds should be made available." (E)

"In my opinion the funds for the ERASMUS programme should be directed to student mobility in order to raise the grants. Stop intensive programmes and teaching staff exchange." (I)

"One should distinguish between those going abroad only for learning the language and those going abroad for the purpose of broadening the knowledge in various disciplines." (I)

"Priority should be given to smaller ICPs (few participants) because they can be managed more easily and more efficiently." (D)

"An increase in teacher mobility is vital, because more staff sympathizing with conditions, in the years to come, will affect a considerable number of guest workers and ethnic minorities who already suffer." (UK)

The largest number of critical comments and suggestions regarding the EC policy and general administration referred to what might be called at first glance information issues. A closer look, however, reveals that four different issues were addressed: background information, guidance, transparency and communication.

Some coordinators even claimed that basic information about the ERASMUS programme is not yet sufficiently spread:
"The experience with Italy shows that knowledge about ERASMUS and the willingness to study abroad is not very high. The Italian 'mass' universities need a very intensive information programme regarding the ERASMUS scheme." (D)

Also, some coordinators considered basic information needed on the higher education systems, the equivalences of courses and degrees as well as on curricula developed at various institutions of higher education in Europe. Obviously, many of the coordinators suggesting these improvements were not aware of available publications:

"A general guidebook (if this does not already exist), giving basic information on such things as levels in each member state would be useful." (UK)

"Establish equivalences for the organisation and quality of teaching as well and research in the different European universities." (E)

"It is necessary to establish a data bank for delivering exact information about European university networks." (P)

"To provide the opportunity to get the addresses and references of all possible partners in all countries of the EC. A kind of information centre should be established: supply and demand for cooperation, because one tends to work only with countries and partners which are already known." (B)

"The ERASMUS Bureau should request detailed information about all the study schemes from the departmental coordinators of all participating institutions in order to increase the opportunity of cooperation on the basis of common curricula on European level." (G)

Several coordinators suggested that detailed information about the selection criteria should be made public:

"In the case of a programme not being accepted at all or just partly, you should state the reasons much more in detail regarding the individual programme." (NL)

"The criteria for the distribution of grants to programmes and institutions should be open to the public. The ERASMUS bureaucracy is getting more and more under suspicion of realizing political higher education policies by means of anonymous financial decisions." (D)

In this context, another proposal made by a British coordinator might be mentioned:
"Where reduced financial allocations are made, it would be helpful if guidance was offered on which aspects of the exchange should be given a high priority." (UK)

A substantial number of ICP coordinators suggested to publish the results of the various studies undertaken on the ERASMUS programme or to undertake more efforts in analyzing the outcome of the ERASMUS programme:

"Detailed publication of all results and experiences of programmes." (NL)

"Both the ERASMUS Bureau and the universities should put more effort in informing professors as well as students about the opportunities of ERASMUS and about the beneficial results, such as the progress of knowledge achieved, by inter-university cooperation such as the ERASMUS programme." (E)

In some cases, the coordinators expressed concern that the funding decisions on individual programmes made by the Commission do not reflect the past achievements. A Spanish coordinator stated:

"Although the last exchange has been a success we have been turned down this year. I blame the bureaucratic system for this, which does not take into account the results."

Some coordinators suggested to improve the communication among coordinators of different ICPs:

"An ERASMUS workshop or workshops involving both the Bureau and the coordinators to discuss the ERASMUS concept as a whole." (IRL)

"It would be convenient to organize reunions of programme coordinators who are involved in the same procedures in order to exchange experiences." (E)

A few of the coordinators' comments addressed the administrative setting of the ERASMUS programme in general. Some called for growing administrative flexibility in general, as for example one Irish coordinator made clear:

"As ERASMUS develops it must keep a balance between effective organisation and the freedom to develop. I would not like to see it sink under the weight of more regulations."

Others perceived a lack of flexibility mostly on the part of the national grant awarding authorities, as might be illustrated by the statement made by a French coordinator:

"The administrative procedures of the ERASMUS programme seem to have - in their spirit - the degree of flexibility required for the management of transna-
tional cooperation programmes. Maybe efforts should be undertaken to improve those procedures the national grant agencies are in charge of."

Finally, some coordinators suggested to improve the communication between the ICPs and the ERASMUS Bureau. For example, one Italian coordinator suggested:

"The ERASMUS Bureau should employ specialized personell providing help to the teachers who deal with all problems."

Criticism was very strongly voiced regarding the administrative load required for the applications and reports. Of the large number of comments, a few might be quoted:

"The project has just started, and we already have to write a report." (NL)

"The administrative and information documents are too extensive. There should be summaries to allow quick reading and to point out the essentials." (F)

"ERASMUS is an administrative nightmare because of the extensive rules. It now requires a legal brain to understand and realise their implications." (UK)

"Still too long and too many forms (like this one)." (D)

"If you want to realize an ICP programme, the greatest problem is the enormous administrative trouble. The numerous forms you have to fill in do not correspond to the financial size of the programme. Some coordination and reduction of the administrative load seem urgently required in order to operate successfully in the university world." (NL)

"I would suggest to collect in one the reporting to the NGAA and the ERASMUS Bureau." (DK)

"I would like to mention that I had to write five various reports for one ICP. This example concerns more the national than the Community administration." (F)

"The present system is messy and confusing. In general, it is the adminstration and procedures of the NGAAAs which need improvement. The ERASMUS Bureau works efficiently." (UK)

Some coordinators made proposals for small improvements:

"Send the application form as well as the report form to the coordinating institution in the different languages of the participating institutions. So you save a lot of translation work for the coordinating institution." (NL)

"It takes a lot of time to fill in the forms with a typewriter. One should have the possibility of responding on the PC." (NL)
"The procedure concerning the student grants should be simplified. Each university should be only required to make a summary statement about the real mobility." (F)

"Send this report formula earlier around so that it can be discussed in our co-ordination meeting in June." (B)

Pluri-annual funding is viewed as an important instrument in reducing the administrative load, as, for example, a British coordinator expressed:

"A year is simply not enough to mount, run and assess such a complex ICP properly. To this extent we welcome the move to three year funding from 1991/92 onwards." (UK)

Changes in the timing of application, award, financial transfer and reporting processes were most strongly advocated by the ICP coordinators. It was obviously one of the two or three major administrative concerns expressed in the final open sections of the report form.

The late announcement of award decisions to the programmes and to the students as well as the late transfer of the grant notably to the students were most frequently deplored. It is obvious that many ICP coordinators considered the concept of the ERASMUS programme seriously compromised by the late award processes. To quote a Danish coordinator:

"Too late authorisation of the programme and therefore too late selection of exchange students. This leads to high administrative problems and reduces the possibilites of exchange of information and planning regarding the stay and thus makes accommodation outrageously difficult."

Irrespective of the various causes for late decisions, among whith slow postal service was mentioned, the coordinators basically considered late decisions as detrimental for the students. They can only decide very late about spending some period abroad, preparation is hampered by the late decision, and also the academic and administrative support abroad was likely to be substantially improved, if decisions regarding the award were made in time. Finally, many coordinators considered it intolerable that a substantial proportion of students did not receive the grant prior to departure or even does not know what amount of award they will receive.

"As a very natural thing you would like to know, before you travel abroad, whether you receive a grant or not and about the amount!" (DK)
"The delay of the decision on the programme. For this reason many students withdrew their application to study abroad. It is necessary to distribute the grants or at least a certain amount to them before their departure." (E)

"The greatest problem was and still is the delay in the communication of the decision for the programmes and in the provision of the grants. As long as this is not resolved there will remain a considerable amount of improvisation that reduces the opportunity of exploiting all the virtues of the programmes." (P)

"The decision about the acceptance of the programme should be announced earlier. Above all, the national agencies should distribute the grants much earlier, because currently all preparations have to be undertaken in summer, when it is much more difficult to contact the students." (E)

"We should prefer to select the candidates earlier in order to organize better preparation for the study period abroad." (P)

"The period between notification and approval compresses available time for setting up and operating language preparation courses." (UK)

"The money should be transferred together with the award decision." (D)

As far as dates are suggested, most coordinators considered the notification of the award decision to be needed by May or June. A few coordinators even suggested April as the date needed in order to ensure early preparation. At that time, also the number of students to be supported ought to be fixed. Students should be provided the grant at least immediately before their departure to the host country.

A substantial number of ICP coordinators does not, however, favour the implementation of earlier award decision and earlier provision of funds by means of setting earlier dates for application. On the contrary, many coordinators considered the deadline for application - end of October of the preceding year - as too early. Two principle reasons and one pragmatic reason were voiced in this context. The first principle reason is linked to the students' decisions. A Belgian coordinator emphasized that one cannot expect the majority of students to opt for study abroad a year in advance or even earlier:

"We note that under the prevailing conditions the students must show their interest for the programme very early, i.e. one year before the real exchange. For that reason, the execution of the programmes becomes dependent on many factors such as for example the passing of examination or the change of interest."

Second, some coordinators considered an improvement of the programme more likely, if the application for the respective year was based on an analysis of the experiences of the academic year ending at that time:
"It seems essential to me that the application should be filed as late as possible to allow the universities to take into account the experiences of the earlier year." (F)

"Our programme is changing. Therefore it is annoying to plan the details of the student mobility as early as one year in advance. The students sometimes have other interests than what was planned in the programme such a long time in advance." (NL)

Finally, some coordinators pointed out that they feel overburdened by being expected to present a report on the academic year just terminating and an application for two years later at exactly the same time and that during the period when the start of the academic year requires at lot of attention for the incoming students:

"Foreign students arrive in late September to start the academic year. It takes at least one month to sort out all the academic, personal and administrative teething problems which one’s job as a lecturer, colleague and ERASMUS coordinator involves. Therefore, 31st of October should just be the deadline for the final report, the statement of activities and of the utilisation of the grant. It is most time-consuming to get all the details for the reaplication of the ICP. The deadline would be more suitable for 15th or 30th November." (IRL)

"This application requires a lot of consultations and meetings between the various departments and institutions, and this is the time the courses get started. A later deadline should be granted." (F)

7.4 Administrative Issues at Institutions of Higher Education and the Workload Involved

Among the administrative problems not infrequently mentioned, difficulties in cooperating with the partner institutions were noted, first, regarding the communication in general. Some coordinators identified specific problems at partner institutions, whereas others referred to the amount of work involved in communication in general:

"The administrative work of the global coordination and the local coordination of such a big network asks for time and energy." (B)

"Coordination problems are often caused by changes of the responsible individuals at the participating institutions." (D)
"Difficulty in communication, lack of responsiveness, lack of cooperation at one partner institution." (IRL)

"One of the biggest loads of work consisted of maintaining contacts with partner institutions." (DK)

"The cooperation with the other universities was difficult especially in estimating the number of students participating." (E)

Few administrative problems were stated in respect to the respective home institution or the home country in general. We have to take into account, however, that the report form primarily addressed the ICP coordinators' functions.

"Getting over bureaucratic barriers caused by exam and study regulations." (D)

"Getting reports from participating students is most difficult." (D)

"In several cases the coordinators complained that the administration at their institutions is not sufficiently cooperative." (P)

As far as proposals for improvement were made in this context, almost all called for more administrative assistance.

"In most institutions, there is a desperate need to provide administrative assistance for running the programme. The logistics of managing an ever growing student population that wants to study abroad means more financial investment by the institutions." (NL)

"The individual universities should make more administrative assistance available to solve problems of management, administration, accommodation and communication." (E)

"ERASMUS should recommend and support the employment of multilingual personnel, preferably students, to work at ERASMUS offices of universities." (E)

Finally, many coordinators complained about the administrative burden put on them in general. Most of them viewed the work load involved in the ERASMUS programme as conflicting with the general role as teacher and researcher:

"The administrative tasks were varied and difficult. Lack of help on the part of our university. The very intensive work has not been honoured and was at the expense of other duties of the ordinary full-time job." (DK)

"As the programme coordinator my main problem has been the combined pressure of the bureaucratic procedures imposed by the EC and the national agencies which turned my coordination into mere administration." (E)
"There is a large administrative burden for the responsible persons who often were involved in several ERASMUS programmes. This is at the expense of research activities or leisure time which can cause tensions within the family." (B)

"The enormous bureaucratic work and the total lack of administrative support. Coordinators are primarily academics and researchers, not administrators and bureaucrats." (E)

"I wonder how long the teaching staff will accept to invest so much of its time and energy in such conditions." (P)

"Provide some concrete benefit to the coordinator so that it isn't all done just for 'love'." (IRL)

### 7.5 Issues of Students' Life and Study

The substantial increase over the years of the total number of students being awarded an ERASMUS grant might create the impression that the institutions of higher education do not have any problems in finding students interested in participating in the ERASMUS scheme. In reality, however, many institutions of higher education would like to involve more students in study in another European country than actually participate. As available application, award and actual participation statistics show, those ICPs awarded a grant actually send on average less than 70 percent of the students abroad they expected to send at the time of application. ICP coordinators considered problems concerning students' participation as one of the about ten major problems.

As already stated, the late award decisions and the consequently reduced opportunity to prepare for the stay abroad were viewed as major causes of students' reluctance in participation. In addition, the small amount of the grant, low foreign language proficiency and shortage of accommodation were frequently stated as barriers.

"A slow start, especially because of low interest by the students." (DK)

"There is a high dropout rate among 'potential' exchange students." (UK)

"A lack of interest among students that are confronted with economic difficulties and language problems." (E)

"The amount of student grant is still too low. This reduces without any doubt the number of students." (F)
Only in a few cases, ICP coordinators stated issues of the study programme setting, of the curricula or of recognition as causes of limited participation. Two examples of this kind might be quoted:

"The relatively unflexible system of teacher education in the host country resulted in fewer incoming students than expected." (D)

"The principal disappointment was the poor response of students in some institutions of higher education. The fact that the programme is optional means that one cannot exert too much pressure on students to participate in it." (IRL)

In referring to problems regarding students' life abroad, almost all coordinators stated accommodation problems. This both underscores the gravity of this problems and the otherwise obviously easy integration of students into life in another European country. Most coordinators pointed out accommodation problems did not mean a problem of availability of accommodation per se, but rather availability at a modest price, as the following typical selection of statements shows:

"Difficulties to find accommodation for a modest price and or a short period." (B)

"It is without any doubt that the accommodation issue in the host country has hindered the programme development. Many students interested, already selected within the ICP, gave up their participation because of this problem." (F)

"We have the general problem of providing sufficient accommodation for the ERASMUS students considering their low grant." (I)

Most coordinators suggested improvement through increase of the grant, although a few suggested different ways in increasing the supply of university accommodation:

"ERASMUS should cooperate with NGAAs to intervene at universities in order to get accommodation in university-owned facilities reserved for ERASMUS students." (F)

"An accommodation agency sponsored by ERASMUS, but being independent from the individual universities, would be of great assistance." (UK)

In referring to language problems, some coordinators seemed to assume that this barrier is one which neither can be overcome by any support measure nor by the participating institutions. According to these views, the majority of students just do not acquire a foreign language proficiency sufficient for study abroad.

"The language proficiency of the incoming students is much too low." (NL)
"Problems in finding sufficient students with adequate linguistic levels to participate in the programme." (UK)

"The problem of language proficiency that considerably reduced the student mobility. It prompts us to extend teaching staff exchanges." (F)

Some coordinators, however, expressed the hope that increased funds, earlier notification of award or curricular integration of foreign language courses could lead to significant improvements:

"Greater language preparation funds should be made available for minority languages: Portuguese, Greek, Dutch and Danish." (IRL)

"Difficulties in arranging adequate linguistic preparation, mainly due to the late notification of acceptance of ICP application." (UK)

"Foreign languages should be considered an integral part of all academic curricula in degrees other than modern languages." (UK)

The strong emphasis placed on the range of administrative problems stated above does not mean that ICP coordinators tended to see success or failure of the ERASMUS programme primarily resting on administrative issues. Finding ways of assuring an academically meaningful study period abroad is clearly the major activity of the ICP coordinators. Therefore, a quarter of them addressed academic issues even in a context of questions which primarily referred to administrative issues. In many cases, the coordinators talked about academic "challenges" rather than "problems".

A portion of these statements referred to problems which, in principle, could be solved through specific targeted measures:

"Not all preparatory courses have been successful." (D)

"No access to some courses for the ERASMUS students. American and Canadian students who are financially more interesting, are preferred to ERASMUS students." (B)

"The main difficulties are based on limited staff resources. This results in a certain degree of dissatisfaction, because foreign students generally need a much higher degree of guidance than home students." (D)

Most coordinators, however, were concerned about improvement of the study abroad under conditions of hitherto extraordinarily diverse curricula, teaching and learning styles:
"Accommodating our curriculum development work to such diverse curriculum structures proves to be a considerable challenge." (G)

"There are still many differences in teaching methods and in the background of the students between the two universities." (NL)

"Different traditions and different methods especially in newly developing programmes make it difficult for students to understand what is required of them, and to meet the expectations of the host university." (UK)

"The differences in pedagogical approach and technical knowledge levels between the UK and the German system of higher education." (UK)

Most proposals for improvement favoured a greater degree of curricular harmonization either within the networks or between the member states of the European Community:

"The ultimate aim of all participating institutions should be the establishment of a new 'European Curriculum', leading to an internationally recognized 'European Degree'. (G)

"The EC should oblige the participating countries to establish elements in their curricula which would be common to all countries." (F)

"In the next year one should pay more attention to academic recognition, which in my opinion only can become a reality, if special study programmes are worked out, which should become common at the various European universities. How else can a similar education system be guaranteed in the European Community?" (DK)

"The national exam regulations and curricula guidelines are overcome only by strong efforts of the participants in order to establish integrated study abroad." (D)

The majority of coordinators, however, seem to take it for granted that it will be the permanent task of the ICP to ease study in environments which clearly constrain those at home in many respects. And they seemed to be far more optimistic in this respect than in regard of overcoming many administrative barriers.
Summary

8.1 Content and Information Basis of the Study

This study is based on the information provided by coordinators of ERASMUS Inter-University Cooperation Programmes (ICPs) in 1989/90. It draws from the ICP coordinators' official reports submitted to the Commission of the European Communities as part of their contractual obligation. The study focuses on information provided on student mobility in response to "closed" questions asked in the report form. It is based on reports from coordinators of 1,241 ICP representing 95 percent of the ICPs supported for student mobility, with more than 17,000 students spending a period of study in another Member State of the European Community.

8.2 Profile of the Programmes

Of the 1,241 ICPs, the largest number of programmes was in languages and philological sciences, engineering and technology, business studies and management science, social sciences and natural sciences. On average, 3.3 partners cooperated in an ICP. The number of partners per ICP was the highest in business studies and management science and geography and geology.

The 1,241 ICPs sent 17,135 students abroad. Almost 50 percent of the students were enrolled in business studies and management science and languages. The average size of the ICPs in terms of student numbers varied considerably by the field of study. The average number of students per ICP ranged from more than 30 in business studies and framework agreements to about 7 in natural sciences, medical sciences and mathematics.
8.3 Academic Arrangements

Some 84 percent of the ICPs employed systematic criteria in selection of students. In all those cases, academic achievement was taken into account. In most cases personality and motivation (73 %) and foreign language proficiency were also taken into consideration - the latter somewhat less often in science fields than in humanities and social sciences. Active preparation for the study period abroad was reported to be a selection criterion in 34 percent of the programmes. Less than 10 percent of all ICPs accepted students on a "first come, first served" basis or did not select at all among the applicants.

In one third of the ICPs the partners cooperated with their partners abroad in the selection of students. Also, one third of the ICP coordinators reported that - at least in some participating institutions - cooperation in the selection of students for participation in the ERASMUS Programme existed between departments which were involved in the other ICPs of their institution - in part identical with the former.

Study periods abroad were mandatory in all (or in the majority of) departments participating in 13 percent (respectively 21 % for parts of the networks) of the ICPs. About half of the ERASMUS students in business studies and law spent their study period abroad in ICPs where studies abroad were mandatory at least in the majority of participating departments.

In more than half of the ICPs, all or most of the courses to be taken abroad were prescribed in advance. Students in more than half of the ICPs were also expected to take more or less the same course load abroad as host institution students. This does not mean, however, that special arrangements for incoming students were excluded: according to the ICP coordinators, 30 percent of ERASMUS students took, at least in part, special courses for foreign students, and ICPs involving 14 percent of the ERASMUS students recommended that at least part of their courses abroad should be host institution courses for students of earlier years of study.

More than half of the ICPs employed schemes for adaptation of grades or joint assessment. Common course requirements were set by 24 percent, and joint or double degrees were awarded in 16 percent of the ICPs.

Work placements were included in 29 percent of all ICPs, and in more than half of the programmes in business studies, agriculture, and education and teacher training, and in almost half of the engineering programmes. In the majority of such cases, placements were mandatory, and achievements were assessed.
8.4 Services Provided

In 56 percent of the ICPs, mandatory courses, and in a further 26 percent optional courses, were provided and aimed at preparing students for the study period abroad. A further 13 percent arranged preparatory meetings. Very few ICPs provided only written materials or offered no preparatory provisions at all. Preparatory advice was provided in almost all ICPs with regard to living and studying in the host country, with regard to foreign languages in three quarters, and in about two thirds of the ICPs with regard to academic issues and society and culture of the host country. Large programmes as well as those providing for a relatively long period of study abroad were most likely to offer preparatory courses for various purposes.

Coordinators of ICPs sending 65 percent of the ERASMUS students abroad stated that accommodation was provided by the host institution (usually in halls of residence) with the help of staff or of students in some cases. Some partners provided temporary accommodation and/or supported the search for accommodation; 21 percent of the ICP coordinators stated that most students made their own arrangements in advance or were not offered any support at all regarding accommodation.

According to the ICP coordinators, financial matters (named by 40% percent of the ICP coordinators) were the most frequent serious problem which ERASMUS students faced during their study period abroad, followed by problems regarding accommodation (27%). Taking examinations in a foreign language (19%) and differences in teaching and learning methods between the home and the host institution (15%) played a lesser role. In contrast, ERASMUS students surveyed in the preceding year stated relatively less problems with finance and accommodation and relatively more academic problems as well as problems in communication.

8.5 Recognition and Academic Impacts

The home institutions tend to accept statements by the host institution about achievement abroad as a complete package in only 29 percent of the ICPs - considerably less than the in Joint Study Programmes, the predecessors of the ERASMUS programme. However, in most cases, students were offered recognition on the basis of assessment of individual courses successfully completed abroad.
According to the ICP coordinators, the home institutions accepted about 90 percent of successful study abroad. Recognized achievements corresponded to about 85 percent or slightly more of study typically undertaken during a similar period at home, and the prolongation of the overall course of study due to the study period abroad was expected to amount to 23 percent of the study period abroad. Incomplete recognition was - according to the ERASMUS students of the preceding year - about twice as high as that perceived by ICP coordinators 1989/90.

In order to raise the level of recognition, various ICPs selected the most promising students (38 %), expected their students to accumulate their optional courses and individual study during the study period abroad (32 %), or expected students to take a bigger course load than normal for students not going abroad (28 %). According to the ICP coordinators, some partners slightly lowered the standards of assessment, asked their students to take less demanding courses abroad or told students in advance that they had to be prepared to accept incomplete recognition.

In 11 percent of the ICPs, a double degree was awarded. In almost half of all ICPs certification of the study abroad period formed part of the official certification upon graduation, and in most others transcripts or other forms of documentation were provided.

### 8.6 Spin-Offs

Almost 90 percent of the ICP coordinators reported that their Student Mobility Programme led to some form of spin-off. 55 percent stated that cooperation regarding student mobility stimulated research cooperation. In 40 percent of the ICPs, staff exchange had been implemented for teaching purposes. In one third of the ICPs, cooperation regarding student mobility led to partnership arrangements among all or some of the participating institutions.
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The ERASMUS Programme launched 1987 by the Commission of the European Communities supports student and staff mobility as well as other means of cooperation primarily within the framework of networks of higher education institutions known as Inter-University Cooperation Programmes. This study summarizes the experiences of 1,241 coordinators of ICPs, who were awarded support for student mobility in 1989/90. It focuses on the various educational and administrative arrangements for the study period of ERASMUS students, the problems faced and the perceived impact of the programme.