

Towards a Better Understanding of How To Conduct and Evaluate  
Educational Exchanges

by

Elizabeth Louise Kilby  
B.A., University of Victoria, 1988  
B.Ed., University of Victoria, 1990

ACCEPTED

TY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department of Communications and Social Foundations  
in Education

We accept this thesis as conforming  
to the required standard

Dr. G. Potter, Supervisor (Communications and Social Foundations)

Dr. P. Evans, Departmental Member (Communications and Social  
Foundations)

Dr. D. Court, Outside Member (Social and Natural Sciences)

Dr. P. Farragher, External Examiner (Social and Natural Sciences)

© ELIZABETH LOUISE KILBY, 1992  
University of Victoria

All rights reserved. Thesis may not be reproduced in  
whole or in part, by photocopy or other means,  
without the permission of the author.

## ABSTRACT

This research examined the extent to which a technology based international educational exchange program, Future Partners, reached its objectives. Future Partners involved students and teachers from Victoria, Canada, Morioka, Japan and Bangkok, Thailand. The method selected to collect the data was a qualitative case study using interviews, questionnaires and the analysis of documents and artifacts produced by the program. It was found that the program was successful in reaching its objectives despite problems in structuring and directing program meetings and student activities. As a result, a series of conclusions and recommendations were made regarding how to improve an exchange program's structure, meeting organization, selection and management of students, instruction in and use of various communications technologies (facsimile machine, electronic mail, computer graphics and sound generation, and audio and video equipment), foreign language instruction, the creation of educational presentations for culturally different students, and an exchange trip. In addition, a strategy is presented regarding how to conduct an evaluation of an educational exchange. Therefore, information from this study can be used by planners of an educational exchange first to conduct an exchange and second to evaluate their program to determine how it can be improved. Finally, suggestions for future research efforts into educational exchanges and their evaluation are proposed.

Examiners:

[REDACTED]

Dr. G. Potter, Supervisor (Communications and Social Foundations)

[REDACTED]

Dr. P. Evans, Departmental Member (Communications and Social Foundations)

[REDACTED]

Dr. D. Court, Outside Member (Social and Natural Sciences)

[REDACTED]

Dr. P. Farragher, External Examiner (Social and Natural Sciences)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preliminary Pages

|                   |     |
|-------------------|-----|
| Title Page        | i   |
| Abstract          | ii  |
| Table of Contents | iii |
| Acknowledgments   | iv  |

Text

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Chapter 1 Introduction . . . . .                   | 1   |
| Chapter 2 Literature Review. . . . .               | 15  |
| Chapter 3 Research Design . . . . .                | 36  |
| Chapter 4 Findings . . . . .                       | 65  |
| Chapter 5 Discussion and Recommendations . . . . . | 109 |

|                             |     |
|-----------------------------|-----|
| <u>References</u> . . . . . | 123 |
|-----------------------------|-----|

Appendices

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Appendix A: Consent Forms . . . . .                               | 129 |
| Appendix B: Interview and Questionnaire Schedules. . . . .        | 132 |
| Appendix C: Interview Data Sample . . . . .                       | 161 |
| Appendix D: Examples of Condensed Participant Responses . . . . . | 180 |
| Appendix E: Data from Japanese Future Partners. . . . .           | 185 |

## CHAPTER ONE

### THE PROBLEM

The intent of the researcher is to examine the extent to which an international educational exchange program, Future Partners, reached its objectives. Future Partners was a technology based international educational exchange program involving students and teachers from Victoria, Canada, Morioka, Japan and Bangkok, Thailand. The purpose of the program was to establish communication links between the students in the three countries through which cross cultural learning could take place.

#### Program Description

In 1989 British Columbia's Ministry of Education attempted to strengthen its educational contact with the Pacific Rim through the establishment of the Pacific Rim Initiatives Program. This program was designed to provide funding to enable British Columbian students and teachers to improve their knowledge and understanding of the Pacific Rim countries, peoples, and cultures in whatever ways seemed appropriate to the teachers in those schools. Future Partners, the recipient of a \$77,000 grant from this program, attempted to establish educational communication exchanges between Canada and the Pacific Rim countries by bringing together approximately twenty Canadian grade nine students, ten each from a local private and a local public school, to communicate with similar groups of students from both Morioka, Japan and Bangkok, Thailand. The intent was to increase the mutual cross-cultural understanding between the students in the program through a variety of information exchanges.

These exchanges took place in four ways: (a) correspondence, (b) telecommunications, (c) media presentations and (d) exchange visits.

A proposal designed by the Future Partners Program Steering Committee (Potter, Gardiner, Murphy, P., Murphy, S., 1987) outlined the general purposes of the program as follows:

1. To increase the knowledge of young people in Japan and Thailand regarding British Columbia.
2. To increase the knowledge of young people in British Columbia regarding Pacific Rim countries.
3. To assist young people in preparing instructional resources on British Columbia for special educational seminars, workshops, and weeks in the cooperating Pacific Rim schools.
4. To establish a new communication network so students in the Pacific Rim schools could converse about their cultures, communities, schools and lifestyles.
5. To establish an attachment-exchange scheme to provide students with an opportunity to experience life in the cooperating countries and participating educators with the opportunity for professional development and exchanges.
6. To provide students and educators in Pacific Rim schools with the opportunity to interact by modern communications technology.
7. To provide students of Asian countries with a means of intercultural exchange.

To facilitate these exchanges, the Victoria based students needed to acquire various media skills, skills in the use of communications technologies, knowledge of topics to be exchanged in collaborative

educational projects such as acid rain, forestry, and women's studies; and to acquire some knowledge of Thai and Japanese language and culture.

### Research Questions

The following research questions have been designed to determine both how well the program's organization and activities enabled the participants to reach the purposes stated by the steering committee, and how the program could be improved. The major questions addressed by the researcher were:

1. What factors influenced the evolution and operation of the Future Partners Program?
2. How did the communications technologies and program activities in Future Partners enable the Canadian participants to communicate with and learn about their partners in the other two countries?
3. What could be done differently to improve the program?

In addition to answering the research questions, an intention of the researcher was to determine whether or not information from this study could be generalized to other educational exchanges.

To answer the research questions the researcher:

- examined the objectives of the program
- documented what happened during the program
- determined the extent to which various objectives were achieved
- determined in what ways components of the program influenced the participants in reaching their objectives
- offered recommendations and improvements for a second offering of the program

- offered suggestions for those intending to conduct an educational exchange in the future
- presented an evaluation strategy for the evaluation of future technology based educational exchange programs

#### Rationale

An important problem in education is a lack of evaluation which enables educators to improve their practice efficiently and effectively. Worthen and Sanders (1987) explain that the greatest contributing factors to inadequate evaluation in education are:

- (a) the lack of dependable information about the performance of educational products, practices, and programs, and (b) the absence of established systems for producing such information. (p. 4)

Educational programs such as student exchanges in particular suffer from a lack of evaluation. The most frequently called for areas of research regarding student exchanges are the basic need for more research into how to conduct them efficiently and effectively, the formal evaluation of these programs, and the creation of a comprehensive data base of such research (Dragonas, 1984; Fleck, 1984; Hansel, 1984). The educational merit, as determined through academic research and sanctioned by formal evaluations of these new educational endeavors will help to ensure their longevity as valuable components of school programs. Without careful, systematic inquiry into the effectiveness of new educational programs such as educational exchanges, they become little more than the random adoption of

faddish innovations (Worthen and Sanders, 1987). Therefore, this study has been undertaken not only to evaluate how well the Future Partners program reached its objectives, but also to determine how it can be improved. Information from this study will contribute a formal evaluation of an educational exchange to the literature, as well as recommendations regarding how exchanges like Future Partners can be conducted more effectively and efficiently.

## DEFINITION OF TERMS

### Program Variables

Program variables in this study were both communications and learning variables which did not remain constant throughout the program. The communications variables varied in terms of the number of participants involved in them, their duration and their effectiveness in facilitating the participants in reaching program objectives. The learning variables varied both in the degree to which students involved themselves, and therefore in their effectiveness as parts of the program. Thus, the following communications and learning variables were evaluated with regard to the ways in which they worked or did not work for the participants in the program.

### Communications Variables

Communications variables were aspects of the program which facilitated communication with and learning about the partner students in Thailand and Japan. Communications variables were skills in the use of communications technologies (fax, electronic mail), the creation of media

projects for the purpose of conveying information to students overseas, and the exchange trip to Thailand and Japan.

Collaborative Educational Projects - This describes the group, problem-solving activities near the end of the project which revolved around the presentation of societal issues common to the three countries involved. The expectation was that through the establishment of the communications links and rapport between the student participants, the means and common ground had been established upon which three very different countries could work together toward solutions to common problems.

Exchange Visits - Exchange visits refer to three weeks in August, 1990, when the Victoria Future Partners travelled to Thailand and Japan. The exchange visits that occurred when the Japanese and Thai Future Partners travelled to Victoria were not a part of this study because this evaluation occurred after the Japanese and Thai participants had returned home.

Media Projects - The term media projects was used to describe the group work which produced various audio-visual presentations that were exchanged internationally between the student participants in the program.

Modes of Communication - Five modes of communication were employed during the course of this project. They were: telecommunications (electronic mail and facsimile), traditional correspondence, media projects, collaborative educational projects with trans pacific partners, and exchange visits.

Telecommunications - Telecommunications refers to the linking of two computers by telephone or cable for digital information exchange. Communication through this means was divided into a) electronic mail and b) facsimile.

Traditional Correspondence - This term serves to mean the exchange of information by means of traditional letter writing activities.

### Learning Variables

Learning variables were skills and knowledge that the students were expected to acquire during their involvement in the program.

Cross-Cultural Education - This term is defined as the learning about, and tolerance of the differences between the Canadian students and the people, language, norms and expectations of the Japanese and Thai cultures.

Cultural Orientation and Language Learning - These terms refer to the components of the project involving the instruction in Thai and Japanese language and culture in a series of sessions during the year and a half preceding the trips abroad.

Media Skills - This term refers to the skills which the students were required to learn to enable them to use the communications media to achieve program objectives. Media skills include the use of a facsimile machine, electronic mail, a 35mm camera, a slide projector, the audio

studio, a computer to generate graphics, a video camera, and the video editing equipment.

### Definitions

Activity - Activity will define the single use of a communications medium and specific events such as Parents' Night.

Analysis - The organization, verification and examination of data. In this study the researcher employed qualitative data analysis.

Qualitative data analysis involved examining the data from interviews and questionnaires several times and counting the occurrences of words, phrases, sentences and themes. These units of information were then used to form categories of information. The content of the categories was examined and hypotheses were formed based on the ideas and themes that emerged from the data.

Communications Medium - Communications medium refers to a physical medium through which communication takes place, i.e. a computer, telephone/fax machine, and the sending of a letter.

Educational Exchange - The term educational exchange is a broad one encompassing a variety of types of exchanges. For the purposes of this paper the terms educational exchange, student exchange or exchange are understood to mean the reciprocal exchange of high school age students and their teachers, and educational information or materials between culturally different students and/or teachers. ✓

Effectiveness - The term effectiveness is used to describe the degree to which a process or activity enabled a participant in the project to accomplish that which he/she intended. Further, effectiveness will also be examined in terms of the degree to which the Future Partners Program met its purposes.

Evaluate - The term evaluate in reference to this paper describes the effort to ascertain the extent to which a process or activity facilitated the achievement of an objective by the participants.

Future Partners Meeting - A Future Partners meeting refers to the meetings held at the University of Victoria's Educational Technology Center every Wednesday evening from 6:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m. between September 1989 to August 1990. The students, teachers administrators and personnel were expected to attend as many meetings as possible.

Group Work - Means two to five students working together towards a common goal within the project.

Informants - An informant is someone involved with the program who provided a source of data for the research. The informants of this study were the Victoria students, parents, teachers, administrators and university personnel, and the Japanese students and adults who participated in the program.

Interpretation - The effort to combine the results of data analysis with value statements, criteria, and standards in order to produce supportable conclusions, judgments, and recommendations.

Interpretations were made in this study based on the hypotheses formed during data analysis. Interpretations exist in the Discussion and Recommendations portion of this paper (see chapter 5).

Participants - When used as a general term, participants refer to the Victoria students--including those who did not participate in the project to its completion--university professors, administrative staff, teachers and personnel who were involved in the project. When not used as a general term, the participant(s) being referred to are specified.

Process - Process defines an on-going activity within this project i.e. the language instruction, the cultural orientation sessions, the work on the various group projects, the time abroad, and any repeated use of a communications medium.

Program Infrastructure - Program infrastructure is defined as the framework that established how the program was organized and run in Canada, Japan and Thailand. Program infrastructure includes the people and finances that enable the program to run, meeting organization, work routines, and communications links between the participating countries.

Qualitative Data - The term qualitative data includes information from interviews and questionnaires describing people's personal perspectives and experiences, making respondents' ideas and opinions (stated in their own terms) an important data source for the evaluation. 'Qualitative data' also refers to descriptions obtained from the examination of program documents and artifacts.

Technology-based Educational Exchange - 'Technology-based' is used to describe educational exchanges which rely on technological communications media such as facsimile machines, electronic mail, computer generated graphics and sound, and audio and video presentations for the exchange of information between participant groups.

In the Findings section (see chapter 4) the following terms were used to describe the number of participants who gave a particular response to a question: (a) All = 18 responses; (b) Most = 16 to 17 responses; (c) Many = 10 to 15 responses; (d) Half = 9 responses; (e) Some = 5 to 8 responses; (f) Few = 1 to 4 responses; and (g) None = 0 responses.

#### LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

There exist several limitations of this study. It is important to make these limitations explicit at the outset of this document to enable the reader to understand and appreciate the limitations within which this study was performed. It is also important to note that the limitations that exist within this study were considered when this study took place, and were also taken

into account when comparisons, conclusions and recommendations were drawn from this research effort.

### Limitations

First, all participants in the Future Partners Program did not participate equally in this study:

1. The teacher of Japanese language took up residence in Japan August, 1991, and contact with him was therefore not made. Therefore, questionnaire responses were obtained from one out of two teachers of the language lessons.

2. As of September 1991, two of the Future Partners student participants lived in other parts of North America and were not available to participate in this study. As a result, responses from these two participants were not available for the consideration of this research.

3. The University of Victoria student who helped to train the Future Partners students in the use of the equipment was uncomfortable with an interview, and then answered one third of the questions that were faxed to her on a questionnaire. The researcher was therefore unable to clarify questions which the respondent may not have understood, or to ask the respondent to elaborate upon her responses.

4. While 15 student participants were available for interviews, 13 students returned questionnaires. Also, while there were 15 potential parent informants--one parent per student--ten parents returned questionnaires. Therefore, the data do not represent every single participant in the Future Partners Program.

Second, the data obtained from the Future Partners participants varied. These variations were considered in the drawing of conclusions and the making of recommendations in chapter 5 of this document. The data varied in the following ways:

1. Each Victoria participant responded differently to the interview questions. For instance, even though the respondent was asked a specific question--sometimes several times presented in several ways--he/she sometimes did not answer the question. In addition, often an informant would offer several answers to a question or would answer 'both yes and no' to a question. In both cases each answer given was recorded. Therefore, in the Appendices when the number of responses to a question are reported, often the numbers do not reflect the exact number of informants interviewed.

2. The program, which ran for two years, ended 20 months prior to this study and some informants admitted that they did not recall details in the same way they would have if this study had taken place immediately at the end of the program. Therefore, some accuracy in the data was lost due to informants' inability to remember some things clearly.

Third, the Canadian students were expected to communicate with the students in Japan and Thailand using a variety of means, most of which relied on communications technologies. This use of technology placed a further limitation on this study with regard to evaluating the frequency and manner in which the students communicated overseas for the following reasons: a) all of the students in the program did not learn how to use all of the technology equally well; b) the students varied in their interest in using the technology; c) at times the technology did not operate properly and

some students did not experience regular success in their efforts to communicate overseas; d) the students did not receive equal instruction in how to use the technology; e) the students did not have equal access to the technology; and f) the students in the partner countries did not possess the access to, or use of the types of communications technologies that the Canadian students did. Therefore, because technology provided the basis for most of the communications activities between the partner groups of students, and because it provided communications opportunities which were not equal across the students participating in the program, limitations exist in the attempt to appraise how successful the students were in communicating with and learning about their partner students.

### Summary

In light of these limitations, the data from the Victoria participants was not considered to be a complete appraisal of the participants' experiences and perspectives of the Future Partners Program. Further, due to time, financial and geographical limitations, it was not possible to thoroughly investigate the Thai and Japanese Future Partners Programs. Therefore, it must be noted that the researcher obtained as much valid and reliable data as possible while working within various limitations.

## CHAPTER TWO

### LITERATURE REVIEW

The major purpose of this study was the examination of three research questions:

1. What factors influenced the evolution and operation of the program?
2. How did the communications technologies and program activities in Future Partners enable the Canadian participants to communicate with and learn about their partners in the other two countries?
3. What could be done differently to improve the program?

A review of the current literature regarding educational exchanges revealed that not only have few educational exchanges been evaluated formally, but few have been evaluated at all. A second purpose then was to contribute to the understanding of how to evaluate educational exchanges. The literature review is therefore divided into two parts. First, a review of the literature regarding educational exchanges describes types of educational exchanges, their objectives, and the efforts that have been made to evaluate them. Second, a review of the evaluation field presents types of evaluations, the purposes for various evaluations, and the ways to conduct them.

#### Educational Exchanges

A survey of the literature over the past 30 years regarding domestic and foreign student exchanges illustrates a variety of types of exchanges with a variety of objectives. While no two exchanges are

exactly alike in terms of their design and duration, all of the exchanges within the realm of this research problem involve high school students and share at least the following three objectives: (a) to increase students' understanding and acceptance of culturally different peoples, (b) to help students learn a foreign language, and (c) to facilitate students' immersion in another culture.

The types of exchanges that exist within these parameters fall into the following two categories:

1. Individual students travelling to a host country to live with a native family and to study either for several months or for one academic year.

2. Groups of students travelling to a foreign country with teachers and chaperones to live with host families for a short period of time, and to visit the schools and other culturally significant sites and events there. Future Partners followed this format.

The majority of student exchanges fall within the first category, and are sponsored by organizations such as the American Field Service, Rotary Youth Exchange Programs, the Society for Educational Visits and Exchanges in Canada, Youth For Understanding, The Copen Foundation, Partners of the Americas, the American Heritage Association, The British Central Bureau for Educational Visits and Exchanges, the Educational Foundation for Foreign Study, the Open Door Student Exchange Program, the German American Partnership Program, the Scout Association, the YMCA/YWCA, and the Scottish Union of Students. The programs represented by the second category

are usually smaller scale efforts on the part of individual schools or subsets of large organizations.

The literature regarding educational exchanges contains mostly descriptive or anecdotal reports of exchanges that have taken place rather than formal evaluations which assess how well exchanges have met their objectives, offering recommendations regarding how educational exchanges can be conducted more efficiently and effectively. An anecdotal report occurs when the teacher involved with an exchange writes a summary of the exchange upon his/her return home, sometimes with a series of recommendations of how the exchange could have been improved. This type of report presents a rendition of the exchange based solely on one teacher's interpretation of the experience and does not include the points of view held by either the local student participants or the partner teacher and students. Examples of this type of report are an exchange between high school students in Indiana with students in Togo, West Africa (Stitsworth, 1987), several exchanges between students from the United States and the Soviet Union--Commonwealth of Independent States (Altenberger, 1989; Carey, 1983), exchanges between Californian and Mexican, and Japanese and German students (Biggs, and Wan, 1991), an exchange between students from Montreal and students from Spain (Fleck, 1984), and an exchange between high school students in New York with Israeli students (Mei and others, 1988).

Unlike Future Partners, most exchange programs do not include a significant period of time prior to travel during which the participants orient themselves toward, and communicate with, their foreign partners (Dragonas, 1983; Dawson, 1984; Kelsh, 1982). Instead, most exchange programs involve some initial communication

between the exchange students and a brief introduction to their culture, with the focus of the exchange on the time spent abroad. Therefore, the few existing formal evaluations of educational exchanges focus on the degree to which program objectives were met based on the time the participants spent abroad. Examples of these types of exchanges are those which focus on the students' acquisition of a second language. The few evaluations of these types of programs have compared both the participants' motivation to learn, and their acquisition of the second language upon their return home, relative to similar students who did not share the same experience abroad (Hamers and Deshaies, 1984; Lussier-Chasles, 1984; Parent, 1984; Stern, 1984). These evaluations do not indicate whether or not the students experienced a period of preparation prior to their sojourn abroad.

Programs such as Future Partners which include a period of orientation toward and communication with the native nationals in the host country prior to travel are private, school-based exchanges comprising groups of students travelling abroad with their foreign language teacher to meet a foreign partner class (Kelsh, 1982; Neeson, 1983). Examples of this type of exchange are group exchanges sponsored by subsets of organizations such as the Pacific American International Student Services programs, American Intercultural Student Exchanges, Youth For Understanding programs, Amigos De Las Americas programs, Educational Foundation for Foreign Study programs, some AFS programs, some programs supported by the Copen Foundation, some SEVEC programs, and programs sponsored by the British Columbia Ministry of Education's Pacific Rim

Initiatives Program. Unfortunately very few of these programs have been formally evaluated, and those researchers who express an intention to evaluate their exchange programs have not yet conducted these evaluations. For instance, while the Copen Foundation has been sponsoring exchanges for the past ten years between teachers and students from New York State with students and teachers from a variety of European and Asian countries, only recently has an evaluation been planned for one of their exchanges. A date and strategy for the evaluation is not currently available (P. Copen, personal communication, December 5, 1991) Also, the first planned evaluation of one of the many educational exchanges sponsored by British Columbia's Ministry of Education is of the Japanese Language Immersion Program. This program began March 31, 1992 and will not be evaluated until its completion in July, 1992 (J. McRae, personal communication, March 13, 1992).

The American Field Service was the only organization which used external evaluators to formally evaluate the effectiveness of some of their programs (Hansel, 1986; Hansel and Grove, 1984). While the exchanges sponsored by the American Field Service include a period of time prior to travel spent learning about the host people and culture, this component was not evaluated in terms of how it influenced the participants' ability to reach stated program objectives.

Other evaluations were designed to ascertain how well the participants met with an array of stated objectives relative to non-participants subsequent to their time spent abroad (Dragonas, 1983; Fleck, 1984; Hansel, 1986; Labell, 1984; Parent, 1984; Wood, 1982). These objectives included (a) helping students learn to speak a second

language through daily contact with native speakers; (b) helping students acquire a deeper appreciation of the customs, values, beliefs, and viewpoints of their hosts; (c) increasing student awareness of each country's position in world affairs, business technology; and (d) developing an understanding of and tolerance for cultural differences. In addition, some evaluations were conducted on a variety of types of programs to ascertain, in general terms, how students feel they have changed personally as a result of their foreign sojourn (Dragonas, 1983; Grove, 1983; Hansel and Grove, 1984; Stewart's study cited in Hansel, 1984; Kauffman's study cited in Hansel, 1984; Kagitcibasi's study cited in Hansel, 1984). In each instance, the evaluation focuses on how the participants have changed subsequent to their time spent abroad.

To summarize, this review reveals several issues that are not addressed in the literature on educational exchanges. First, most of the literature on educational exchanges exists in the form of a descriptive report instead of a formal evaluation. Second, the few programs which are formally evaluated either do not include a significant period of time prior to travel during which the participants prepare themselves for the exchange, or do not include this component of the program in the evaluation. Third, these formal evaluations focus on the degree to which the participants have changed as a result of their time abroad instead of as a result of their involvement in the entire program. Fourth, the literature does not contain a series of recommendations regarding both how to conduct an educational exchange efficiently and effectively, and how to evaluate an educational exchange.

Having looked at what has taken place in terms of educational exchanges like Future Partners over the past 30 years, an examination of the literature on the field of evaluation will be presented. The field of evaluation has been researched with the goal of ascertaining which means and methods of evaluation would be most appropriate for the evaluation of educational exchanges which share characteristics of the Future Partners Program.

### The Field of Evaluation

Many views of evaluation exist. The factors that lead to differing views of evaluation include evaluator's diverse philosophical ideologies, values, purposes for conducting evaluations and methodological preferences. Different views of evaluation range from sharing similar philosophical assumptions and methodological attributes to being divergent, based on conflicting philosophical assumptions, different methodologies and focussing on different goals or purposes.

The evaluation field is dominated by two different inquiry paradigms: (a) logical-positivism, which uses quantitative and experimental methods to test hypothetical-deductive generalizations, and (b) phenomenological inquiry, using qualitative and naturalistic approaches to inductively and holistically understand human experience in context-specific settings.

An inquiry paradigm comprises a series of characteristics which direct the research effort. For instance, if the inquiry paradigm is phenomenological, or qualitative, the research will be characterized by naturalistic inquiry, a holistic perspective, a unique case orientation, inductive analysis and grounded theory building. On the contrary, if

Table 1

Characteristics of Qualitative and Quantitative Research

| Point of Comparison    | Qualitative Research  | Quantitative Research  |
|------------------------|---|--|
| Focus of the Research  | Quality (nature, essence)   | Quantitative (how much, how many)                                  |
| Philosophical Roots    | Phenomenology, symbolic interaction   | Positivism, logical empiricism                                     |
| Associated Phases      | Fieldwork, ethnographic, naturalistic, grounded, subjective                       | Experimental, empirical, statistical, objective                    |
| Goal of Investigation  | Understanding, description, discovery, hypothesis generating                      | Prediction, control, description, confirmation, hypothesis testing |
| Design Characteristics | Flexible, involving emergent characteristics                                      | Predetermined, structured  |
| Setting                | Natural, familiar   | Unfamiliar, artificial   |
| Sample                 | Small, nonrandom theoretical  | Large, random, representative                                      |
| Data Collection        | Researchers as primary instrument, interviews, observations, documents, artifacts | Inanimate (instruments, tests, scales, questionnaires, computers)  |
| Mode of Analysis       | Inductive (by researcher)   | Deductive (by statistical methods)                                 |
| Findings               | Comprehensive, holistic, expansive  | Precise, narrow, reductionist                                      |

Note. From Case study research in education: A qualitative approach (p. 18) by S. Merriam, 1988, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

the inquiry paradigm is that of logical positivism, or quantitative, the research effort will be characterized by experimental design, attention to discrete, independent and dependent variables, replicability of findings, deductive analysis and theory testing (Patton, 1990).

Qualitative research is referred to as naturalistic inquiry in that the researcher does not attempt to manipulate the research setting (Guba and Lincoln, 1985). The research setting, like the evaluation of Future Partners, is a naturally occurring event, program or interaction that has no predetermined course established by and for the researcher. Rather, the point of using qualitative methods is to understand the phenomena in its context (Patton, 1990). Egon Guba (Guba and Lincoln, 1985) defined naturalistic or qualitative inquiry as a "discovery-oriented" approach that minimizes investigator manipulation of the study setting and places no prior constraints on what the outcomes of the research will be. Naturalistic inquiry is thus contrasted to quantitative, or experimental research in which the investigator attempts to control the conditions of the study by manipulating, changing, or holding constant external influences and in which stated outcome variables are measured. A naturalistic inquiry strategy is selected when the evaluator wants to minimize research manipulation when studying program or treatment processes and impacts. Unlike the goals of this research, experimental conditions and designs are selected when the evaluator wants to control treatment processes and impacts, reduce variation in extraneous variables, and focus on predetermined measures.

Some qualitative-naturalistic evaluators state that the quantitative approach (a) assumes a single reality or world view which

oversimplifies the complexities of real-world experiences, (b) excludes factors that are not easily quantified, and (c) fails to portray a sense of the program and its impacts as a whole. In contrast, the assumptions made by some qualitative researchers are that (a) research involving human factors and describing human characteristics cannot be quantified, (b) the perspectives and experiences of participants are essential in the overall understanding of a phenomenon, and (c) reality is a construction of the mind, therefore multiple realities, or views of the world, exist (S. Merriam, personal communication, February 21, 1992).

Some critics of qualitative inquiry have charged that the approach is too subjective (Fetterman, 1988; Merriam, 1988), because the researcher is the instrument of both data collection and data interpretation, and because a qualitative strategy includes having personal contact with the people and the situation under study. From the perspective of the logical-positivist scientific paradigm, subjectivity is the antithesis of scientific inquiry (Patton, 1990).

Regardless of the research design, a credible research strategy requires that the investigator adopt a stance of neutrality with regard to the phenomenon under study (Patton, 1990; Yin, 1989). The investigator should not set out to prove a particular perspective or manipulate the data to arrive at predisposed truths. The neutral investigator enters the research arena with no theory to prove and no predetermined results to support. Rather, the investigator's commitment is to understand a phenomenon, to be true to complexities and multiple perspectives as they emerge, and to be balanced in reporting both confirming and disconfirming evidence

(Guba and Lincoln, 1985). Qualitative researchers argue that a researcher maintaining this perspective and utilizing systematic data-collection procedures, multiple data sources, triangulation methods, external reviews, and member checks of the data, will produce high-quality qualitative data that are credible, accurate and true to the phenomenon under study (Merriam, 1988).

The advantages of qualitative research are that (a) the research design is flexible and sensitive to the phenomenon being studied, and (b) a holistic portrayal of a phenomenon portrays both expected and unexpected variables, impacts and outcomes (Fetterman, 1988; Lincoln and Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1988; Patton, 1987, 1990).

The advantages of quantitative research are that (a) measurements can be precise and the analysis of numerical data is relatively objective, and (b) when program elements can be quantified with validity, reliability, and credibility, statistical portrayals can be powerful and succinct (Madaus, Scriven, and Stufflebeam, 1983; Patton, 1987, 1990).

The qualitative research paradigm was chosen for this research because determining how the Future Partners Program functioned, why it functioned as it did, and what could be done differently a second time to improve the program required an attempt to portray the program as a whole. Portraying the program as a whole required including the perspectives of all participants in the program, and therefore assumed that multiple perspectives of the program exist. Further, the program did not involve quantifiable, prestated, measurable, standardized outcomes against which participants' performance could be measured at the end of the program. However,

this study does contain a quantitative aspect in that it quantifies the number of types of responses the participants made to specific questions about the program.

Because the qualitative approach to evaluation was chosen for the purposes of this research the literature review hereafter focuses on the theoretical origins, models and methods of qualitative research.

### Theoretical Traditions and Orientations in Qualitative Research

The social and behavioral sciences have evolved into disciplines by focusing on different core questions. Those differences in focus, based on the kinds of research questions asked, have implications for the theoretical tradition within which a specific study is placed (Patton, 1990).

Many theoretical traditions and orientations to research lie within the qualitative research paradigm. Table 2 presents the theoretical traditions that exist in qualitative research, the disciplinary roots of each, and the central questions each asks.

Table 2  
Variety in Qualitative Inquiry: Theoretical Traditions

| <u>Perspective</u>               | <u>Disciplinary Roots</u>                  | <u>Central Questions</u>   |
|----------------------------------|--|--|
| Ethnography                      | Anthropology                               | What is the culture of this group of people?   |
| Phenomenology                    | Philosophy                                 | What is the structure and essence of experience of this phenomenon for these people?   |
| Heuristics                       | Humanistic Psychology                      | What is MY experience of this phenomenon and the essential experience of others who also experience this phenomenon?                   |
| Ethnomethodology                 | Sociology                                  | How do people make sense of their every-day activities so as to behave in socially acceptable ways?                                    |
| Symbolic Interactionism          | Social Psychology                          | What common set of symbols and understandings have emerged to give meaning to people's interactions?                                   |
| Ecological Psychology            | Ecology, Psychology                        | How do individuals attempt to accomplish their goals through specific behaviors in specific environments?                              |
| Systems Theory                   | Interdisciplinary                          | How and why does this system function as a whole?  |
| Chaos Theory: nonlinear dynamics | Theoretical Physics, natural sciences      | What is the underlying order, if any, of disorderly phenomenon?  |
| Hermeneutics                     | Theology, Philosophy<br>Literary criticism | What are the conditions under which a human act took place or a product was produced that makes it possible to interpret its meanings? |
| Orientalational, Qualitative     | Ideologies, Political<br>Economic          | How is x ideological perspective manifest in this phenomenon?  |

Note. From Qualitative evaluation and research methods, second edition (p. 88) by M. Patton, 1990, London: Sage Publications.

The research questions guiding the evaluation of the Future Partners Program ask both how and why does this system function as a whole, and what is the structure and essence of experience of this phenomenon for these people? Therefore, this research effort is grounded in both a Systems and Phenomenological theoretical tradition.

There exists a link between the theoretical tradition, the research model, and the method of research applied. This link is based on the idea that the purpose of the research determines the questions that are asked about the world. These questions determine how the world is studied, which determines what is learned about the world.

In summary, there are a variety of theoretical traditions within the qualitative inquiry paradigm. The type of questions being asked determines the theoretical origin of a study and which research model will be best suited for a study. From the research model follow the types of data collection methods used for the study. The following are a list of research models within the qualitative research paradigm.

#### Evaluation Research Models

There are many models of evaluation. Evaluation models are not standard methodological packages, but general research strategies (Madaus, Scriven and Stufflebeam, 1983). Models are derived from the purpose of the research and are developed to help evaluators know what steps to follow and issues to consider in designing and implementing a study.

The models presented in Table 3 range from those supporting only qualitative inquiry methods to those which only use quantitative methodologies, to those which can incorporate a blend of both types of inquiry methods. Further, each model can either stand alone or be combined with another model as an approach to an evaluation problem. The first models are termed quantitative because they describe the inquiry approach to purely quantitative research. The second group of evaluation models are termed quasi-qualitative because they can combine quantitative and qualitative evaluation questions and methods in their inquiry. The third group of evaluation models are termed qualitative models because they ask only qualitative questions and utilize only qualitative methods.

Table 3

Evaluation Models Overview

| <u>Type of Model</u>   | <u>Central Questions Asked</u>   | <u>Methods Used</u>  |
|--|--|--|
| <u>Quantitative Models</u><br>Experimental Research<br>(Madaus, Scriven and<br>Stufflebeam, 1983)  | What are the effects of an intervention on outcome variables?  | simulations, quasi-experimental and experimental   |
| <u>Quasi-Qualitative Models</u><br>Consumer Oriented<br>(Madaus, Scriven and<br>Stufflebeam, 1983) | Which objects are the best buy given their costs, the needs of the consumer group and the values of society? | checklists, needs assessment, sampling, modus operandi, cost analysis, quasi-experimental  |
| Management Oriented<br>(Madaus, Scriven and Stufflebeam, 1983)                                     | How should a given enterprise be planned? How should a program be revised? How should a plan be carried out? | case studies, Delphi technique, sampling, surveys, advocate teams needs assessments, observations and quasi-experimental designs                     |
| Accountability Studies<br>(Madaus, Scriven and Stufflebeam, 1983)                                  | Are personnel and organizations achieving all they should be given the resources to support their work?      | mandated testing programs and procedures for auditing the design, process, and results of a program  |
| Accreditation/Certification Studies<br>(Madaus, Scriven and Stufflebeam, 1983)                     | Are institutions meeting minimum standards? How can performance be improved?                                 | case studies, self-reporting, panels of experts, judicial proceedings, sampling and auditing procedures.   |
| Objectives Oriented<br>(Worthen and Sanders, 1987)   | Have stated objectives been achieved?  | standardized tests, case studies scales, observations, content analysis  |
| <u>Qualitative Models</u><br>Expert Oriented<br>(Madaus, Scriven and<br>Stufflebeam, 1983)         | What merits and demerits distinguish an object from others of the same kind?                                 | critic's use of perceptual sensitivities, past experiences, and refined insights.  |
| Transactional Oriented<br>(Rippey, 1973)   | How does change in an organization affect the people there?  | case studies, questionnaires, modus operandi, observations, interviews, attitude measurement scales, content analysis, document analysis             |
| Illuminative Evaluation<br>(Parlett and Hamilton, 1972)  | What is it like to participate in the program? What are the program's significant features?                  | case studies, interviews, content analysis, observations, the examination of documents and artifacts   |
| Client Centered<br>(Stake, 1973)   | What is the history and status of the program? How is it judged by the people involved?                      | case studies, interviews, content analysis, observations, the examination of documents and artifacts, adversary reports, histories, archival records |

Table 3

## Evaluation Models Overview Continued

| <u>Type of Model</u>  | <u>Central Questions Asked</u>   | <u>Methods Used</u>   |
|---|--|---|
| <b><u>Qualitative Models Cont'd</u></b>                         |  |   |
| Responsive Evaluation<br>(Stake, 1973)                          | Addresses the concerns and issues as stated by a stakeholder audience.   | case studies, observations, content analysis, interviews, examination of documents and artifacts.   |
| Goal Free Evaluation<br>(Madaus, Scriven and Stufflebeam, 1983) | What are the results of a program (whether planned or not)   | case studies, interviews, content analysis, observations, the analysis of documents and artifacts, Q sorts, documenting program activities. |
| Participant Oriented<br>(Guba and Lincoln, 1985)                | What is it like to be a participant in the program? What are the concerns of the participants in the program? What recommendations can be made to improve it?                                  | case studies, interviews, survey questionnaires, observations, and examination of documents and artifacts                                   |
| Process Oriented<br>(Patton, 1990)                              | How does the program operate? What is the nature of staff client interactions? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the program? How are clients brought into and work within the program? | case studies, interviews, survey questionnaires, observations, and examination of documents and artifacts                                   |
| Outcome Oriented<br>(Patton, 1990, and Popham, 1974)            | Do program services meet the needs of the participants? What is the experience of each participant in the program?   | case studies, interviews, survey questionnaires, content analysis, attitude measurement scales  |

To review, evaluation models are not standard methodological packages, but general research strategies (Madaus, Scriven and Stufflebeam, 1983). In selecting an evaluation model, researchers must match the evaluation model, or models, with the purpose of their research.

The evaluation models presented in this chapter represent evaluation strategies for a variety of research needs. These models are termed quantitative, quasi-qualitative and qualitative based on the

purpose of the evaluation, and the methods each uses to carry out the evaluation. For instance, a quantitative design is appropriate for experimental research aimed at measuring the performance of specific variables against intended standards. Quantitative models involve the quantification and measurement of variables that are easy to identify, control and measure. The purposes of quasi-qualitative evaluation models such as Consumer Oriented Evaluation, Management/Decision Oriented Evaluation, Accountability Studies, Accreditation/ Certification Evaluation, and Objectives Oriented Studies are not only to measure a result and compare it to an intended standard, but also to make decisions based on the perspectives held by people involved with the phenomenon under scrutiny. Therefore, a blend of both quantitative and qualitative methods are used in a quasi-qualitative model of evaluation. Finally, qualitative evaluation models such as Connoisseur-Based, Transactional, Illuminative, Client-Centered, Responsive, Goal Free, Participant Oriented, Process Oriented, and Outcome Oriented evaluation are used when the purpose of the research is to conduct an evaluation without using pre-stated objectives or standards against which results of the evaluation are compared. Further, qualitative research focuses on illuminating the unique characteristics of the phenomenon under study and always includes the perspectives held by the people close to the phenomenon under study.

Some quasi-qualitative and qualitative evaluation models share similar characteristics, however, each model is distinct based on the focus of the evaluation. Therefore, while some models appear to be quite similar, each model is well suited for the specific focus of particular evaluations. For

instance each model asks different research questions and the questions are often directed at different groups of people or at different aspects of the phenomenon being evaluated. Further, while the evaluative methods are often the same, the way these methods are carried out can differ. For example, the focus of an evaluation will dictate whether the evaluation is conducted in the middle and/or at the conclusion of a program, or it can focus either on the manner in which an event occurred or on the outcome of an event, or both. An evaluation can be conducted with the evaluator either being cognizant or not of the objectives of the program, or it can be conducted by an evaluator who is either an expert or a novice in the field of the phenomenon under study. When selecting a model to guide the design and implementation of an evaluation, it is important that the researcher bear in mind the specific purpose and focus of the research.

The evaluation of the Future Partners Program employed the Participant, Process and Outcome evaluation models. These qualitative evaluation models were chosen because they focus on answering the three questions posed by this research effort. A more elaborate explanation of why these models have been chosen can be found in the Research Design portion of this paper (see chapter 3).

### Data Collection Methods

Data collection methods are ways of collecting information for a research problem. While a variety of methods are available to evaluators, the selection of methods depends on the evaluation model and the goals of the research (Patton, 1990). The methods presented here range from those supporting only the qualitative inquiry paradigm, to methods which can be used to support both qualitative and quantitative research inquiries. Data

collection methods used only for the purpose of quantitative inquiries exist but will not be mentioned as they are not a part of this study.

### Qualitative Data Collection Methods.

The following data collection methods can be combined to gather data for a qualitative research problem. These methods enable the researcher to examine the phenomenon being studied holistically in its context without placing any constraints on the outcome of the evaluation.

- Interviews
- Observations
- Document Analysis
- Case Studies
- Content Analysis
- Modus Operandi Analysis
- Judicial Proceedings
- Histories
- The Analysis of Archival Records
- Covert Investigations

### Research Methods Used by Qualitative and Quantitative Inquiry Paradigms.

These data collection methods can be used to support both quantitative and qualitative research inquiries. Each method can be used in an evaluation in varying degrees depending on the purpose and goals of the study.

- Q-sorts
- Auditing Procedures in a Program

- Survey Questionnaires and Survey Methods
- Sampling
- The Delphi Technique
- Attitude Measurement scales
- Cost-Benefit Analysis

Because this qualitative research effort uses participant, process and outcome evaluation models, the methods chosen are the case study using survey questionnaires, interviews and the analysis of documents and artifacts.

To summarize, the literature regarding educational exchanges presents a variety of types of exchanges. Few of them have been evaluated formally or have included in the evaluation the portion of time spent preparing for the exchange. The literature regarding evaluation offers several research paradigms, theoretical traditions, models and methods to choose from to conduct an evaluation. One purpose of this research was to build on the current body of information in the literature by contributing a description of how technology based educational exchange programs like Future Partners are organized, what their educational merit is, and a method of evaluating them. Also, the results of this evaluation offer recommendations regarding improvements for educational exchange programs which share similar characteristics to the Future Partners Program, and which use communications technologies for the creation of media presentations and telecommunications.

## CHAPTER THREE

### RESEARCH DESIGN

The research questions addressed in this study are:

1. What factors influenced the evolution and operation of the Future Partners Program?
2. How did the communications technologies and program activities in Future Partners enable the Canadian participants to communicate with and learn about their partners in the other two countries?
3. What could be done differently to improve the program?

The research method selected to answer these questions was (a) a qualitative case study, (b) based on the phenomenological and systems theoretical traditions of qualitative research, and (c) was directed by a process, participant and outcome orientation to evaluation.

### THE QUALITATIVE PARADIGM

The qualitative research setting is a naturally occurring event, program or interaction that has no predetermined course established by and for the researcher. The purpose of using qualitative methods is to understand the phenomenon in its context (Patton, 1990). The research goals of this study included gaining an in-depth understanding of what occurred during the Future Partners Program from the perspectives of the participants, focusing on processes as well as outcomes. The researcher also intended to determine what

the weaknesses and strengths of the program were, identify why they occurred, and compile a series of recommendations for improving the program for its second offering and for use by educators involved with similar exchange programs. Future Partners was not designed to achieve standardized changes in its participants which could be measured before and after implementation of the program. Further, the intent of this evaluation was not to establish the success of the program based on a demonstration of cause and effect relationships between the program, its aims, its interventions and its results (Weiss and Rein, 1970). Consequently the qualitative, rather than quantitative, approach to this study was the ideal inquiry paradigm for understanding, interpreting and evaluating this educational phenomenon (Eisner, 1991; Merriam, 1988; Yin, 1989).

#### THEORETICAL ORIGINS OF THIS STUDY:

##### A SYSTEMS AND PHENOMENOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

Qualitative research examines the object under study as a system in a holistic way (Patton, 1990), rather than something that can be divided into discrete, measureable components. A qualitative systems perspective to evaluation assumes the entire phenomenon under study is a complex system that is more than the sum of its parts. Systems theory suggests the researcher define the boundaries of the system by "focusing attention on the smallest set of interacting groups and individuals that will account for most of what happens and most of what determines what happens" (Weiss and Rein, 1970, p. 155). A systems perspective also assumes that the whole of a program is both greater than and different from its parts (Patton, 1990). A systems study asks how and why does this system as a whole function as it

does. This research bore a systems approach to evaluation because two of the research questions in this study were:

1. What factors influenced the evolution and operation of the program?
2. How did the communications technologies and program activities in Future Partners enable the Canadian participants to communicate with and learn about their partners in the other two countries?

Phenomenology is the study of how people describe things and experience them through their senses. The basic assumption underlying phenomenology is that we only know what we experience by attending to our perceptions and the meanings we attach to the experience (Patton, 1990). Phenomenological inquiry asks what is the structure and essence of this phenomenon for these people? The origins of this study were also embedded in phenomenology theory because the focus of this evaluation was to ascertain what the participants' experience was of Future Partners by asking them what their perspectives and feelings were about the program.

#### Evaluation Models Used in this Study:

##### Process, Participant and Outcome Models

##### Process Evaluation

Data from a process evaluation permit judgments to be made about the extent to which a program operated in the way it was supposed to, highlighting strengths of the program that should be preserved, as well as revealing areas in which relationships can be improved (Patton, 1990). Therefore this evaluation was supported by a process orientation to evaluation because the inquiry focusses on how

the program evolved, how the program operated, and how the program can be improved.

Process descriptions also help people indirectly involved in a program--in this case external funders from British Columbia's Ministry of Education--to understand how the program operated. This gives external persons a knowledge base from which to make decisions about the program. Further, because process evaluations describe how the components of a program functioned they are useful where a program like Future Partners has served as a demonstration project for possible replication and dissemination (Patton, 1990).

#### Participant Oriented Evaluation

The intent of the participant approach to evaluation is for the evaluator to learn from the participants what it was like for them to participate in the program. This research orientation assumes that the perspective of the participants is meaningful and important in the evaluation of a program (Worthen and Sanders, 1987). Participant evaluation also assumes that there are aspects of a program that cannot be directly observed by the evaluator, but must be rendered explicit by interviewing the participants (Merriam, 1988). The participant orientation to evaluation was therefore consonant with the inquiry of this study because this evaluation attempted to ascertain what the participants' experience was of Future Partners by asking them what their perspectives and feelings were in light of the purposes of the program.

### Outcome Oriented Evaluation

Outcome evaluation (Patton, 1990; Popham, 1974) attempts to match program activities to the needs of individual participants. Outcome oriented studies assume outcomes will vary among participants, therefore the intent of outcome oriented evaluation is to document the outcomes experienced by individual participants rather than to measure outcomes standardized across all participants.

The Future Partners Program provided activities in which the participants engaged at individual levels of involvement. Therefore, the outcomes of having engaged in those activities were different for different students. The assumption underlying outcome oriented evaluation is that common activities will result in different experiences and therefore different outcomes for participants depending on their background experience, how they approached the activities, what their unique needs and interests were, and which activities they found most stimulating (Popham, 1981).

Process, participant and outcome approaches to evaluation support each other in this study in that the purpose of this research is to examine the Future Partners Program as a whole. Therefore this evaluation focuses on how the program operated, how the participants responded to program activities, and what outcomes were achieved at the end of the program. Process evaluation examines how the program operated and makes recommendations for improvement, participant evaluation asks the participants how well their needs were met with regard to the purposes of the program, and outcome evaluation examines the outcomes experienced by the participants given the activities of the program.

## The Case Study Method

A qualitative case study was chosen for this research after comparing the possible methods used to conduct evaluation inquiry with the research questions of this evaluation. Below is a list of the research questions of this study and the procedures necessary in order to answer each:

1. What factors influenced the evolution and operation of the program?
  - document what happened during the program
  - determine the extent to which various objectives were achieved
  - determine in what ways components of the program influenced the participants in reaching their objectives
  
2. How did the communications technologies and program activities in Future Partners enable the Canadian participants to communicate with and learn about their partners in the other two countries?
  - examine the objectives of the program
  - document what happened during the program
  - determine the extent to which various objectives were achieved
  - determine in what ways components of the program influenced the participants in reaching their objectives
  
3. What could be done differently to improve the program?
  - ask participants what they could recommend regarding improvements to the program
  - offer recommendations and improvements for the second offering of the program

The qualitative research paradigm assumes that while each case shares characteristics of other examples of the phenomenon, each case is also individual. The aim of the qualitative inquiry then is to be true to, respecting and capturing the details of the cases being studied (Patton, 1990). Case studies become particularly useful when one needs to understand a group of people, a particular problem, or a unique situation in great depth (Yin, 1989). The case study method of research is particularly appropriate for the evaluation of educational exchanges because of the flexible nature of case study research and the variety that exists in the organization and purposes of educational exchanges. The unit of analysis in a case study can be a person, an event, a program, an organization, a time period, or a community. Regardless of the unit of analysis, a qualitative case study seeks to describe that unit in depth and detail, in context, and holistically (Fetterman, 1988). Case studies can be used to evaluate such things as how an aspect of an educational exchange program worked-- technology based communication, organization practices--and/or to evaluate the outcomes of a program--students' acquisition of a second language or an increased cultural awareness of another group of people. The outcomes of educational exchanges tend not to be quantifiable or standardized across all participants. Therefore, qualitative case study methods are appropriate when educational exchanges, like Future Partners, expect each participant to experience individual outcomes.

Case studies are a preferred research method when "what, how or why" questions are being posed, when the investigator has little control over events, and when the focus is on a contemporary

phenomenon (Yin, 1984). Case studies are empirical inquiries that allow an investigation to retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics of contemporary events by using interviews, document analysis, participant observations, and questionnaires as evidence to document and evaluate program aspects, people or events.

For the convenience of this study the evaluation was conducted in terms of the three research questions posed. The following specific aspects of the Future Partners Program were examined with regard to each research question:

1. What factors influenced the evolution and operation of the program?

Specifically:

How did the participants feel the mechanics of the program affected the objective of cross-cultural learning the way it did? In other words, how did the structure and objectives of the program work or not work?

(**Structure** = student management, teacher involvement, meeting organization, and program goals, **Objectives** = for the participants to communicate with and learn about other culturally different groups of students and teachers)

These aspects of the program were chosen for examination because they formed the organizational basis upon which program activities were run.

2. How did the communications technologies and program activities in Future Partners enable the Canadian participants to communicate with and learn about their partners in the other two countries?

Specifically:

How did the period of language learning and cultural orientation prior to the travel facilitate the participants' ability to communicate with and learn about their partners in the other two countries?

How did the communication technologies used in the program facilitate mutual learning between culturally different students?

How did the participants feel the mechanics of the program facilitated the objective of cross-cultural learning? In other words, in what ways did the organization, structure, objectives of the program work or not work for the participants?

These aspects of the program were chosen to be examined in terms of this research question because they not only include the activities designed to facilitate communication with and learning about the overseas partners (the language instruction, media project work, joint educational projects, and communication activities - fax, letters, e-mail, and the exchange trip), but they also include the organizational basis upon which these program activities were run.

3. What could be done differently to improve the program?

Specifically:

How could the period of language learning and cultural orientation prior to the travel be improved to better enable the students to communicate with and learn about their partners in the other two countries?

How could the mechanics of the program be improved to better facilitate the objective of cross-cultural learning? In other words, how could the organization, structure, objectives of the program be improved?

How could communication technologies be used in the program more effectively and efficiently to facilitate mutual learning between culturally different students?

These aspects of the program were selected to be examined for the purpose of answering the third research question because they comprise both the organizational framework and the activities that formed the program.

This evaluation determined in what ways each of these aspects of the program contributed to the achievement of the objectives of the program--to facilitate the participants' ability to communicate with and learn about other culturally different groups of students and teachers. While all participants were expected to participate in each aspect of the program--project work, language instruction and cultural orientation, joint educational projects, communications activities, the trip--they were granted the freedom to choose the extent and nature

of their participation. Thus the evaluation aimed to discover in what ways each participant engaged in these aspects of the program, why they chose to involve themselves in these activities the way they did, what aspects had the most impact on what they learned about their foreign counterparts, and what recommendations could be made to improve them for a second offering of the program.

Each aspect of the program was judged according to how much the participants felt they learned from it relative to how much they expected to learn from it, and whether they felt it was required or not.

To collect this information the researcher posed questions which fell within the following framework consisting of five types of inquiry. The five types of inquiry below emerged from the original three research questions of this study:

1. What factors influenced the evolution and operation of the Future Partners Program?
2. How did the communications technologies and program activities in Future Partners enable the Canadian participants to communicate with and learn about their partners in the other two countries?
3. What could be done differently to improve the program?

#### Five Types of Inquiry

1. Quantitative Measures - i.e. the number of students at the commencement of the program, the number who dropped out, when they dropped out, the age range of the students, which school each participant attended, how often individual students attended the weekly meetings, and how often students utilized a specific communications medium (fax, correspondence, e-mail).

2. Descriptive Measures - Reports on actions taken i.e. descriptions of which activities were undertaken by each program participant and what was subsequently accomplished, explanations of how students were chosen for the program.
3. Interpretive Measures Asking WHY - i.e. why did participants accept the invitation to participate; why did they choose to participate in the particular group and individual activities they did; why did some things work better than others in the program; why did some students drop out of the program?
4. Interpretive Measures Asking WHAT and HOW - what are the program objectives; what are the participants' personal objectives within the program; what do the participants think about what they did in the program; what worked and what did not work in the program in terms of enabling them to reach their intended goals; what could have been done differently; how could instruction have been improved; how could the students have been better motivated to learn the languages; how could the students have been better motivated to complete the joint educational projects?
5. An opportunity to comment on, express opinions or make observations or recommendations about anything regarding the program.

### Means of Data Collection

Qualitative research methods are derived most directly from the ethnographic and field study traditions of anthropology and sociology (Patton, 1987, and Kirk and Millar, 1986). These methods consist of three kinds of data collection instruments: (a) the examination of documents and artifacts, (b) interviews, and (c) observations.

Observations of program activities could not be used because the Future Partners Program was not currently active. However, survey questionnaires were used to collect data from student and adult program participants who lived in Canada and Japan, and attempts were made to obtain data from Thailand using survey questionnaires. The use of a combination of data gathering instruments enabled the researcher to use different data sources to validate and cross-check findings (Patton, 1990).

### Documents and Artifacts

Program documents and artifacts provide information about the program that cannot be acquired by other means (Merriam, 1988; Worthen and Sanders, 1987). The examination of documents and artifacts also provides stimulus for generating questions for interviews and questionnaires (Patton, 1990). The artifactual products from the project were such things as the audio tapes, photographs, computer graphics, slides, video and written presentations, and the documented electronic mail exchanges, faxes and correspondence created by the participants. These items were examined as confirming or disconfirming evidence of some of the program activities the students reported they participated in. Further, public documents were

reviewed such as the newspaper articles, reports, newsletters and proposals pertaining to the program, as well as institutional and group files such as the minutes of meetings, records of equipment purchase and use, student records and the scripts written for the projects.

### Questionnaires

Survey questionnaires can be used to collect information relevant to the evaluation of the effects of a program (Sonquist and Dunkelberg, 1977). Questionnaires enable the evaluator to ask each program participant the same questions in the same sequence which reduces the possibility of evaluator effects from asking different informants different questions (Patton, 1990). Questionnaires are also used when information from a large number of informants is sought.

Questionnaires were used in this evaluation because it was not practical to interview the 78 participants in the program, including those living in Japan and Thailand, because of time, money and logistical reasons. Therefore, individual questionnaires were designed for specific participant groups within the project (the Victoria students, their parents, the teachers, University of Victoria personnel, the Thai and Japanese students and adults). These questionnaires facilitated the collection of the data from levels one, two, three and five questions.

### Interviews

Qualitative interviewing is based on the assumption that the perspective of others is meaningful, knowable, and able to be made explicit (Patton, 1990). Because interviews allow for elaboration,

"clarification and probing" (Worthen and Sanders, 1987, p. 308) they facilitated the collection of the data from levels two, three, four and five questions of this study. The participant groups to be interviewed were the Victoria students, the administrators, and the university professors.

Four types of qualitative interviews exist: (a) the informal conversational interview, (b) the general interview guide approach, (c) the standardized open-ended interview, and (d) the closed field response interview (Conner, 1981; Lincoln and Guba, 1985; Madaus, Scriven and Stufflebeam, 1983; Patton, 1987, 1990; Popham, 1974; Rothman, 1980). The format chosen for this study was the standardized open-ended interview.

In the standardized open-ended interview the exact wording and sequence of questions are determined in advance of the interview, all interviewees are asked the same questions in the same order, and questions are worded in an open-ended format (Merriam, 1988; Yin, 1989). Asking the same questions of each respondent reduces the possibility of the interviewer changing the wording of the questions and thus minimizes interviewer effects in the data (Patton, 1990). The openendedness of the questions means that there are no predetermined answers.

The standardized open-ended interview format was chosen because the purpose of this research was to acquire comprehensive information documenting each participant's experience of program variables. The standardized open-ended interview enables the researcher to ask each informant the same series of questions and allows the informant the freedom to offer individual responses. The

strengths of this method are that by respondents answering the same questions in the same sequence, comparability of responses is possible, and data are complete for each person on the topics addressed in the interview. This method also reduces interviewer effects and bias because the interviewer cannot reword or resequence, or omit questions. Further strengths of this approach include evaluators being able to see and review the instrumentation used in the evaluation, and it facilitates data organization and analysis (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). The weaknesses of this method are that it allows for little flexibility in relating the interview to particular individuals and circumstances, standardized wording of questions may constrain and limit naturalness and relevance of questions and answers (Smith and Glass, 1987).

#### Procedures for the Collection of the Data

The questionnaires and interview questions were pilot tested in order to identify confusing, inconsistent, or ambiguous questions. The questions were pilot tested on a sample of Grade 12 students and adults at a local high school. The sample consisted of both students and adults who had been involved in an educational exchange visit to Japan within the previous two months and those who had not. This measure was taken to prevent distortions in the data due to the potential for participants to misunderstand what information was being asked for by the questions. The questionnaire and interview questions intended for the Victoria based students were pilot tested by asking 10 Grade 12 students to briefly answer them and to comment on any ambiguities or inconsistencies in the wording of the

questions. Similarly, the questionnaire and interview questions intended for the Victoria based teachers and parents were pilot tested by asking three adults who were both parents and teachers to briefly answer them and comment on any difficulties they experienced with the questions.

The questionnaire questions intended for the Japanese participants were faxed to Mrs. Natsumi Onaka in Morioka, Japan with the request that she add questions specific to the Japanese Future Partners group that may have been overlooked, and that the questionnaires be answered by a small group of students and adults who closely represented their Future Partners participants. It was asked that questions and comments regarding the clarity or meaning of the questions be written on the questionnaire, or questions that had been overlooked be included in the questionnaire, and returned. The pilot tested responses were then used to improve the quality and the clarity of the questionnaire questions by improving the existing questions, including new questions, and omitting others.

The questionnaires for the Japanese students and adult participants were then faxed back to Mrs. Natsumi Onaka with the request that they be distributed to their Future Partners participants for completion and be mailed back to the researcher. Unfortunately the questionnaires were returned to Canada after the completion of this document, thus the data obtained from the Japanese Future Partners' questionnaires can be found in Appendix E.

The questionnaires for the Thai students and adult participants were mailed to the Dean of the Faculty of Education at Chulalongkorn University, Dr. Somwung Pitiyanuwat, with the request that he pass

them along to someone involved in the Future Partners Program who would distribute them to the student and adult participants in Thailand. It was also requested that the questionnaires for the Thai students and adults be examined and that questions specific to the Thai Future Partners group that may have been overlooked be added, and that the questionnaires then be answered by a small group of students and adults who closely represented their Future Partners participants. It was asked that questions and comments regarding the clarity or meaning of the questions be written on the questionnaires and returned. However, communications restrictions due to the rebellion in Thailand in the summer of 1992 resulted in a lack of response from Thailand.

After the revisions to the questionnaire and interview questions, interview times were organized with the Canadian student participants in their homes. When each student was interviewed a questionnaire was issued to both the student and one parent. If a parent was unable to complete the questionnaire at that time, the student was asked to bring the completed questionnaire to school where it was picked up at a later time. Meetings were also arranged for interviews with the administrators who were involved with the project (Dr. G. Potter, Dr. P. Evans, Mr. P. Gardiner and Mr. S. Murphy). Dr. K. Potter, the Thai language instructor, preferred that she be contacted over the telephone whereupon she answered the questionnaire questions. Mr. T. Karajanis, the Japanese language instructor, had moved to Japan and was unavailable to give a response.

Telephone contact was made with Mrs. P. Gaube who helped to run the program in Victoria, Canada. She asked that interview

questions be faxed to her place of employment. She then answered them in written form and faxed them to the researcher at the University of Victoria.

Data from the public and institutional documents pertaining to the Future Partners Project were accessed in the University of Victoria's Educational Technology Centre and from Mr. Steve Murphy, and were read, analyzed and documented. The project slides, photographs, audio tapes and computer graphics materials were accessed, viewed, analyzed and documented.

#### Data Reduction, Analysis and Interpretation Procedures

Transformation of the information from the interviews and the documents and artifacts to workable data was achieved through the following steps:

1. The information from the questionnaires was collected on the questionnaire sheets.
2. The interviews were audio taped, with the consent of each subject, and then transcribed for the convenience of the ensuing analysis.
3. The content and nature of the documents and artifacts were assessed and described. The conditions under which these items were produced, what their relationship was to other documents and artifacts and the program in general, what specific methodological, purposeful and technical decisions may have been made in their creation, and what consequent impact those decisions had on the nature of the data being examined, was determined.

The information gained from this examination of the documents and artifacts created by the Future Partners Program helped to answer two of the research questions:

1. What factors influenced the evolution and operation of the Future Partners Program?

2. How did the communications technologies and program activities in Future Partners enable the Canadian participants to communicate with and learn about their partners in the other two countries?

To acquire this information the researcher asked the following questions of each document and artifact:

- what is the history of the document/artifact?
- how did it come into the researcher's hands?
- is it complete?
- has it been edited or altered?
- under what circumstances and for what purposes was it produced?
- who was the author?
- what was he/she/they trying to accomplish?
- for whom was it intended?
- does it represent an eyewitness account, a secondhand account, or a reconstruction of something?
- what was or is the author's bias?
- do other items exist that might shed additional light on the same story, event, project, activity, context? if so, are they available, accessible? who holds them? (Merriam, 1988).

Two levels of qualitative content analysis were then employed. First the data from the interviews and questionnaires was analyzed to measure and categorize recurring patterns of words, phrases, sentences, paragraphs, themes, and behaviors in order to construct and confirm hypotheses (Merriam, 1988; Patton, 1987, 1990; Worthen and Sanders, 1987; Yin, 1989). This form of analysis entailed examining the data several times and counting the occurrence of distinct patterns of words, phrases, sentences, paragraphs, themes, and behaviors. These units of information were compared with each other to define categories. Then the content of the categories was examined and tentative hypotheses were formed based on the ideas and themes that emerged from the data. This method of data analysis helped to identify and clarify values in an objective way through the observation of how often they occurred in the data. The next step in this qualitative content analysis was to verify emergent theoretical relationships within the data. This process required the investigation to be systematic and analytic, but not rigid. Although categories and critical variables initially guided the work, others were allowed and expected to emerge throughout the study. This process also involved the coding of raw data and category construction described above, but focused instead on insights in the data in which descriptions of situations, settings, impressions and meanings derived from the program participants were key topics (Bogdan and Biklen, 1975; Merriam, 1988; Patton, 1990; Yin, 1989).

The next level of analysis involved making inferences and developing theories grounded in the data for the purpose of drawing conclusions regarding the study (Bogdan and Biklen, 1975; Merriam,

1988). Merriam (1988) states "the theories will emerge from the categories of data, and consist of properties and hypotheses" (p. 140). Properties describe a category. For instance, the category disliking school, may be defined by the properties of boredom, the inability to get work done and feeling trapped in a bureaucracy. Hypotheses are the suggested links between categories and properties (Merriam, 1988). One could hypothesize that the greater one feels the properties of boredom, the inability to get work done and feeling trapped in a bureaucracy, the more one experiences the dislike of school. While tentative hypotheses emerged during the collection and analysis of the data, new hypotheses emerged while others were abandoned.

#### Validity and Reliability:

##### Validity

To ensure the internal validity of this study--that findings from this study match the reality of the program (Kirk and Millar, 1986), the following strategies were employed:

##### Cross-checks

Second information sources were used when possible to cross-check (i.e. use of questionnaire data to corroborate or discount information gathered from interviews) and responses of like respondents were checked (i.e. information from those working in the same group activities were cross-checked). This included the examination of rival explanations and the review of negative cases (those who dropped out of the program).

### Member Checks

Member checks involve taking data and interpretations back to the informants and asking them if the results are true to their intended meanings. If informants disagree with the researcher's interpretations, questions are posed a second time and new data is gathered (Merriam, 1988). Half of the informants were shown the transcript and resulting categories of their interview and were asked to change any unintended information so the transcript would more accurately present the meaning intended.

### Triangulation

Triangulation is the use of multiple sources of data or multiple methods of data collection to enable the comparison and confirmation of findings (Merriam, 1988, Patton, 1990, and Worthen and Sanders, 1987). Multiple sources of information are sought and used because no single source of information can be trusted to provide a comprehensive perspective of a program (Patton, 1990). The four basic types of triangulation are (a) data triangulation--the use of a variety of data sources in a study, (b) investigator triangulation--the use of several researchers (c) theory triangulation--the use of multiple perspectives to interpret a single set of data, and (d) methodological triangulation - the use of multiple methods to study a program (Patton, 1990).

The employment of triangulation in this study included implementing multiple data gathering methods (interviews, questionnaires and the examination of program documents and artifacts); the comparison of these

multiple data sources; and examining the perspectives from multiple participants.

### Design check

A design check is the examination of distortions in the data due to the design of the evaluation (Merriam, 1988; Yin, 1989). Distortions in the data can result from interview or questionnaire questions worded to elicit ambiguous or inaccurate responses. The design of the interview and questionnaire questions used in this study were checked during the pilot test of the questions. Participants in the pilot tests examined the questions and looked for ambiguities, inconsistencies and questions contrived to elicit specific types of responses. Participants in the pilot tests were also asked to include questions that may have been overlooked in the original creation of the questionnaire. After the pilot test the questionnaire and interview questions were modified and used in the study.

### Evaluator Effects

Evaluator effects are distortions due to the evaluator's perspectives, history with the program, presence or behavior. A study can control for evaluator effects by documenting the evaluator's background, the evaluator's perspectives on the program, the evaluator's history with the program, and the perceived effects of the evaluator's presence on the interviewees during the interviews as a part of the study.

Evaluator effects were accounted for by acknowledging:

1. The evaluator as Participant Observer during her involvement with the Future Partners Program
  - The evaluator is a graduate student at the University of Victoria who joined the Future Partners Program in the middle of its first year. The evaluator was a member of the personnel team who helped the students to use the equipment, to prepare their projects, and to develop their joint educational presentations. Through this involvement the evaluator observed the various behaviors of the adult and student participants in the program and both had conversations with them and overheard conversations they had about various aspects of the program while it was in progress. As a result, the evaluator has made a conscious effort to portray the Future Partners Program strictly with regard to the data that has been obtained from this investigation without the intrusion of the evaluator's biases.
  
2. The evaluator's perspectives on the program
  - The evaluator felt that the program could have better realized its objectives if it had been more structured in its organization, if the students were supervised more closely, and if deadlines were more strictly enforced.
  
3. The effects of the evaluator's presence on the interviewees
  - The evaluator had a very warm and friendly rapport with each student and adult participant in the program and was

therefore able to help the interviewee to feel comfortable with the interview. Some student informants appeared slightly nervous because they spoke quite quickly at the beginning of the interview. This could be due to the use of tape recorder to record the interview. However, in each case the students seemed to become more comfortable when they began speaking in a more relaxed manner within the first ten minutes of the interview.

### External Validity

External validity is concerned with the extent to which the findings of one study can be applied to other situations (Merriam, 1988). In other words, a study possesses external validity if the results are generalizable to other settings or people. Since one purpose of qualitative inquiry is to provide perspectives on context-bound information, it is difficult to generalize from a single case, and more appropriate to replace generalization with working hypotheses (Merriam, 1988), with a working hypothesis being a concrete, universal theory (Erickson, 1986). While the phenomenon under study here is unique in many ways, it shares enough characteristics of other educational exchanges that the emergent working hypotheses may be generalizable in the field of educational exchanges and the evaluation of them.

A second purpose of qualitative research is to generate and verify universal theories based on empirical truth. Merriam (personal communication, February 21, 1992) refers to reader, or user generalizability in qualitative research. Merriam states that the

generalizability of qualitative research depends on the reader and his/her purpose for reading it. This is supported by Eisner's (1975) statement that the general lies in the particular, and that we take a specific instance and generalize it to other instances. By "attending to the particular, concrete universals (working hypotheses) will be discovered which can then be compared with other cases studied in equally great detail" (Erickson, 1986, p. 130).

By applying a more qualitative definition of external validity the researcher improved the generalizability of the findings by both providing a thorough enough description "so that anyone else interested in transferability has a base of information appropriate to the judgment" (Lincoln and Guba, 1985, pp. 124-125), and "Establishing how typical the program is compared with others in the same class so that users can make comparisons with their own situations" (Merriam, 1988, p. 177).

The findings, conclusions and recommendations presented in this study pertain to educational exchanges which share similar objectives and organizational characteristics with the Future Partners Program. These characteristics were presented in chapter 2, Literature Review, of this paper. To review, the objectives of these types of programs are: (a) to increase students' understanding and acceptance of culturally different peoples, (b) to help students learn a foreign language, and (c) to facilitate students' immersion in another culture. Also, the organization of the Future Partners Program is typical with regard to educational exchanges characterized by groups of students travelling to a foreign country with teachers to live with host families for a short period of time, and to visit the schools and other culturally significant sites and events there. Therefore,

the recommendations made in this chapter are generalizable to educational exchanges which share this format.

The researcher further improved the generalizability of the findings by illustrating how to evaluate educational exchanges so that others interested in this form of evaluation can transfer this strategy to their particular circumstance. The strategy used in this study was a qualitative case study which is outlined in this chapter on pages 42-57.

### Reliability

Reliability refers to the extent to which one's findings can be replicated (Yin, 1989). In other words, if a reliable study was to be repeated it would yield the same results. This term is difficult to apply to a qualitative study which 'seeks to describe and explain the world as those in the world interpret it' (Merriam, 1988, p. 170) because there is no benchmark by which one can take repeated measures and establish a reliable interpretation of experience. Therefore, Guba and Lincoln (1985) suggest thinking about "reliability as the 'dependability' or 'consistency' of the results" (p. 288). That is, the intent is for people external to the program to concur that the results make sense--they are consistent and dependable. To ensure that the results were reliable in this sense the researcher used the following techniques:

1. The investigator's position: Explaining the assumptions and theory behind the study (refer to pp. 38-41, Research Design), the researcher's position vis-a-vis the group being studied and the researcher's own assumptions regarding the study (refer to p. 60-61,

Validity), and the social context from which the data were collected (refer to pp. 52- 54, Means of Data Collection).

2. Triangulation: Especially in terms of using multiple methods of data collection and analysis to establish consistency across methods and types of data (refer to p. 59 Triangulation). The researcher collected data for this study using three methods; survey questionnaires, interviews and the examination of documents and artifacts produced by the program. Further, two levels of qualitative data analysis were used. The first level of analysis involved examining the data in terms of recurring instances of small units of information such as words, phrases and ideas from which hypotheses and conclusions about the program were drawn. Second, during the examination of the data larger themes and recurring patterns were again looked for from which hypotheses and conclusions about the program were drawn. Then the researcher made further hypotheses and conclusions about the program based on the agreement and disagreement in the hypotheses and conclusions drawn from both levels of data analysis.

3. Audit trail: Describing in detail (a) how data were collected, (pp. 52-54, Procedures for the Collection of the Data), and (b) how categories were derived (pp. 54-58, Data Reduction, Analysis and Interpretation Procedures).

Essentially the method should be presented in such detail that other researchers can use the original report as an operating manual by which to replicate the study (Merriam, 1988).

## CHAPTER FOUR

### FINDINGS

The following is the synthesis of data acquired from both the interviews and questionnaires completed by Future Partners participants, and documents and artifacts produced by the program. These findings reflect artifactual and documented evidence of specific aspects of the program as well as the perspectives held by program participants regarding the Future Partners Program.

The data is organized such that it provides answers to two research questions posed by this study. Those two research questions are:

1. What factors influenced the evolution and operation of the program?
2. How did the communications technologies and program activities in Future Partners enable the Canadian participants to communicate with and learn about their partners in the other two countries?

Answers to the third research question--what could be done differently to improve the program?--are presented in chapter 5 under Recommendations.

First this chapter provides a summary of the findings of this research. Second, a more detailed explanation of the findings is presented. Finally, additional findings that emerged from this study which do not specifically address a research question are discussed.

## Summary of Findings

### **Research Question #1**

#### **What factors influenced the evolution and operation of the program?**

The program infrastructure did not exist at the outset of the program. Therefore the administrators did not know how the program would be organized or how meetings and program work would take place. As a result of this lack of infrastructure the program lacked initial organization. One administrator felt in retrospect the infrastructure must be in place at the beginning of the program.

The teachers who selected the students for the program felt that the student participants (a) had to have the ability to work together, and (b) had to be able to afford the time to be involved in the program. It was felt that a few students in the program experienced difficulty working together. Also, many students had so many extracurricular commitments that they had difficulty attending program meetings each week. As a result, students would often miss meetings or would arrive tired and hungry after other activities, and were not prepared to learn or work.

The students were given the freedom to manage themselves in terms of their behavior, meeting attendance and the amount of work they contributed to the program. Both the students and administrators agreed however that the students needed more structured instruction, deadlines, guidance and supervision from the adults in their work and program involvement.

Some students felt that when they were in Grade 9 they were too young to operate well within the freedom the program offered. Many students reported that they did not know what they were doing most of the time and did not have a set job. They reported they needed to be told what

to do and be given a deadline for completion. One administrator pointed out that the adults should provide a framework and focus for the students' work. This administrator felt that Grade 9 students might work well within an organized framework guiding their involvement in the program.

The administrators felt they did not manage the dynamics of the student work groups very well. While some students wanted to help with the media project work, other students became possessive over their projects and would not allow some students to contribute to them. It was felt by one administrator that next time there has to be a much clearer definition of each individual's role in the project work. Further, it should be clear to the students that the slides and video are not to be considered complete until everyone has made a contribution to them.

The students lost some of their initial interest in the program when they felt that despite their work, their project deadlines were not being met. Another reason for the students' lack of initiative was they could see no reason for doing their work or communicating with people--the overseas partners--whom they did not know. It was recommended that to increase their motivation, the students need to receive marks and school credit for their involvement in the program, and they need to work for their teachers.

### **Research Question #2**

**How did the communications technologies and program activities in Future Partners enable the Canadian participants to communicate with and learn about their partners in the other two countries?**

Many students reported their disappointment in not receiving instruction in each of the media areas. However, one program administrator pointed out that some students did not attend all program meetings and

other students did not always arrive on time. Also, the teachers' attendance at meetings was irregular. As a result, it was difficult to offer structured instruction in which each participant received equal exposure to each medium.

Most of the students learned how to use a VHS video camera but were disappointed that they did not learn how to edit a video program. Most of the students learned how to take pictures using a 35mm camera but did not learn how to mix an accompanying soundtrack well. The students who created computer generated graphics and music were unable to use the majority of their work in the media projects. It was felt by the students and administrators that the students required more intervention, instruction and direction from the adults regarding their media project work.

The video presentation was well done but it was felt it would have been better if it had been a longer presentation and if more students had contributed to it. The visual aspect of the slide presentation was very good, however the soundtrack and its synchronization with the slides was poor. The students presenting the slides experienced technical difficulties in Japan, and the students presenting the video were unable to show it in Thailand due to incompatible equipment. It was concluded that compatibilities in technology must be addressed and assured prior to travel.

Electronic mail was not used effectively by most of the participants in the program. Many students had difficulty remembering the procedures for using electronic mail, some students felt they had poor access to a computer and a modem, while other students did not know how they were expected to use electronic mail.

Fax was used regularly by many adult and student participants because fax was easy to use, people knew their message arrived at its destination, and often an immediate response was received.

Student participants used letters most frequently to communicate with their partners overseas because they felt that letters were more convenient to write than messages on a computer and letters were more personal and could contain pictures.

The Canadian students were not motivated to communicate overseas when they felt they did not know the Asian students and therefore had little to say. The Canadian students communicated the most with their Thai and Japanese partners just prior to their travel abroad and just after their return to Canada.

The students did not learn as much Thai or Japanese language as the administrators and teachers had hoped. It was felt that not only was the delivery of the lessons ineffective, but also the students were not motivated to learn the languages. Further, one language teacher felt the importance of learning the languages and cultures of the overseas partners was not emphasized enough in the program. However, the students felt the language lessons were a good idea and that the lessons should have started at the beginning instead of the middle of the program.

The students felt the joint educational projects were a good idea but very few students worked on them. While the teachers who witnessed these presentations felt they were well done, the students rushed at the last minute to prepare them. The students felt work on these presentations needed more emphasis in the program. Also, it was suggested that parts of the joint educational presentations should be presented in the language of the audience and should contain a visual media component.

The students and adults enjoyed the exchange trip to Japan and Thailand, but felt the time spent in Japan was too short. Further, the students wanted more unstructured time to spend both with their host families and to explore their surroundings.

The students felt the best parts of the program were learning skills in the use of modern communications technologies, making new friends, learning to work well in a group, and the exchange trip to Asia. Students felt that their experience in the program has both broadened their perspective on the world and has helped them make decisions regarding career goals. One of the adults felt the biggest highlight was that despite the problems that were faced, the program actually took place and many goals were achieved. In addition, most of the students stated that they would become involved in a program like this a second time and would recommend it to their friends.

However, despite the difficulties experienced in the initial stages of the program, and despite some errors in judgement in how to manage the students and organize the program meetings and activities, it was felt that the program was a success. In the following ways the program met its general purposes (Potter, Gardiner, Murphy, S., Murphy, P., 1987):

1. To increase the knowledge of young people in Japan and Thailand about British Columbia.

Groups of Japanese and Thai students communicated with British Columbian students, visited British Columbia, and were exposed to educational presentations regarding current environmental and social issues in British Columbia.

2. To increase the knowledge of young people in British Columbia about Pacific Rim countries.

British Columbian students communicated with students from Thailand and Japan, visited their countries, were exposed to their culture and language and to educational presentations regarding their current environmental and social issues.

3. To assist young people in preparing instructional resources on British Columbia for special educational seminars, workshops, and weeks in the cooperating Pacific Rim schools.

The Canadian students created and presented video and slide materials, and joint educational presentations depicting aspects of life in British Columbia to students and teachers in Thailand and Japan.

4. To establish a new communication network so students in the Pacific Rim schools could converse about their cultures, communities, schools and lifestyles.

An electronic mail link was made with Japan, and fax was used to communicate with both Thailand and Japan.

5. To establish an attachment-exchange scheme to provide students with an opportunity to experience life in the cooperating countries and participating educators with the opportunity for professional development and exchanges.

The students who participated in Future Partners experienced life in the cooperating countries during the exchange visits. The teachers met

with other teachers, university professors and political officials during the exchange in the participating countries.

6. To provide students and educators in Pacific Rim schools with the opportunity to interact by modern communications technology.

Participating students interacted using video, slide and telecommunications--fax, electronic mail--technologies.

7. To provide students of Asian countries with a means of intercultural exchange.

Both Japanese and Thai students experienced an intercultural exchange with Canadian students.

## FINDINGS

The following is a more detailed explanation of the results of this research. The findings are presented with regard to each research question addressed.

### **Research Question #1**

#### **What factors influenced the evolution and operation of the program?**

This research question focused on how the program evolved and operated in regard to its organization and how the participants involved themselves in the program. The aspects of the program examined in this section of the findings were: (a) program meetings, (b) student selection, (c) student management, (d) student attitude and involvement, (e) program infrastructure, and (f) program structure.

### Program Meetings

Exchange programs require the participants to meet in order to plan program activities. Teachers involved in exchange programs need to establish a time, place and format for these meetings. Future Partners meetings were held between 6:30 p.m. and 9:30 p.m. each Wednesday evening at the University of Victoria's Educational Technology Centre. Meeting format varied somewhat throughout the two year duration of the program depending on who attended each meeting and whether the meeting was held at the beginning of the program or near its end. However, on most occasions Dr. Potter commenced each Future Partner's meeting with a period of time where the participants were given information regarding the most current developments in the program.

Most program participants commented that throughout the program there were too many information meetings. Most of the students reported that often they did not need to, or want to know much of what was said, and that the meetings were therefore boring and wasted time that they feel could have been better spent on project work. In retrospect, Dr. Potter agrees that "the students were getting fed up with hearing me speak", and stated that:

I wouldn't run the meetings that way again. But I can remember on so many occasions that I would go into those meetings and I was the only adult in the room and I'd have fax messages from Japan and Thailand and the latest information on whether or not there'll be any money from the government. And here I am sitting looking at a group, half aren't there, and I knew I'd have to give this information to these kids. I didn't know what else to do

because if I hadn't told them it was obvious none of it was coming from their teachers. How else were they going to get it? . . . There was stuff I had to distribute, there were the endless negotiations of dates and times of visits. It was all very complicated and I knew that this wouldn't be very popular with the kids but every time I said that stuff it was all new to them.

The reason we had so many information meetings was that the infrastructure was being put into place while those kids were sitting there. If we had the infrastructure in place before hand we wouldn't have had to do it that way because we could say 'This is how its gonna be, these are the dates, the time and the cost, this is how we raise the money and this is how much we can give you.' We could've done it very quickly. But for months I'd have to tell them 'This is what we've heard from Japan.' and they weren't interested in it. I had no choice but to tell them because it was the only thing we had.

### Student Selection

#### Method of Selecting Student Participants

Teachers conducting educational exchanges need to consider what characteristics student participants should have, and how they will select student participants. Mr. Peter Gardiner and Mr. Steve Murphy were responsible for the selection of students from their respective schools for the program. The following describes the method used and characteristics the administrators were looking for in the selection of the students.

Mr. Murphy

Mr. Murphy requested Grade 9 students who were interested in becoming involved in an educational exchange with other Pacific Rim countries to fill out an application. After perusing the students' applications and consulting the principal, Mr. Murphy was able to select ten student participants for the Future Partners program.

Mr. Murphy was looking for creative students who knew how to use computers; who had some understanding of, or use of, computers; who had already travelled to Asia; who had average to above average marks; who had good attendance at school; who had a good attitude about school and education; and who had the ability to work with other kids. One of the most important characteristics Mr. Murphy felt that the student participants had to have was the ability to work together.

Mr. Gardiner

Mr. Peter Gardiner selected 10 students "with a range of abilities and interests" to participate in the program. He chose students who he believed were outgoing, bright, articulate, and artistic, with an interest in languages. An important factor for the selection of these students was that "they had to be able to afford the time in their fairly rigid schedule."

Grade nine students were selected because the program planned for the Victoria Future Partners to travel to Asia two years from the commencement of the program. The steering committee felt that Grade 11 would be a particularly good time in terms of the students' maturity and ability to afford the time away from school.

Regarding time available for the program, an administrator explained that the students who participated in the program were extremely busy with

a variety of extracurricular activities as well as Future Partners. "The kids were spread so thin that they had trouble getting here even one day a week." Often students would arrive at Future Partners meetings directly after basketball practices or music lessons. They were hungry, tired and had hours of homework ahead of them.

Future Partners was just another thing for them to try to fit into their week. So when they came in here we had everything set up ready to teach them, but they weren't necessarily ready to learn. They tended to have other things on their mind. And a big problem was they wouldn't always come and the group they were in couldn't work together, and that was cause they were off doing other things. . . . So I guess I feel they were pulled in a lot of different directions and it meant that they couldn't respond as well as we would've wanted them to, to the facilities and teaching that we had.

Most of the students got along well together. However, a few students dominated some activities and would not allow other students to work with them while a few other students did not mix well with any other students and were left out of most things. One administrator recalled "The balance among the kids wasn't the best, some were ill selected . . . there were two or three who dominated it. There was a lot of possessiveness that developed."

Many participants commented that some students did not attend as many meetings and did not work as hard as other students in the program.

One administrator commented:

I think that some of the kids we had in the group were great, but others in retrospect I'd rather weren't there. They were simply hanging around waiting for something to happen to them instead of being proactive and actually doing something. There was a group who did very little.

### Reasons Students and Parents Gave for Becoming Involved in The Program

All the students became involved in the program because they thought it would be interesting, "neat" or "fun." They wanted to learn to use the technology, to learn different languages and cultures, and to connect with people overseas.

Most parents wanted their child to participate in the program because he/she would gain "exposure to international kids and cultures, and would have an opportunity to travel," and felt that the exposure to group, cooperative work would be beneficial for their child.

### Student Management

Teachers need to decide how they will manage the involvement of the student participants in an exchange program. Students need to know what is expected of them in terms of attendance, behavior and work. Participation in the Future Partners Program was voluntary, therefore punctuality and attendance at meetings was left to the students' discretion. Further, the students were given the freedom to choose how much and in what ways they involved themselves in program activities. Throughout the program the students were given the freedom to form work groups and to select the

content and medium for their projects. This approach allowed students to manage themselves and assume ownership over their work in the program.

The program administrators reported two ways of managing the involvement of the students. The students could either have had their activities prescribed, or they could have been presented with the options available to them and allowed to experiment and involve themselves in whichever ways they chose. One program administrator commented:

A basic disagreement existed between myself and the two teachers (the two other administrators) involved where I wanted to give the students a degree of autonomy and the teachers didn't want to. They wanted to direct them more. And in retrospect, I think the teachers were right. Then we could've done things a lot faster . . . They were right about the amount that the kids needed to be guided, the kids needed more guidance . . . Many of these kids are only recognized by their marks and by doing what they're told and by being good, particularly in the private schools. They are functioning in a very narrow definition of what life is all about, so its very difficult to respond to someone who says "Well, what do you want to do?" So I think in that sense they needed someone to work with them and that its part of their Social Studies or Language Arts mark.

Another administrator reported:

It was like we were driving them instead of them driving themselves. And with the framework showing the critical path along which to move they'd drive themselves because

they'd know in advance what it was they were going to be doing. That's one of the key criticisms by the students and ourselves. It was too loose, no framework equals too much wasted time.

### Student Discipline

Many of the students said they needed to be told what to do and be given a deadline to have it done by. "We were told to set our own deadlines but we never took them seriously because we made them, so it was easy for us to break them too." While some students remarked that they needed to be told they had to do specific things, that tasks needed to be made more of an obligation, a few students warned that they would quit if the program was too strictly run. A few students also felt that they--the whole group--abused the programs' flexibility and leniency, and that they needed to be more self disciplined and self motivated. Two administrators agreed that "We needed to find a happy medium between being strict and flexible and we never found it."

The administrators felt that some students did not learn skills that they wanted to acquire because they did not avail themselves of the expertise and instruction that was available to them. One administrator remarked:

I don't think our kids were very highly self-motivated. I think they had too much of an assumption when they came into this that things would be done for them, like what is largely done for them in school. . . . They often were hanging around waiting to be told what to do next. . . . Self motivation has nothing to do with their age, but with the state of their lives.

However, many of the students felt that when they were in Grade 9 they were too young to operate well within the freedom the program offered.

These students remarked:

In Grade 9 we didn't have the motivation to do the kind of stuff we were supposed to be doing.

We were too young and didn't have the initiative to get going on things ourselves.

We were told all along that it was our project and to set our own deadlines, and we were too young for that, it didn't work.

One program administrator felt that:

Grade 9 is quite young to expect them to take the initiative to do certain things. Obviously it depends on the students. Some were very self motivated, but a framework needed to be laid down before they went to the meetings so the less motivated students would know what to do.

This administrator commented further that regarding whether the students were too young or not it was " . . . hard to know because of the lack of structure (in the organization of the students and their tasks) it was felt the kids were too young and Grade 9 might be fine with an appropriate framework."

### Student Attitude and Involvement

Most of the students had a positive attitude regarding the program at the outset. However, by the end of the first year of the program the students reported that they "lost interest; weren't quite as positive; got tired of it; felt neutral; were annoyed and fed up; were pretty disappointed; and felt washed out about it." When asked why their positive attitudes changed most students stated that it was because they seemed to be working but not accomplishing anything. Many students commented that there were too many information meetings, there was no structure or goals, and they felt they were wasting their time.

One of the administrators felt that it was difficult to maintain the students' interest for the following reasons:

It took two to three months before we had contact in the other two countries, so for quite a while we didn't know who we were doing the projects for and the students could see no reason for doing them. . . . And no one ever told them what to do, everything they did was theirs, and they got bored with it because they could see no reason for doing it. But these things were explained to them. We had all kinds of sessions where we planned it out. We would sit down with them and say "This is where you begin and lets do this piece, so in you go, your first task is to discuss this." And I'd go back 30 minutes later and they're listening to music and talking about school and telling me they didn't know what to do. So what do you do under those circumstances? Unfortunately these guys are only trained to work for marks. And if that's the only way they

can behave we'll have to accept that. Its a shame. I don't like it. It goes against the grain for me but if that's the way it has to be.

One of the problems was that we never knew whether the teachers were going to come or not because they, like the students, were involved in a variety of extracurricular activities which made demands upon their time. The reality for these kids is that they go to school and the authority in their lives regarding learning were their teachers. They were, I think, quite prepared to work for their teachers, but not for a university academic and his staff whom they didn't know. And I think that that meant that the kids were not sure exactly who they were doing this for, and I realize now that the kids needed to do it for someone, so I would agree that Steve and Peter were right about the amount the kids needed to be guided, the kids needed more guidance. But I think it also meant that they needed to know they were doing it for Steve and Peter and not for me.

### Social Aspect of the Program

All of the students commented that while they enjoyed the social aspect of participating in the program, it tended to impede their progress in their project work because they wanted to socialize more than they wanted to work.

Three administrators had something different to say regarding the social aspect of the program:

As long as its a volunteer program then it should be fun and we should not be on their backs all the time.

They interacted like normal teenagers. I think both groups (public and private school kids) benefitted from the mix of the two schools.

Because of the looseness, the lack of structure, it turned into more of a social time than a work time.

However, one administrator commented further that:

I think that it was a lot of socializing and not an awful lot of task oriented behavior. The kids were not on task a lot of the time while they were there (at the meetings). You can't criticize them for that. They've been to school for five or six hours and they've done homework and they've got more to do and music lessons and rugby games.

### Program Infrastructure

The infrastructure of exchange programs includes the people and money that enable the program to exist, communication links between the participating groups in the program, and established procedures for meeting organization, program activities, and work routines. Program infrastructure was defined by one program administrator as "the organizational framework for each of the three Future Partners groups and the communication links established to connect them." This administrator explained that the

infrastructure did not exist at the outset of the program. In fact the program began before Future Partners groups were established in each of the participating countries, before it was known how the participating groups would eventually be linked to communicate together, and before decisions had been made about how the program would be organized or run. This program administrator commented that "I didn't know how it was going to be organized at the beginning". He further explained:

We did start it without any infrastructure and that was basically the whole problem, and that's what one should never do. You have to have the thing in place . . . I jumped into it not really sure of how it would actually be organized. I would never want to do it again like that.

The infrastructure was established during the first six to eight months of the program. The lack of infrastructure at the beginning of the program meant that initially there was no one for the Canadian students to communicate with or create their projects for. The result was the direction, organization, and activities of the program got off to a slow start. For instance, some students said that at the beginning of the program they did not know what they would be expected to do as participants. One student remarked "It was unclear at the beginning, so I wasn't sure." A program administrator commented that:

That was just a factor of having to start somewhere. We thought we'd just muddle through this first time. I appreciate the patience of the kids . . . but the critical thing was a lack of infrastructure.

Another program administrator reflected that "There was no framework, it was too loose, and no framework equals too much wasted time."

### Overall Program Structure

The structure of an educational exchange program includes program goals and means of reaching those goals. Most program participants reported that in terms of structure the program lacked firm organization, discipline and focus. Half of the students stated that they needed an agenda for each meeting and specific things for each student to do. For instance, one student recalled he was told "You know what you're supposed to do, so go do it," when instead he needed to be told exactly what to do. Many students remarked that in terms of structure they needed more instruction, deadlines, guidance and supervision. However, one administrator felt that the reason the students were not task oriented was because they were tired. He commented:

What I wouldn't do again is to allow the children to spread themselves as thin as they did. They had too many other things going on in their lives. Like they're expected to play the tuba, to ski, to speak three languages and be a member of the local choir. And Future Partners was just another thing for them to try to fit into their week. They weren't necessarily ready to learn. They tended to have other things on their minds. And a big problem was they wouldn't always come, and then the group they were in couldn't work together, and that was because they were off doing other things.

Regarding the teachers' and administrators' ability to impose structure on the students, one program administrator stated:

It wasn't like a classroom situation, you couldn't say to a kid you have to be here at six (o'clock) because its a volunteer type thing . . . and if you can make it great, but if they can't then they can't. And you can't tell a kid he can't leave early to study for a Biology test tomorrow. If they were getting credit for it then you might be able to, but not otherwise.

The autonomy the students were given in their involvement in the program resulted in the feeling among the program participants that there was a lack of structure, focus and discipline. The result was that students felt they did not know what to do, they socialized instead of worked and project work was slow. People became bored, discouraged, lost interest and felt meetings were a waste of time.

#### Comments about the Program Being Connected More Closely With The School

Most participants agreed that the program needed to be run out of the students' schools so the students could receive marks and course credit for their work. It was felt that the students would put more time into the program and take their work more seriously if they were working for their teachers and for marks.

One administrator, Dr. Evans, remarked "The focus is an educational endeavor and the schools should take an active role in it . . . It should be built

into their school curriculum as much as possible, and the teachers need to participate more."

**Research Question #2:**

**How did the communications technologies and program activities in Future Partners enable the Canadian participants to communicate with and learn about their partners in the other two countries?**

Findings pertaining to this research question have been organized in terms of the components of the program that were designed to facilitate the participants' communication with and learning about their partners in Japan and Thailand. These components were: (a) media projects--instruction and work, (b) final video and slide presentations, (c) computer graphics and music, (d) instruction and use of electronic mail and fax, and use of letters, (e) Thai and Japanese language instruction, (f) joint educational presentations, and (g) the exchange trip to Japan and Thailand.

Media Projects:

Instruction and Work

Educational exchanges which use communications technologies, like Future Partners, require the students to learn a variety of media skills. During the initial weeks of the program, the intent was for the students to undergo training in the skills of video production, computer graphics, photography and sound mixing. To accomplish this the students formed four groups. Each group was to spend two weeks engaged in learning how to use a medium, after which the groups would rotate to work with a new medium until each group had received instruction and experience with each of the

four media areas. This format of media experience and instruction was intended to allow each student enough experience with each medium so that he/she could make an educated decision about which media area he/she wished to work in for the creation of the presentations to be sent overseas.

However, many students interviewed claimed that they did not learn how to use all four media areas because the groups at the beginning did not rotate for instruction as was originally intended. These students felt this was unfortunate because they therefore did not have the opportunity to learn all of the media skills.

One program administrator explained that project groups did not rotate as originally planned because all the students did not attend the program meetings. One program administrator observed, "Therefore the students could not complete what they set out to do in the groups."

#### Students Who Did Not Belong to Established Project Groups

Some students did not belong to established working or social groups in the program. These students were referred to as floaters by the other students in the program because they tended to float from work group to work group unsuccessfully trying to involve themselves in the projects in progress. The students already involved in project work reported that they did not want new people interfering with their work and these students should have formed their own project group. While the administrators did make efforts to bring the floaters together to form one or two groups to work on their own video production those efforts were unsuccessful. One administrator recalled:

We tried so many things with them. We tried to get them to form their own group to do their own thing and it didn't

work because internally they didn't get along. They were really isolates, they weren't just separated from the established groups, they were also excluded from members of their own little isolated group. That was very unfortunate. I think that had a lot to do with their personalities and with bringing together people from two different schools, which worked in some ways and in some ways it didn't. I think next time we'll have to make sure that everybody has a specific role.

Some students stated that if the project groups had rotated through all the media areas in the beginning as originally planned then everybody would have had things to do and been involved in everything. One of the floaters reported that "We just didn't know what we were doing most of the time, we didn't really have a set job."

One of the administrators felt that a contributing factor for the emergence of 'floaters' was that "we did not manage the dynamics of the groups that well." Some students became possessive about the projects and did not want other students contributing to them. The result was that not all the student participants were represented in the final video and slide presentations. One of the administrators stated that "Next time there has to be a much clearer definition of each individual's role. I think it has to be clear that the tape and video aren't complete until everyone's stuff is in them."

### Video and Slide Projects - Purpose

The video and slide presentations were a way to communicate with the overseas partners in terms of introduction and learning about each other. These presentations were to show Canadian--British Columbian-- culture and lifestyle from the students' point of view. In addition, the creation of the projects helped the students to learn how to use the equipment and to learn how to create presentations.

### Video

Most of the students said they were satisfied with the instruction they received on how to use the VHS video camera, but were dissatisfied with the instruction they received regarding video editing. The students who tried to edit their video footage commented that the majority of what they learned was by using the manuals for the equipment and by trial and error. The result was that only two students learned how to edit their video footage well. The person responsible for the instruction in this area stated:

The students were instructed how to do things but did not easily grasp the concept of using a script for putting a production together, and did not know what to do with their resulting random shots. Editing was the hardest concept for them to learn and they got little instruction in this area.

### Slide Presentation

Most of the students who were involved in learning about the creation of a slide presentation were satisfied with the instruction they received regarding taking pictures. However, none of these students were satisfied

with the instruction they received regarding audio mixing. The group that made the slide presentation reported that the most difficult part was making the soundtrack and synchronizing it to the slides and that they did not receive adequate instruction in how to do this. When they completed the soundtrack for their presentation they reported that it was after learning about it through trial and error and after redoing it many times.

Project work often seemed unstructured with little direction. However, one program administrator recalled that often he did not know which students or adults would attend each meeting and therefore it was impossible to make definite work plans for each evening. He recalled:

And then there was the question of what they were going to do during the session. You'd never know who would be there or not and we would have to work with whoever was there. And we would say to the kids to get into your groups and get on with what you were doing, and inevitably a group would be waiting 'cause someone who had the slides hadn't turned up or something. That was annoying.

### Final Video and Slide Presentations:

#### Video Presentation

Most of the participants felt that the quality of the final video presentation was good. However, many people commented that the video either should have been longer or a series of short videos should have been made, including input from all the students in the program.

Half the people interviewed felt the video took too long to make. One administrator reflected, "The video was good but it got to the point where

they were trying to be so meticulous with it. They spent far too much time on it."

Two students commented that they were disappointed that they could not show their video in Thailand.

At one point in the program there were three video projects in progress and the students competed for the use of the video editing equipment. They reported that if their group did not get to work on the editing equipment then they did not have anything to do during that Future Partners night. These students recommended that they needed something constructive to do on the evenings when the video editing equipment was unavailable. As a result of the students' frustration two of the video projects were never completed.

#### Slide Presentation

Many participants felt the slide presentation was "good" when they saw it in Victoria but that it was "poor" when they saw it in Japan. The students who comprised the slide group reported a lot of technical problems both in the creation of the presentation in Victoria, and in its presentation in Japan. These students felt they needed more help in the selection of the slides and creation of the sound track. Further, they were unfamiliar with the equipment they used to present the slides in Japan. It was suggested that there should have been time allotted for the students to practice using the equipment before their presentation in Japan.

#### General Comments Made Regarding both Video and Slide Final Presentations

Half the students felt they were trying too hard to produce professional presentations. However, they reported feeling high expectations placed

upon them because they were told they would be expected to show their presentations to other University of Victoria professors and to the governments of each participating country.

Many students reported that they liked the video format as a presentation and as a means to communicate with the overseas partners better than the slides.

Most of the parents who saw the presentations were satisfied with the quality of them. Some of the parents' comments were:

With the format and their goals they were fairly well done, and for a self-directed first time effort they were creative and informative.

I enjoyed them and found them interesting.

The video was outstanding, but there needed to be more presentations with a shorter format.

Regarding the project work and the final presentations one administrator remarked:

Its not so much the products that come from a venture like this as the process of engaging in this type of activity. So in that sense it was a success.

### Computer Graphics and Music Production

The students who formed the computer group reported that they wanted to be in other groups but selected the computer group because

nobody else was in it. One of these students recalled:

At the beginning I picked the computer group but wanted to be a part of the video. But there wasn't enough interest in the computers so I thought I might as well do that just so they had people in it.

These students created computer generated graphics and music and were disappointed when most of their work was not used in the video and/or slide presentations. One of the students in the computer group commented:

I did some work on the computer but that wasn't really ever used. Like that was too bad because we worked hard on the computer making various pictures that were never used. But we learned so much doing those, using the graphics and music program, but we never actually used it.

### Instruction and Use of Communications Technologies:

#### Electronic Mail

During program meetings the students were given instruction on how to use the Macintosh and Amiga computers to send electronic mail messages both locally and overseas. When the students knew how to use this means of communication the teachers and administrators of the program expected them to spend time each Wednesday evening receiving and sending electronic mail messages to local and overseas Future Partners participants. In addition, two modems and computers were made available for the students to use e-mail in their homes.

Few program participants used electronic mail as their primary means of communication with the overseas partners. These people had permanent

access to a computer and modem in their homes. Most program participants either did not use electronic mail at all or used it two or three times.

The people who used electronic mail reported that they used it mostly locally because they knew the local Future Partners participants, their messages were sent and received more successfully locally than their overseas messages, and the procedure for communicating locally was easier to remember than the procedure to communicate overseas. The few students who used e-mail to communicate with the Japanese Future Partners said they would have preferred being able to communicate with the students directly instead of through the teacher in Japan. The Japanese students did not have direct access to a computer and modem and therefore sent and received electronic mail and fax correspondence through their teacher. No one was able to communicate with Thailand using electronic mail because the Future Partners in Thailand did not have the hardware or the electronic link to facilitate the connection.

Most students commented that they had poor access to a computer despite efforts to make computers, modems and software available to them. These students felt the location of the computer and modem at their school was "inconvenient" for them to use. Many students also stated that they did not know how they were expected to use e-mail. One student said "It needed to be more clear and it needed to be more of a requirement, an obligation, that we had to do it."

Half of the students commented that electronic mail was an effective way to communicate but they needed to have the instructions on how to use electronic mail written down because they kept forgetting the proper procedure. These students did not ask for help because they were also not motivated to communicate with their overseas partners because they did not

know them and felt they had nothing to say to them. They reported that unless they knew the person they were writing to, the communication had little significance. One student said:

I didn't know why we did it (electronic mail). I just thought it was sort of a fun thing. . . . I only used it once and just to communicate with people across the room. It didn't really come to anything . . . and I didn't know anyone in Japan or Thailand either, that's another reason why I didn't correspond to them at all. I couldn't see any point in writing anything.

### Facsimile

There was no formal instruction regarding how to use a facsimile machine. The students who used it received individual instruction in their schools from their teacher/administrator who was involved with Future Partners and whose job it was to help the student participants.

Many participants reported using fax as their primary means of communication overseas. The people who used fax most frequently reported that it was the easiest, fastest and most convenient way to communicate. People reported having good access to a fax machine, and that faxing was "fun," cheap and a reliable means of communication.

Three Victoria administrators reported using fax as their most frequent means of communication overseas and that it was mostly for administrative paperwork. One program administrator recalled:

There was a time when the Japanese teacher and I were engaged in sort of a conversation so we did it by e-mail, and it was only three or four messages into each thing

before we realized we needed to send something by fax. So it was back to fax very quickly.

### Purpose of Using Fax and Electronic Mail in the Program

A program administrator reported that:

The purpose of using fax and electronic mail was to have the young people realize how easy it is to communicate with someone else in another country. And I think they realized that technically it was quite easy, but we know from research that people can get very bored with the messages they're sending. If the content isn't anything more substantial than 'Hi, how are you? What's the weather like there?' after the initial introductions, students will not use these technologies to communicate with unless they have a reason to.

### Letters

Many students recalled using letters as their primary means of communication overseas. These students reported writing letters because a letter was delivered to the recipient's house, information could be personal and confidential, and pictures and newspaper clippings could be sent with letters.

Within the first six months of the program an effort was made to initiate communication activities between the Future Partners students in the three participating countries. A package of correspondence arrived for the Victoria Future Partners students containing letters of introduction from the Japanese and Thai Future Partners students. The Victoria students were

expected to select a Thai and Japanese student with whom they felt they had some things in common and respond with a similar letter of introduction.

Some of the Victoria students' responses to this effort to encourage communication between the groups of students were:

I knew we were supposed to pick a letter and write back but it wasn't really enforced or anything, and we didn't really know them, so some people just didn't and nobody seemed to care one way or the other.

It's hard to get interested in some people that you've never met before and I was never into pen pals.

The pictures weren't very good quality and you couldn't tell what the people looked like or anything. So you don't really learn much about a person who's all smudged, not like a photo. Like we should've sent posters of ourselves to get it started, like about our hobbies and some pictures of yourself.

Most of the Canadian students were highly motivated to communicate with the students overseas when their exchange trip drew near because that was when they had someone specific to communicate with--their billets--and a reason to communicate with them. These students reported that they began to communicate with their overseas partners after they had made a personal connection with them.

## Thai and Japanese Language Instruction

### Purposes of Language Instruction

Educational exchanges between culturally and linguistically different groups of students and teachers require the participants to learn enough of their partner's language and culture to facilitate a meaningful exchange. The students felt that the language instruction was to enable them to communicate with the overseas partners while an administrator explained "It was for protocol and equality reasons, and to have our students become more aware of what it means to be a Pacific Rim country."

The teacher of Thai language explained that the purpose of the language instruction was to give the students a basic understanding of some of the language and culture that they will experience during their visit to Thailand. She stated further that a program designed to encourage culturally different students to work together demands that they learn about each others' culture and language. Finally, she added that learning about the language and culture of the partner students is an act of diplomacy and friendship and is fundamental to bridging the gap between them.

### Reactions to Language Instruction

Most of the students felt that the language instruction was a good idea but the way it was delivered was unproductive. Many students stated that the language instruction was "boring and a waste of time" because the language teachers did not motivate them. Also, some students were not interested in learning Thai and Japanese because they were already learning foreign languages at school and two more was too much work. Many students commented also that they were too tired to learn the languages because they had too many other things to do. Further, they felt that the teacher of

Japanese covered the material too quickly with no review. These students said that therefore they found the Japanese lessons confusing and difficult. Finally, a few students were unmotivated to learn the languages because they expected that the people overseas would speak English anyway so they felt no need to learn Thai or Japanese.

Many adults and students responded that learning about Japanese and Thai cultures and some Thai and Japanese language was a good idea but to be effective these lessons should have started at the beginning instead of the middle of the program.

One of the administrators explained that:

They needed fundamental communication skills in the languages for this circumstance, not so much language structure. They needed basic tourist skills more than anything else, phrases like 'How much is this? Where is the train?' and 'Thank you'. We couldn't expect them to have a working knowledge of Thai and Japanese in one year . . . but it was too rigid. There are more creative ways of learning conversational Thai and Japanese. They needed to practice the conversation. We could've done things like have ten minutes where all communication is in Thai or Japanese, and then gradually expand that to 15 minutes and so on.

A good part of the language lessons was that we learned a lot about the Thai culture before we left, the courtesies and their philosophy of life and way of thinking. That was a major gain and that was a main part of the program, to find out about the culture, not just language

skills. That was more successful with Thai because the teacher was a native speaker, a failure on the part of the Japanese part. You really need a native speaker who can combine enough of the language to survive with the cultural aspects. We need to learn about what food to expect as well.

The teacher of Thai language commented that the necessity of learning some basics of the languages should have been emphasized so that it would have been regarded more as a priority by the students.

### Joint Educational Projects

#### Purposes

Two program administrators explained that the joint educational projects were designed to provide a focus for the students' communication. Many of the students regarded the joint educational projects as about international education and cultural exchange.

The joint educational projects were introduced into the program during the final stages of the media project work, and just prior to the Canadian students' trip to Asia. The students who were heavily involved in the media project work continued to work on their presentations, while the students who were not attached to media project groups began work on the joint educational projects.

All of the students interviewed reported that the joint educational projects were a low priority and that they did very little research for them. However, many students felt that the joint educational projects were a good idea, they should have been made a bigger priority, and they should have

been rehearsed before they were presented in Asia. Further, some students felt that the Japanese and Thai partners did not understand the Canadian presentations because of the language barrier and suggested that it would have been better if the presentations were more visual and if parts of the presentations were presented in Japanese and Thai.

A program administrator commented that:

I saw the Japanese work at this very hard, and I saw the Thais who were younger do their very best. And I saw our kids put a half assed effort into it. I was really not impressed at all with they way they went about it. The truth of the matter was that it was a bit of a joke to them. And when they arrived in Japan and Thailand it was almost as though "Oh God. We have to do this? Lets rough something up really quickly." I think one or two of our kids went to some trouble to get the thing going but most hadn't. And in that sense I was disappointed. I was annoyed that they were not willing to put the commitment into it that the others did. But had we had the infrastructure when we started we could've got that all done within a few weeks and it might have had some significance to them. But my feeling was that they were not that interested to do it. I think it was because of the primary problem we had which was that the kids were spread too thin.

## Exchange Trip to Japan and Thailand

### General Comments Regarding the Trip

Exchange programs include the participants travelling to meet and stay with their partners and experiencing their culture. The students and adults who travelled to Japan and Thailand reported that they enjoyed their exchange trip. The Canadians spent five days in Morioka, Japan and two and a half weeks both in Bangkok and travelling around Thailand.

### Japan

Many of the Canadian Future Partners participants felt that they needed more time in Japan. One administrator remarked "We had a too limited insight into Japan because of the short time we had." Most people felt that the pace was too fast in Japan, that there were too many activities planned for them in too short of a time period. Also, the students would have liked to have spent more time in Tokyo and travelled to another part of Japan. One of the teachers who travelled to Asia commented:

We never got to go into a Japanese school and the orientation of the program was an educational one . . . A lot of what people get out of travelling to another culture is what they are familiar with and these kids are familiar with a school based environment. They never went into a school in Morioka and I think that was a loss. It should not be the only focus but it was a gap because school is a common area where the students can make comparisons between them and relate to it directly.

Many of the students felt that the camping trip was the best part of the trip to Japan because the students stayed up socializing all night away from the adults. One student reported that "That was when we mixed the best with the Japanese kids."

### Thailand

All of the Canadian students felt they had too many official meetings and sight-seeing activities planned for them in Thailand. All of the students would have preferred more time to relax with the Thai Future Partners to get to know their host families and to do things like go to the beach or shop.

The Canadian Future Partners felt that they got to know the Thai students better than the Japanese students because they spent more time in Thailand. Further, one administrator remarked:

They gained much more in Thailand because we were there for longer. They had a chance to explore and wander and get a chance to see what the culture was like.

Half the Canadian students felt that the Thai partners were too young. While the Japanese students were, like the Canadian Future Partners, 15 and 16 years old, the Thai students were 12 and 13 years old. One of the adults who travelled with the students explained:

The Japanese students were senior students and therefore the level of exchange was very good between them and our students. The level of exchange in Thailand was more limited because they were younger students so they didn't really spark much conversation or interaction. It is much better with older students like in Japan. The students in

Thailand were delightful but were too young. The compatibility of age is important cause then they gain more from it.

### Comments Regarding the Travel to Both Countries

All of the students commented that they would have liked to have had more unstructured time to get to know their partner students and host families better in both countries. An administrator who travelled to Asia commented:

When travelling, the unstructured time is absolutely necessary to discover the essence of a place. That's when you begin to understand a culture.

Further, many students did not care for the "touristy things and official stuff," and would have preferred spending this time doing less formal things with their host family. Half of the students felt that they needed to communicate with their billets more before the trip. One student said "It would have been better to have known our billets better and to have known more Japanese before the trip. Then we would've mixed better."

### Additional Findings

#### Participant Views on the Most Beneficial Aspects of the Program

Many students felt that learning about the computers, video, 35mm camera and the electronic mail skills were the most beneficial aspects of the program. The students reported that they felt that these skills are useful because they have been able to use these skills in the production of other school projects. One student explained, "Its beneficial to use current

technology and to be exposed to new ways to communicate with it." Some students commented that the trip to Thailand and Japan and learning about the Asian cultures was the most beneficial aspect of the program. A few students felt that working in a more mature setting, and learning how to work well in a group were the most beneficial aspects of the program.

One program administrator summarized what he perceived as the high points of the program:

We did it. It had never been done before, so in spite of everything we did it. That's a tremendous thing. Everyone got to see everyone else's country. They had a wonderful trip. I don't hear very much negative stuff about the travel. It can be as long as anyone wants but our kids were so busy with other things that we only had a bit of time in Japan. Some studies suggest that kids should not be away from home at that age for more than three or four weeks or they get very homesick. We accepted the time in Japan and Thailand because that seemed to be about right and to take them away from home for more than a month would make them homesick. I've learned a hell of a lot from doing this. I'm sure everyone has. Eventually the negative side fades from memory, and put into perspective it's really okay. And all kinds of the kids have called me to ask if I'll act as a referee for them as they apply to go to other countries and go into international work. Lots of people got to understand other cultures better. Canada got promoted in Asia. A lot of things like that. Tremendously constructive things. The Japanese and Thai kids got here. We got

those Thai kids here and up on top of Whistler and taught them how to ice skate. So lots of things like that. Several of the kids got very good at photography and video work, they all had an introduction to computers. Some responded better than others. And coming out of it all, the option you're giving us is to understand it well and to be able to design it again and not make the same mistakes. That's great.

### How Their Involvement in the Program Changed the Participants' Lives

All of the students commented that their involvement with the Future Partners program changed their lives in a positive way. Some students said that participating in Future Partners has helped them to set their university goals and choose their career and commented:

The most worthwhile part of the project for me was being able to try out video because I loved it and now its my future aspiration, to make films. I've found something I love doing.

I now want to go to Thailand and teach English. I've already applied for a Pacific Rim Scholarship to go there next year.

I now know that I want to get into international law focusing on the Pacific Rim.

In addition, some students commented that they made some very good friends through their involvement with the program, they have learned to work well in a group, and the experience they gained in the program was helpful on resumes. Other students reported they have learned to appreciate the Canadian lifestyle and environment, they have a better understanding of people in other countries, and that they are interested in travelling abroad further. One student explained:

It really opened me up to a lot of things. I now have a more worldly attitude. Its good to see other points of view on things. And its good to see that other kids around the world just want to hang out too. It reinforced the feeling that I want to travel but a lot sooner and for longer. Also, the skills I learned are good skills to have that I think everyone can use eventually.

Comments Regarding Whether the Students Would Become Involved in a Program Like Future Partners a Second Time

A program administrator recalled "Most students I've talked to feel it was a good thing to do," and most students said that they would get involved in a program like this again and they would recommend that their friends participate in this type of a program.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of chapter 5 is to interpret the findings presented in chapter 4 and to illustrate the importance of the results as they pertain to other educational exchanges. First the questions of this study are addressed. To review, those questions are:

1. What factors influenced the evolution and operation of the Future Partners Program?
2. How did the communications technologies and program activities in Future Partners enable the Canadian participants to communicate with and learn about their partners in the other two countries?
3. What could be done differently to improve the program?

First the findings regarding each research question are discussed. Second, generalizable conclusions regarding the operation and planning of educational exchanges, and regarding the evaluation of educational exchanges are addressed. These conclusions were based on the data obtained in the findings portion of this paper (see chapter 4). Third, a series of recommendations regarding how to improve the organization and operation of an educational exchange program like Future Partners are presented. The chapter also discusses a summary of the strategy for the evaluation of educational exchanges and makes suggestions for future directions of research in the areas of evaluation and educational exchanges.

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

### **1. What factors influenced the evolution and operation of the Future Partners Program?**

While Future Partners was successful in accomplishing its objectives, it was felt by the student and adult participants that the length of the program was too long and that projects could have been completed much more quickly. It was found that the lack of initial program infrastructure, the type of students who were selected to participate in the program, and the manner in which their involvement in the program was managed all contributed to Future Partners Program activities beginning and progressing slowly. The program began without an infrastructure--which organizes, directs and facilitates program activity--in place. Without an infrastructure established at the outset of the program, activities seemed disorganized and students lost enthusiasm for what they were doing. Also, many of the students selected to participate in the program did not have the time or energy to engage themselves fully in their work in the program. Therefore, program activities were not accomplished as expediently or as efficiently as both the students and program planners wished. Finally, the Grade 9 Future Partners were unable to self motivate or self direct their work. Consequently they felt nothing was being accomplished and they did not know what to do.

**2. How did the communications technologies and program activities in Future Partners enable the Canadian participants to communicate with and learn about their partners in the other two countries?**

The Canadian Future Partners communicated with the Japanese and Thai partners using a combination of letters, faxes, electronic mail, a video and slide presentation, joint educational presentations, by learning some Japanese and Thai language and culture, by hosting the Japanese and Thai visits to Victoria, and by travelling to Japan and Thailand. However, the Canadian students did not engage themselves in these communications activities equally. While the program made instruction and a variety of media and communications technologies and opportunities available to the students, the students were allowed to choose how they involved themselves in these activities. It was found that under these circumstances--for the majority of the students--unless students feel as if they know their exchange partners or have a reason to communicate with them, regular, meaningful communication does not take place using letters, fax and electronic mail. In addition, the students did not complete as large a video presentation as they had wanted, or learn as much Thai and Japanese language as they had wished.

**3. What could be done differently to improve the program?**

As a result of the above findings regarding the evolution and operation of the Future Partners Program it is recommended that (a) the infrastructure be in place at the outset of the program, (b) students selected have the time and energy to participate fully in the program, (c) students be given structured instruction, tasks, and deadlines accompanied by teacher supervision and involvement in their work, and d) that the program

becomes school based so that teachers can direct and manage the students' involvement, can grade their work, and can offer them course credit for their involvement in the program. In addition, with regard to how the Future Partners Program enabled the Canadian participants to communicate with and learn about their partners in the other two countries it is recommended that (a) students be exposed to structured instruction both in the use of the media and communications technology available in the program, and in the language and culture of their partner students; (b) students be required to acquire specified skills in the use of the media and communications technology, and in the language of their partner students; and (c) students are given assignments which require them to use their media, communications technology, and language skills.

#### Conclusions Regarding the Operation and Planning of Educational Exchanges

The following conclusions are based on the data in the findings portion of this paper (see chapter 4).

1. Exchange programs must be well planned in advance with an infrastructure in place. A program infrastructure consists of a clear direction accompanied by an established pathway along which the participants will move to reach program objectives. This pathway includes planning meeting organization, work routines, expectations from students, time-lines, and establishing communications links with partner students and teachers.

2. The student and teacher participants should be willing to commit the time, energy and money their involvement in the program requires.

3. Students and teachers should attend all meetings and be punctual.
4. Students need direction and supervision from their teachers in their instruction and work, and they need to be assigned specific tasks.
5. All student participants should be required to contribute to the projects and activities directed toward their partner students.
6. Language learning and cultural orientation helps to prepare students and teachers to travel abroad and to host partner students and teachers. This component should begin at the outset of the program and should include assignments requiring the students to apply and use their knowledge of new languages and cultures.
7. Each student should learn skills in the use of all communications media used in the program. Further, students should be given both structured instruction and assignments in the use of communications technologies.
8. Students are not highly motivated to communicate with their partner students unless they feel they know their partners and have a reason to communicate with them.
9. Unstructured time should be planned into the schedules of exchange students to enable them to get to know their host families and to explore the foreign environment.

10. Educational exchange programs which require a large commitment of time and energy should be school based and should offer the students course credit for their involvement.

### Conclusions Regarding the Evaluation of Educational Exchange Programs

The following conclusions are based on the data in the findings portion of this paper (see chapter 4).

1. Exchange programs should be evaluated close to the conclusion of the program ensuring the availability of as many students and teachers as possible to participate in the evaluation, and enabling the participants to offer as clear a recollection as possible of their experience of the program.

2. A comprehensive evaluation of a program should include the partner students and teachers. The optimal situation would involve the evaluator travelling to the exchange country and being fluent in the language of the exchange partners. If this is not possible, difficulties exist in obtaining data from foreign program participants regarding translating information and relying on a participating teacher to collect the data.

3. Depending on the purpose for the evaluation and the specific characteristics of various programs, the evaluation of an educational exchange should focus on: (a) how the participants' involvement in the program was educational, (b) how the program was organized, (c) the type and quality of exchanges that took place during the program, (d) student

involvement in the program, (e) teacher involvement in the program, and (f) how well the program met its objectives.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations pertain to educational exchanges which share similar objectives and organizational characteristics with the Future Partners Program. These characteristics were presented in chapter 2, Literature Review, of this paper. To review, the objectives of these types of programs are: (a) to increase students' understanding and acceptance of culturally different peoples, (b) to help students learn a foreign language, and (c) to facilitate students' immersion in another culture. Also, the organization of the Future Partners Program is typical with regard to educational exchanges characterized by groups of students travelling to a foreign country with teachers to live with host families for a short period of time, and to visit the schools and other culturally significant sites and events there. Therefore, the recommendations made in this chapter are generalizable to educational exchanges which share this format.

### Program Organization

Because Future Partners' activities and meetings lacked initial direction and organization due to the lack of infrastructure at the outset of the program, it is recommended that an infrastructure be established before the program begins. The infrastructure in place at the outset of the program means having: (a) a partner group or groups of students identified, (b) the means of communication between the participating groups established, (c) money and equipment secured to support program activities, (d) program activities and schedules determined, and (e) being

able to explain to participating students and parents what their involvement in the program will require of them in terms of time, effort and money.

In addition to an infrastructure at the outset, the adults need to define how program meetings will take place and write agendas each week specifying each student's work assignments and goals. In addition, definite rules, goals and expectations regarding student involvement, behavior and productivity in the program need to be established and made explicit to the students. Work periods should be focussed and the best effort possible should be made to meet work deadlines.

It is also recommended that marks and course credit be offered to students who participate in a program which requires at least one year of involvement. Further, the teachers should be active in the program in terms of attending each meeting, monitoring student attendance, and in offering instruction in the use of the technology. The teachers also should work with the students on their projects and ensure each student has specific tasks to perform each program meeting.

### Program Meetings

Because the students responded well to the requests of their teachers, and because the students agreed that they would be motivated to work for marks and course credit, it is recommended that program meetings take place in the students' school and be run by the students' teacher or teachers. Meetings should be held at least once a week, however if the students and teachers wish, meetings could be held more frequently. It is recommended however, that all participants attend all meetings.

To ensure students know what is expected of them each meeting and that students accomplish goals and meet work deadlines, an agenda should

be prepared for each meeting. The agenda would provide structure and direction for each meeting by outlining the goals to be achieved by the end of the meeting and the tasks that need to be performed to achieve those goals. The adults involved in the program should ensure that meeting agendas are followed closely. Activities on a meeting agenda could include language instruction, work on collaborative educational projects, specific tasks related to media project work, and specific communications activities with the overseas partners.

A 10-15 minute information period--or discussion period--should take place at the beginning of each meeting for the discussion of items such as program goals and how they can be achieved, the agenda for each meeting, deadlines for project work, dates for travel, and possible fund raising activities. In addition, depending on the length of program meetings, breaks from project work should occur to allow students and teachers time to socialize and relax.

### Student Selection

The students who are asked to participate in an educational exchange program need to be able to overcome individual differences and get along with all the people they meet in the program. These students must also be able to work well together; to afford the time to participate fully in the program; to make a commitment to the program; and to be interested in learning languages. Further, participating students need to know what kinds of benefits they will receive from their participation in the program such as course credit, media skills or travel.

### Student Management

It is recommended that students be included in the decision making process regarding the types of activities and projects they will engage in to meet program goals. Student participants need a degree of flexibility and freedom blended with a prescriptive assignment of tasks, giving them choices in their work in addition to their assigned work. In addition, work in the program should be designed to accommodate both group and individual efforts that would meet students' needs to work either cooperatively or independently. Further, an attitude of cooperation should be cultivated among the students in their work.

The adults in the program should provide guidance and intervention in terms of ensuring all students are involved in accomplishing stated work objectives. If students are required to create projects for their partner students each student should be responsible for making a specific contribution to them. This prescriptive method of assigning work ensures that each student is actively involved each program meeting and can see evidence of his/her contribution to the project work.

### Program Activities

At the beginning of the program the students need structured instruction from the adults in how to use the available technology and how to meet program requirements such as creating projects or presentations, and communicating with their partner students. Students should be led in their work in the program with written guidelines of goals and assignments to be handed in each week.

If students are required to make presentations, they should rehearse them with their peers and teachers before they are presented publicly. This

practice should focus on how the students could improve the delivery and content of their presentations. Further, students travelling abroad to give media presentations should arrange the use of equipment such as video cassette recorders, audio cassette players and slide projectors which is compatible with the software they intend to present.

### The Use Of Media and Communications Technologies

Students need structured instruction regarding how to use the media and communications technologies available in the program. All student participants should learn the skills which enable them to use each piece of equipment, and be given assignments which require them to demonstrate those skills.

Students who are expected to create videos and slide presentations should be given structured instruction in how to create these types of media based presentations. Also, if students are expected to communicate with their exchange partners it is recommended that they be able to communicate directly with their partner students. Further, students who are expected to use communications technologies should have easy access to the technology and reference cards reminding them how to use it.

The student groups in the program should introduce themselves to each other and be given specific assignments requiring them to communicate further. Adults should supervise students' use of communications technologies and should follow up on their completion of communications based assignments.

### Language Instruction

If the exchange involves bringing together culturally and linguistically different students, the students should realize that learning the language and culture of the people with whom they are attempting to establish a friendly rapport and working relationship is a matter of equality, diplomacy and protocol, as well as an effort demonstrating respect and good will.

If language lessons are part of an educational exchange program, they should begin at the outset of the program and take place during each meeting. It is recommended that the language instruction be delivered by a native speaker who can also teach the students aspects of the culture they will experience. Also, the teacher offering this instruction should include small assignments and activities requiring the students to practice and review their language skills between weekly lessons. It is recommended that these assignments support the students' media or collaborative project work.

The language lessons should focus on providing the students with basic conversational skills in the language(s) they are learning. Further, they must learn the common courtesies regarding respect for social and religious traditions which will be expected in the culture they are entering.

### Exchange Travel

The students from the participating countries should represent the same age group enabling them to interact and relate to the exchange activities with the same level of interest and ability. To facilitate socializing between the different groups of students more communication should take place between them before the exchange trip, and unstructured time should

be planned into the exchange schedule. In addition, the visiting and host students should have acquired conversational skills in each other's language.

It is recommended that several program activities be planned upon the students' return home from the exchange trip. For instance, students could be expected to make presentations to local schools informing other students and teachers about the exchange and sharing what they learned from the experience.

### Summary of the Strategy for the Evaluation of Educational Exchanges

A qualitative case study, as outlined in chapter 3, the Research Design portion of this paper, is recommended for the evaluation of educational exchanges. The focus and purpose of the evaluation, however, will direct the researcher's choice of theoretical tradition and evaluation model or models, as outlined in chapter 2, Tables 1 and 2, which will guide the study.

### Recommendations and Directions for Future Research Regarding Evaluation and Educational Exchanges

Due to the lack of research into educational exchanges in general it is recommended that more educational exchanges be formally evaluated. Further, research should focus on how the use of specific communications technologies in international exchange programs facilitates mutual learning between culturally and linguistically different students. Finally, it is recommended that one or several of the corporate organizations which sponsor educational exchanges undertake to create a comprehensive data base containing recommendations regarding how to conduct educational

exchanges, information on how to evaluate educational exchanges, and existing evaluations of educational exchanges.

#### SUMMARY OF THIS REPORT

The most called for areas of research into educational exchanges, as previously mentioned in the Rationale portion of chapter 1, are: (a) a basic need for more research into how to conduct them efficiently and effectively, (b) more formal evaluations of educational exchanges, and (c) the creation of a comprehensive data base of such research. In terms of contributing to these research areas this study has (a) contributed to the literature a formal evaluation of an educational exchange, (b) provided a series of recommendations regarding how to improve the organization and operation of an educational exchange program like Future Partners, (c) presented generalizable conclusions regarding both the operation and planning of educational exchanges, and regarding the evaluation of educational exchanges, and (d) offered suggestions for future directions of research in the areas of evaluation and educational exchanges. This study has also created information that could contribute to a comprehensive database of research on educational exchanges. Finally, chapter 3 of this paper provides a description of the strategy a researcher can employ to evaluate an educational exchange.

## References

- Altenberger, A. (1989). Educational exchanges between the United States and the Soviet Union. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
- American Field Service International/Intercultural Programs. (1983). 1983 Annual Report. New York, NY: AFS International/Intercultural Programs.
- Biggs, C., and Wan, S., (Eds.), (1991). Teachers and students go abroad - summaries of student exchanges: California with Mexico and Germany with Japan. (Occasional papers in intercultural learning No. 12). New York, NY: AFS International/Intercultural Programs, Inc.
- Bogdan, R. and Biklen, S. (1975). Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bresee, D. (1985). Exchange program teenagers compare life in Denmark and the U.S.A. (Occasional papers in intercultural learning No. 10). New York, NY: AFS International/Intercultural Programs.
- Campbell, D. and Stanley, J. (1966). Experimental and quasi-experimental design for research. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Carey, S. (1983). U.S. - Soviet exchanges - the kinds of exchanges that have taken place, what works, how can they be made more effective? Washington, DC: Institute For Soviet-American Relations.
- Conner, R. (1981). Methodological advances in evaluation research. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Dawson, D. (1984). Exchanges . . . and Canada's bicultural aspect. In Exchanges . . . assessing their value: A summary of the annual conference of the society for educational visits and exchanges in Canada (pp. 11-15). Ottawa, Ontario, Canada: The Society for Educational Visits and Exchanges in Canada. ✓
- Dragonas, P. (1983). The high school goes abroad: International homestay exchange programs. Language in education: Theory and practice, 5, 1-80.
- Eide, I. (1970). Students as Links Between Cultures. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget. ✓

- Eisner, E. (1975, March). The perceptive eye: Toward the reformation of educational evaluation. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Assoc., Washington, DC.
- Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M. C. Whittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching. (3rd ed.) (pp 83-92). New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Fetterman, D. (1988). Qualitative approaches to evaluation in education, the silent scientific revolution. New York, NY: Praeger. ✓
- Fleck, P. (1984). Domestic and international student exchanges . . . programs and problems. In Exchanges . . . assessing their value: A summary of the annual conference of the society for educational visits and exchanges in Canada (pp. 15-18). Ottawa, Ontario, Canada: The Society for Educational Visits and Exchanges in Canada.
- Grove, N. (1984). The impact of an intercultural homestay on youth. In Exchanges . . . assessing their value: A summary of the annual conference of the society for educational visits and exchanges in Canada (pp. 29-35). Ottawa, Ontario, Canada: The Society for Educational Visits and Exchanges in Canada.
- Guba, E. and Lincoln, Y. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications. ✗
- Hamers, J. and Deshaies, D. (1984). Intercultural exchanges in a school setting . . . attitudes, motivation and cultural identity. In Exchanges . . . assessing their value: A summary of the annual conference of the society for educational visits and exchanges in Canada (pp. 29-35). Ottawa, Ontario, Canada: The Society for Educational Visits and Exchanges in Canada.
- Hansel, B. (1984). Why an AFS experience accelerates learning and the growth of competence (Research Report No. 25). New York, NY: AFS International/Intercultural Programs, Inc. Research Dept.
- Hansel, B. (1984). Literature review: studies of the impact of a travel-abroad experience (Research Report No. 28). New York, NY: AFS International/Intercultural Programs, Inc. Research Dept.

- Hansel, B. and Grove, N. (1984). Why an AFS experience accelerates learning and the growth of competence (Research Report No. 25. Revised and Expanded). New York, NY: AFS International/Intercultural Programs, Inc.
- Hartung, E. (1983). Cultural adjustment difficulties of Japanese adolescents sojourning in the U.S.A. (Occasional papers in intercultural learning No. 5). New York, NY: AFS International/Intercultural Programs, Inc.
- Herman, P. F., Jr. (1984). Detente: A role for U.S.-Soviet Exchanges? Proceedings of the annual meeting of the International Studies Association. Atlanta, GA.
- Hinkle, D., Wiersman, W., and Jurs, S. Applied statistics for the behavioral sciences. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally College Pub. Co., 1979.
- Hopkins, C. (1978). Classroom measurement and evaluation. Itasca, IL: F.E. Peacock.
- Jaeger, R. (Ed.). (1988). Complementary methods for research in education. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association. ✓
- Kelsh, B. (1982). Student exchange program advances foreign language study at Crow High School. Eugene, OR: Oregon School Study Council, University of Oregon.
- Kirk, J. and Miller, M. (1986). Reliability and validity in qualitative research. Beverley Hills, CA: Sage Publications. ✓
- Labelle, H. (1984). Exchanges . . . how they contribute to national unity and national identity. In Exchanges . . . assessing their value: A summary of the annual conference of the society for educational visits and exchanges in Canada (pp. 5-7). Ottawa, Ontario, Canada: The Society for Educational Visits and Exchanges in Canada.
- Lussier-Chasles, D. (1984). The effects of interlinguistic and bicultural exchange activities on second language learning through traditional instruction. In Exchanges . . . assessing their value: A summary of the annual conference of the society for educational visits and exchanges in Canada (pp. 25-29). Ottawa, Ontario, Canada: The Society for Educational Visits and Exchanges in Canada.

- Madaus, S., Scriven, M., and Stufflebeam, D. (1983). Evaluation models, viewpoints on educational and human services evaluation. Boston, MA: Kluwer-Nijhoff Publishing.
- Mei, D. and others (1988). Young Diplomats Program: Israeli school to school exchange end-of-year report. New York, NY: New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn Office of Educational Assessment.
- Merriam, S. (1988). Case study research in education, a qualitative approach. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers. ✓
- Miles, M. and Huberman, M. (1984) Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications. ✱ ✓
- Neeson, E. (1983). America-Israel young ambassadors student exchange program. Orientation manual. Brooklyn, N.Y: New York City Board of Education, Div. of Curriculum and Instruction.
- Parent, P. (1984). Exchanges . . . assessing their value. In Exchanges . . . assessing their value: A summary of the annual conference of the society for educational visits and exchanges in Canada (pp. 19-21). Ottawa, Ontario, Canada: The Society for Educational Visits and Exchanges in Canada.
- Parlett, M. and Hamilton, D. (1972). Evaluation as illumination: A new approach to the study of innovatory programs. Edinburgh, UK: Centre for Research in the Educational Sciences, University of Edinburgh.
- Patton, M. (1987). How to use qualitative methods in evaluation. London, UK: Sage Publications. ✓
- Patton, M. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods, second edition. London, UK: Sage Publications. ✓
- Popham, J. (1981). Modern educational measurement. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Potter, G., Gardiner, P., Murphy, S., and Murphy, P. (1987, November). An outreach program for Pacific Rim schools. Proposal presented at the meeting of the British Columbia Ministry of Education Pacific Rim Initiatives Program Officials and the Future Partners Program Steering Committee, Victoria, B.C.

- Provus, M. (1971). Discrepancy evaluation for educational program improvement and assessment. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.
- Rippey, R. (1973). Studies in transactional evaluation. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.
- Roberts, N. (et. al.) (1990). Integrating telecommunications into education. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Rothman, J. (1980). Social R & S, research and development in the human services. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc. H62 C676
- Sonquist A., and Dunkelberg, W. (1977). Survey and opinion research; procedures for processing and analysis. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc. ✓
- Stake, R. (1973). Program evaluation, particularly responsive evaluation. In Madaus, S., Scriven, M., and Stufflebeam, D. Evaluation Models, viewpoints on educational and human services evaluation (pp. 287-311). Boston, USA: Kluwer-Nijhoff Publishing.
- Stern, D. (1984). Visits and exchanges . . . and the new view of the second language curriculum. In Exchanges . . . assessing their value: A summary of the annual conference of the society for educational visits and exchanges in Canada (pp. 21-25). Ottawa, Ontario, Canada: The Society for Educational Visits and Exchanges in Canada.
- Stitsworth, M. (1987). Addressing third world development through youth exchange.
- Vines, Lois. (1985). Quebec: Preparing for an educational visit. OMLTA Journal, 3, pp. 36-43.
- Weiss, C. (1972). Evaluation Research, methods of assessing program effectiveness. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc. ✓
- Weiss, R. and Rein, M. (1970). The evaluation of broad-aim programs: experimental design, its difficulties, and an alternative. In Madaus, S., Scriven, M., and Stufflebeam, D. (Eds.), Evaluation Models, viewpoints on educational human services evaluation. (pp. 143-163). Boston, USA: Kluwer-Nijhoff Publishing.

Worthen, B. and Sanders, J. (1987). Educational evaluation, alternative approaches and practical guidelines. New York, NY: Longman.

Yin, R. (1984). Case study research, applied social research methods series, volume 5. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications. ✓ ✱

Yin, R. (1989). Case study research, design and methods. Newbury Park: Sage Publications. ✓

Appendix A  
Consent Forms

To The Parents of the Student Participants in  
the Future Partners Program:

I, Elizabeth Kilby, am conducting an evaluation of the Future Partners Program. This evaluation is not an evaluation of the performance of your son/daughter in the program. It is an evaluation of what occurred and how the program could be improved. The student participants will be asked to offer their perspectives on the program, how well they think the program reached its objectives, and how the program could be improved. The identity of your son/daughter will be kept anonymous, the information he/she discloses will remain confidential and any data records and tape recordings of interviews will be destroyed at the end of the study. Your son/daughter may exercise his/her right to withdraw from the study at any time and to answer only those questions with which he/she feels comfortable.

I \_\_\_\_\_ give consent that my

(please print name)

son/daughter be allowed to take part in the evaluation study being conducted by Elizabeth Kilby.

-----

(signature)

(date)

## Future Partners Evaluation Consent Form

This study is an evaluation of the Future Partners Program, not an evaluation of your personal involvement or performance in the program. Your identity will be kept anonymous, the information you disclose will remain confidential and any data records and tape recordings of interviews will be destroyed at the end of the study. You may exercise your right to withdraw from the study at any time and to answer only those questions with which you feel comfortable.

I \_\_\_\_\_ understand the above terms  
(please print name)

and consent to participate in the research study being conducted by Elizabeth Kilby.

---

(signature)

(date)

Appendix B  
Interview and Questionnaire Schedules

Interview Questions for Future Partners Administrators:

G. Potter, S. Murphy, P. Gardiner and P. Evans

- May I tape record this?
- I am only interested in your thoughts on the program, there are no right or wrong answers in this interview.
- Your identity will remain anonymous so you can be as frank with me as you feel comfortable with.

Personal Objectives

Why did you become involved with this project?

What do you feel was your role or responsibility within the project?

What were your objectives within your role?

Did your objectives change during the project?

What criteria did you use in selecting the students for the program?

Program Components

Were you satisfied with the instruction that the students received regarding computer based communication? If not, what would you have been satisfied with?

Were you satisfied with the instruction that the students received regarding video production? If not, what would you have been satisfied with?

Were you satisfied with the instruction that the students received regarding slide/tape production? If not, what would you have been satisfied with?

Were you satisfied with the language instruction that the students received? If not, what would you have been satisfied with?

How do you think this instruction could have been done more effectively?

What do you believe was the purpose of the video tape production?

What do you believe was the purpose of the slide/tape presentation?

What was the purpose of the Thai and Japanese instruction?

What do you believe was the purpose of the educational presentations?

Were you satisfied with the final videotape presentation?

If not, what would you have been satisfied with?

Were you satisfied with the final slide/tape presentation?

If not, what would you have been satisfied with?

Were you satisfied with the amount of Thai and Japanese language the students learned? If not, what would you have been satisfied with?

Were you satisfied with the final educational presentations?

If not, what would you have been satisfied with?

What means of communication did you use most frequently to communicate with the overseas partners? Why?

How was the trip arranged so it was educationally significant? Was it?

How do you know? In what ways? In what ways could it have been better?

### Student Involvement and Attention

What do you think were the students' initial attitudes toward the program?

Did those change over time? In what ways? How do you know?

Why do you think some students withdrew from the program?

What could be done to prevent student attrition?

### Program Organization

What were your frustrations regarding anything in the project?

What comments would you like to make regarding any aspect of the program?

What recommendations would you like to make in order to improve the project for another time?

## Interview Questions for Victoria Student

### Future Partners Participants

- May I tape record this?
- I am only interested in your thoughts on the program, there are no right or wrong answers in this interview.
- Your identity will remain anonymous so you can be as frank with me as you feel comfortable with.

### Personal Objectives

Why did you become involved in the Future Partners Project?

What do you feel you were supposed to do as a participant in the project? In other words, what do you feel your goals were?

### Student Involvement and Attention

What was your initial attitude toward the program?

Did that change over time? In what ways? Why?

Was Future Partners a priority in your schedule or did other things come first? If other things came first, what were they? What would have motivated you to make Future Partners a bigger priority? What was your personal level of commitment or participation?

Why do you think some students withdrew from the program?

What could be done in order to prevent this from happening again?

### Program Components

Were you satisfied with the instruction that you received regarding video production? (please explain why or why not, or give an example)

What kind of help would you have liked to have had?

Were you satisfied with the final video production? If not, what would you have been satisfied with?

How do you think the making of a video like this could be done better another time?

Were you satisfied with the instruction that you received regarding taking slides? (please explain why or why not or give an example)

Were you satisfied with the final slide/tape production?

If not, what would you have been satisfied with?

How do you think the making of a slide/tape presentation like this could be improved?

Were you satisfied with the instruction that you received regarding soundtrack production? (please explain why or why not, or give an example) If not what kind of help would you have liked to have had?

Were you satisfied with the instruction that you received regarding language learning? (please explain why or why not, or give an example of the situation)

Were you satisfied with the amount of Thai and/or Japanese you learned?

If not, would more language instruction have helped you to learn enough to feel comfortable on the trip?

How do you think learning languages like this could be improved?

Do you believe you were paying attention? Were you motivated to learn what was being taught?

Did you ask for help when you got stuck, or did you just move on to a different activity?

Were you satisfied with the instruction that you received regarding computer based communication?

If not what would you have been satisfied with?

How do you think learning about and using electronic mail like this could be done better another time?

Did you feel as though electronic mail is an effective way to communicate? Why?

Did you have to wait a long time for responses, would another means of communication have been better? What means? Why?

What means of communication did you use most frequently to communicate with the overseas partners? Why?

What do you think was the purpose of creating the video tape presentation?

Were you satisfied with your work on the video tape?

Were you satisfied with the end result? In what ways? How do you think that could have been done more effectively?

Were you satisfied with your work on the computer graphics?

Were you satisfied with the end result? In what ways? How do you think that could have been done more effectively?

What do you think was the point of creating the slide/tape presentation?

Were you satisfied with your work on the slide show ?

Were you satisfied with the end result? In what ways? How do you think that could have been done more effectively?

Were you satisfied with your work on the joint educational project?

Were you satisfied with the end result? In what ways? How do you think that could have been done more effectively?

What do you think was the point of the Thai and Japanese language instruction? Did it help? Were you satisfied with the instruction? Why? What could have been done to increase your motivation to learn the languages?

What do you think was the purpose of the educational presentations? Were you satisfied with your participation in them? Why? Were you satisfied with the final presentations in Asia? Why? How could these be improved?

Were you satisfied with the trip abroad? Is there anything you would have liked to have done, or seen being done differently on the trips? What?

### Program Organization

How could any of these things have been done more effectively or differently?

Is there anything else you would like to say about the project that would contribute to my overall understanding of what happened and why?

Can you make any recommendations regarding how this program could be improved for its second running?

-----

\*Only for those students who dropped out of the program:

### Student Involvement and Attention

- When did you withdraw your participation from the program?
- Why did you withdraw your participation from the program?
- What could be done another time to prevent students from withdrawing from the program?

Questionnaire for Victoria Student  
Future Partner Participants

1. Name \_\_\_\_\_
2. Age \_\_\_\_\_
3. Which school do you attend? \_\_\_\_\_
4. Did you participate in the program to the end? \_\_\_\_\_(y/n)
5. If not, when did you leave the program?

-----

6. Out of the following activities, check the ones you participated in (even if your participation was brief).

- a) sending telecommunications messages (electronic mail) to the students in Japan \_\_\_\_\_, in Thailand \_\_\_\_\_
- b) making a video to send to Thailand and Japan \_\_\_\_\_
- c) making a slide/tape presentation to send to Thailand and Japan \_\_\_\_\_
- d) sending letters to students in Thailand and Japan \_\_\_\_\_
- e) joint educational projects to present to the Thai and Japanese people \_\_\_\_\_

7. If any items have been omitted please add them and check those you participated in.

-----

-----

-----

8. Which group did you communicate the most with? Japanese \_\_\_\_  
Thai \_\_\_\_ . Why? \_\_\_\_\_

-----

9. If you used electronic mail to communicate with the students overseas, how many times (approx) did you use it?

-----

10. If you sent letters to students overseas how many did you send?

-----

11. What was the most convenient way for you to communicate with the overseas partners? Why?

-----

-----

-----

12. If you could omit some things from the program, what would they be?

-----

-----

-----

-----

13. Please explain why.

-----

-----

-----

-----

-----

-----

14. What was/were the most productive, beneficial or effective aspect(s) of the program?

---

---

---

---

---

15. In what ways were these things the most productive, beneficial or effective aspect(s) of the program?

---

---

---

---

---

---

16. Would you recommend to your friends to participate in this type of exchange activity? (y/n) \_\_\_\_\_

17. Would you become involved in an educational exchange like this again? (y/n) \_\_\_\_\_

18. For what reasons?

---

---

---

---

---

Thank you for your time.

Questionnaire for the Parents of the Future Partners  
Student Participants

Student Involvement and Attention

Why did you want your child to participate in this program?

-----  
-----  
-----

Did you notice any improvement in your child's ability to do certain things? \_\_\_\_\_ (y/n) If so, what?

-----  
-----  
-----

What was your child's initial attitude toward the program? How do you know?

-----  
-----  
-----

Did that change over time? \_\_\_\_\_ (y/n) If so, in what ways?

-----  
-----  
-----  
-----  
-----

To what do you attribute this change?

-----  
-----  
-----

What was your child's attitude toward the individual project(s) he/she worked on? How do you know?

-----  
-----  
-----

What was your child's attitude toward the Thai and Japanese language instruction? How do you know?

-----  
-----  
-----

How do you think the students could have been better motivated to learn these languages?

-----  
-----  
-----

What was your child's attitude toward the educational presentations they made in Asia? How do you know?

-----  
-----  
-----

How do you think the students could have been better motivated to conduct these presentations?

-----  
-----  
-----

What was your child's attitude toward the trip before departure? How do you know?

-----  
-----  
-----  
-----

What was your child's attitude toward the trip after returning home? How do you know?

-----  
-----  
-----  
-----

Program Components

Were you satisfied with the instruction that your child received regarding computer based communication? \_\_\_\_\_ (y/n)

Were you satisfied with the instruction that your child received regarding video production? \_\_\_\_\_ (y/n)

Were you satisfied with the instruction that your child received regarding slide/tape presentations? \_\_\_\_\_ (y/n)

Were you satisfied with the language instruction that your child received? \_\_\_\_\_ (y/n)

How could any of this instruction have been improved?

-----  
-----  
-----  
-----  
-----

What do you believe was the purpose of the video tape presentation?

-----  
-----  
-----

What do you believe was the purpose of the slide/tape presentation?

-----  
-----  
-----

What do you believe was the purpose of the Thai and Japanese language instruction?

-----  
-----  
-----  
-----

What do you believe was the purpose of the educational presentations?

-----  
-----  
-----  
-----

Did you see any of these presentations? \_\_\_\_\_ (y/n)

If so, were you satisfied with their quality? \_\_\_\_\_ (y/n)

Please explain your answer, including a description of what you would be satisfied with in these types of presentations.

-----  
-----  
-----  
-----  
-----  
-----

Were you satisfied with the trip abroad? \_\_\_\_\_ (y/n)

Is there anything you would have liked to have seen being done differently on the trips? \_\_\_\_\_ (y/n) If so, what?

-----  
-----  
-----  
-----

Did you billet a foreign Future Partner student/adult in your home?

\_\_\_\_\_ (y/n). If yes, was he/she a student or an adult?

-----

Had you billeted a foreign person in your home previous to this experience with Future Partners? \_\_\_\_\_ (y/n)

Did the Future Partners Program help to prepare you to have a foreign person staying in your home? \_\_\_\_\_ (y/n)

Would you have liked more help in preparing you to have a foreign person staying in your home? \_\_\_\_\_ (y/n)

What kind of information or help would you have liked to have had to make your experience with billiting a foreign person in your home easier?

-----  
-----  
-----  
-----  
-----  
-----  
-----

Program Organization

In what ways were you involved in the program?

-----  
-----  
-----  
-----  
-----

Would you have liked to have been more involved in the program?

\_\_\_\_\_ (y/n)

In what ways?

-----  
-----  
-----  
-----

What comments would you like to make regarding any aspect of the program?

-----  
-----  
-----  
-----  
-----  
-----

What recommendations would you like to make in order to improve the program?

-----  
-----  
-----  
-----  
-----  
-----  
-----  
-----  
-----  
-----

Thank you for your time.

Questionnaire for the Teachers of Thai and Japanese  
Language

Personal Objectives

Please describe what your role or responsibility was in the Future Partners Project.

-----  
-----  
-----  
-----

What do you think was the purpose of the Thai and Japanese language instruction?

-----  
-----  
-----

Program Components

Were you satisfied with the amount of Thai/Japanese language that the students learned? \_\_\_\_\_( y/n)

Why or Why not?

-----  
-----  
-----  
-----  
-----  
-----

What were your expectations for this component of the program?

---

---

---

---

How do you think this component of the program could be improved?

---

---

---

---

---

Student Involvement and Attention

How would you describe the students' level of involvement in the language instruction?

---

---

---

Why do you think it was that way?

---

---

---

---

What could be done to increase the students' motivation?

---

---

---

---

Program Organization

What (if any) were your frustrations regarding anything in the project?

-----  
-----  
-----

What comments would you like to make regarding any aspect of the program?

-----  
-----  
-----  
-----  
-----  
-----  
-----

What recommendations would you like to make in order to improve the program?

-----  
-----  
-----  
-----  
-----  
-----

Thank you for your time.

## Questionnaire for Morioka Future Partners Participants

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Age \_\_\_\_\_

Please mark an X in the box beside your answer. You may wish to mark more than one answer.

1. I became involved in the Future Partners Project because:

- a) It sounded interesting.
- b) I wanted to learn about and meet students/teachers in Canada.
- c) I wanted to learn how to speak English.
- d) I wanted to improve my English.
- e) I wanted to travel to Canada.
- f) I wanted to learn how to use computers and other technologies to communicate at a distance.
- g) To gain experience that would help me in my education.
- h) To gain experience that would help me in my future career.
- i) My parents wanted me to.
- j) I had nothing better to do.

2. The most enjoyable part of the whole program for me was:

- a) Making new friends in my Future Partners group here at home.
- b) Making new friends in the Future Partners group in Victoria.
- c) Travelling to Canada to meet the Victoria Future Partners.

- d) Having the Victoria Future Partners come and stay with me.
- e) Learning about global issues from the joint educational projects.
- f) Learning how to use different technologies to communicate with.
- g) Learning how to speak English.
- h) Improving my ability to speak English.

I communicated with the Victoria Future Partners using:

- a) Letters.
- b) Fax.
- c) Video.
- d) Pictures.
- d) Electronic Mail.

Did you have a choice in various ways to communicate with the Victoria Future Partners?

- a) Yes.
- b) No.

What topics or projects would you want to work on with the Victoria Future Partners in the Future?

-----  
-----  
-----  
-----

What did you learn from your involvement in Future Partners?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

If you could change some things about the program to improve them, what would you change and how would you change them?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Would you become involved in another exchange program like this again?

- a) Yes.
- b) No.

Why or why not?

---

---

---

---

---

Thank you for your time.

## Questionnaire for the Thai Future Partners Participants

Name -----

Age -----

Please mark an X in the box beside your answer. You may wish to mark more than one answer.

1. I became involved in the Future Partners Project because:

- a) It sounded interesting.
- b) I wanted to learn about and meet students/teachers in Canada.
- c) I wanted to learn how to speak English.
- d) I wanted to improve my English.
- e) I wanted to travel to Canada.
- f) I wanted to learn how to use computers and other technologies to communicate at a distance.
- g) To gain experience that would help me in my education.
- h) To gain experience that would help me in my future career.
- i) My parents wanted me to.
- j) I had nothing better to do.

2. The most enjoyable part of the whole program for me was:

- a) Making new friends in my Future Partners group here at home.
- b) Making new friends in the Future Partners group in Victoria.
- c) Travelling to Canada to meet the Victoria Future Partners.

- d) Having the Victoria Future Partners come and stay with me.
- e) Learning about global issues from the joint educational projects.
- f) Learning how to use different technologies to communicate with.
- g) Learning how to speak English.
- h) Improving my ability to speak English.

I communicated with the Victoria Future Partners using:

- a) Letters.
- b) Fax.
- c) Video.
- d) Pictures.
- d) Electronic Mail.

Did you have a choice in various ways to communicate with the Victoria Future Partners?

- a) Yes.
- b) No.

What topics or projects would you want to work on with the Victoria Future Partners in the Future?

-----

-----

-----

-----

What did you learn from your involvement in Future Partners?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

If you could change some things about the program to make it better, what would you change and how would you change them?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Would you become involved in another exchange program like this again?

- a) Yes.
- b) No.

Why or why not?

---

---

---

---

---

Thank you for your time.

Appendix C  
Interview Data Sample

Informant M

March 8, 1992

7:00 p.m. - his home

L Why did you get involved in the FP program?

M Well it was partly encouragement from my parents. It was Grade 9 and something like that you don't decide to do it on your own. But at that point I wasn't involved in a lot of things and it looked like something I'd like to do, and actually Japan and my dad's involvement there, it interested me.

L So how did your parents hear about it?

M I actually heard about it first, picked up the form, brought it home and I think that's when my parents read it and said it was a good idea.

L What did you know about the program when you were trying to decide?

M I think all they said was that you'd be using equipment up at the university, talking to people overseas, pretty much that. And it appealed to me cause I thought I'd get to know how to use all these computers and all that sort of stuff so.

L And when you got involved with the program what did you feel you were supposed to do as a participant?

M Um, well at first it was kind of confusing, like there were a lot of us at first, like too many I thought. Like more than 20, and that many people weren't needed for sure. So, but once we were split up onto groups it became clear what our goal was, and then it just took some encouragement. We were pretty young when it started so, you know it

took a little pushing. And we needed more pushing, and I think we would have got more done.

L Would you recommend the next time to use older kids?

M Yeah, definitely. In Grade 9 we didn't have the motivation to do the kind of stuff we were supposed to be doing.

L So what age?

M probably start around Grade 11 or 12.

L Would you have the time to do that in Grade 11 and 12?

M It depends. I think I would have had the time. I know someone like Tag wouldn't. It depends what things you are doing and you just have to make a choice I guess.

L So why do you think use older kids?

M Well because I think we can get more from it, we can learn more. I think at that point you know that you want to learn. That's when you want to do it so you're there to work hard. We fooled around a lot at the beginning and stuff so. And there's more self motivation when you're older.

L What do you think the purpose of the project was?

M Well, I think it shifted. At first it was definitely to get out the video tapes and slide shows and show people what we were doing. And towards the end it was more the exchange with the people from Thailand and Japan as the trip grew closer. And they came here and stuff it changed. But in the beginning it was definitely to get pictures and videos to all those people.

L And what do you think the purpose of all that was?

M I think that was just a different way of writing and talking to other people. and it should have been to teach you about these things as

well, cause that can be helpful, to use the equipment. But there were problems with that too. I think it was just a different way of trying to talk to other people.

L What was your initial attitude toward the program?

M I was excited about it. At first of course I wasn't too comfortable cause I didn't know too many people there so, you know I was uneasy. But as I got into it I liked going up there every week and doing that. I enjoyed it.

L And did your attitude change over time?

M There was a period when I didn't enjoy it. Like it was just sort of dragging. You got to that feeling cause two years is a while and I was starting to feel like I don't want to go up tonight.

L So what would you attribute that to? that slowness.

M Lack of a goal I think. You know you just got to a point where there wasn't, I don't know, there just was a, people were sort of doing stuff and you weren't. And Dr. Potter would come up and say come on we have to do this and you'd sort of drag yourself in there and do some more and go home. Like not having a specific goal. At that point we didn't know about the trip or anything so we were kind of like, why are we doing this?

L Is there anything other than having a specific goal that would have helped to motivate you? Like us working more closely with you guys and helping you more?

M I don't know, yeah, I think that would have helped because there were times when we were just there on our own and you know we goofed around a lot and stuff.

L Was FP a priority in your schedule or did other things come first?

M It was a priority for a long time, and there was a point where I wanted to do other things, but it was always pretty much a priority. It started to take up more time when we had to come in on weekends and stuff.

L Why do you think students like Brian and Brice etc withdrew from the program?

M There's a few reasons, I think it takes a lot of, I don't know what it is, but you have to stick with something like that, and some people just can't last that long with other things. Also, the two schools that were involved are like very cliquy and very snobby and when you get two groups together like that, people aren't going to always get along. And it became pretty clear at the end who was friends, and I think some of the people were, didn't get along too well, and that could be a reason as well. But I think, and also, because of the number of people. We didn't need all those people to do all that stuff, so there were people sort of floating around and didn't know what they were doing.

L So how could we get the floaters more involved next time?

M Well see the thing is is that there were dominant personalities where those people rose up to do the work and often felt like they were doing all the work. But, I don't like to harp on the amount of people, but if there had been say, only 6 people or something, split them up into two groups, that's just 3 people working closely together instead of 20 people with some people working harder than others. And personalities, people just don't get along and want to do their own thing. It isn't always good in that situation.

L Were you satisfied with the instruction you received regarding video production?

M Video production? Um, well I didn't do the video. So I wasn't satisfied. But I felt, when I look back now, slides shouldn't have been put in at all. That's old technology and it just wasn't needed. I think we should have had more instruction in computers. Although I think Paula tried and a lot of people didn't want to do it. But video was, well I couldn't edit today. Jason and Dana could.

L Why do you think people didn't get too interested in the computer stuff?

M I don't think, well some did, but personally I didn't see the value in it. I still don't get along with computers very well, so, when I was in grade 9 and 10 I was at the maturity level where it was, I don't want to do this, forget it. You know, why do I need this? So I just didn't.

L What would it have taken to motivate you more?

M That's hard to say. I think just that you just have to wake up and say, hey these things are gonna be around for a long time and I'm going to have to learn how to use them. In Grade 9 I wouldn't have said that at all.

L What about if we had said that you've got specific tasks to do, you've got a specific person to get in touch with in Japan, and really specific tasks?

M Yeah, then I probably would have said "Okay, I've got to do this," and went and did it. But I think back then when people were dropping out I might have done it too if I said "Hey I don't want to do this." I would have just dropped out. So you know I think a clear understanding of what had to be done at the beginning.

L Like expectations? Like knowing at the beginning?

M Yeah, cause we didn't know really what our expectations were. Mr. Potter was pretty nonchalant about it. He'd come up and say you guys don't worry everything is looking fine, and we'd be like, are you sure? He's such a free spirit. And that kind of trickled down.

L Um, did you get any instruction with the video at all?

M No, I used the cameras but I already knew how to do that.

L Another time would you have liked to have learned how to do more?

M Yeah, I would've, and looking back I would have rather been in video, cause I could use that skill today.

L In what ways?

M Well there's projects at school where you have options to use video and we have that equipment at school. And I think probably when I get to university and higher up, I'd want to use that as well.

L Were you satisfied with the final video production?

M The final video production was good. We could've, I think if more people had been working on it, there were only two in the end, I think we could've done more if we had been set. We could've made more footage. It should have been longer. Like if we had have been like a couple of small groups working together all along there could've been a lot more of it. What was done was good.

L Do you think that the video adequately represented the entire group?

M Well, no, not really. I don't think so because when two people do it I wouldn't expect them to. No it didn't really. I mean personally, it was pretty close to me, but I know other people it might not have been.

L So just getting more people involved in just putting it together?

M Right, or separate ones.

L Were you satisfied with the instruction you received regarding taking slides?

M Yeah, there was no problem with that, it was just so old. Even the equipment was old. And it was just, I think it was a waste of time basically, but as far as the instruction goes it was fine.

L Were you satisfied with the final slide presentation?

M No. It was really rushed in the end. And that was partly our fault too, we didn't get onto it fast enough. And I think the equipment we had, we could have got better equipment. And the stuff we were using was pretty old. And those guys had two TVs and stuff.

L So what else other than better equipment would have made the presentation better?

M Well with the slide presentation, its hard to say. I think a lot of people that started working on it and only a few finished it in the end. So you only got certain people's input, and poor Paula got really fed up I think in the end. And we all just sort of said forget it. You know. I think Jason and Dana stuck with it a little longer, long enough to get what they did. But also they had a smaller product and we were trying to do more and it just sort of fell apart.

L So what went wrong with it in the end?

M The presentation in Japan, there were technical things, and the recording of the words over the music was a real ordeal, that took a long time and that was just never really got down very well. Some of the photographs were really nice. and I think with modern equipment it could have been made into a nice show.

L So another time would you say toss out the slide production or not if we had better equipment?

M I would toss it out now. Back then you still could have used it, but nowadays its not worth it.

L So where would you like to see the emphasis on technology in the FP project?

M Videos and the computers, especially the computers.

L And using computers in what ways.?

M Computer technology like pictures and designs and all that sort of stuff. There was a while when they were working on designs to put in front of the videos and stuff, and if that had been done it could've been really nice. And that's what they're using now, computer art, all that sort of stuff.

L What about telecommunications, like communicating with the computer?

M Communicating with the computer. I think the fax machines was really beneficial. I learned how to use the fax machine. They're using those way more. And in Grade 9 I didn't know how to type so I didn't want to use the computer. But that's definitely good to know.

L Were you satisfied with the instruction you received regarding sound track production?

M The instruction was fine, just again, I know from studying music and the equipment I'm using now, that we could have had way better stuff.

L Were you satisfied with the instruction you received regarding language learning?

M Yeah, the instruction was fine but I felt sorry for the teachers that

tried. It was just a lack of motivation and caring on our part that failed. I knew Japanese already, and the Thai, I still don't know very much Thai. But it wasn't the instructor's fault. They came and did the best they could, although Chada and our group just did not get along. So she wouldn't have been the best choice for someone to teach it.

L So do you think just that age group or that she's just not a terribly good teacher?

M We didn't like her very much quite frankly, but I think to learn a language you gotta want to and most people didn't want to. So there wasn't much point there. And seeing as how everyone spoke English when we went away anyway I don't know if that was a waste of time or not. I mean you pick it up when you were there. I'm sure people learned more Thai in Thailand than from Chada.

L You weren't very motivated to learn it, how could we motivate people better another time?

M Eventually you want to learn the language because of the people you met there. You know I want to be able to talk to them in their language. So you gotta get people together before they're ever really going to want to learn it. Unless they have a specific goal like I want to be there so I need to know this. But there's not many people that would be that motivated to do something like that. So you gotta have a friend come over and speak to you and you go God I don't know how to do that, I wanna learn. That's usually what gets people going.

L So maybe get the overseas people here earlier?

M Yeah, once I got to know the people, especially since I got so close with the people in Thailand, I think if I had met them earlier I would have gotten more into it, made it more personal, and sent them

things. But that was all towards the end. Cause there was way more contact with people after they came than before because you don't know who you're writing to, you've just got someone's name and a picture and it doesn't mean anything.

L Yeah there wasn't much correspondence going on before and that was really what was intended.

M Yeah, I know, I know.

L So you knew Japanese?

M Yeah, I'd had 2 years by then, and the stuff he was going through was just repeat for me.

L So the instruction was basically OK?

M Yeah.

L But Chada wasn't that great?

M No she just didnt gel with the people in the program.

L And now in retrospect you think that it wasn't really that worthwhile.

M No, because we slept, we doodled and we didn't learn very much. I probably learned more with people living in their homes than having to learn how to say that in class.

L Where was English spoken most for you on the trip?

M My family in Thailand was fluent, everyone in English, and in Japan there was only one lady who could speak it. But I'd been to Japan before and I knew a lot of people speak English in Japan. But I was glad I knew Japanese from school.

L Do you think that learning languages like this at Ed Tech would have worked better if the students were a bit older.

M Yeah, I think so, but there's a really attitude. You either like taking different languages or you don't. So I don't know how to get around that. For me I really don't like languages that much.

L You were taught how to use e-mail?

M I was taught, but I couldn't do it now, I forgot pretty quick, I didn't use it really.

L Did you send messages to anybody?

M We faxed, we had a good time with the fax machines because they were easy, you just plug it in and write it. We didn't do the computer thing much at all. It was hard and no one really wanted to go in on their lunch time and stuff. And something about the computer at St. Mikes was bizarre, it was all over the place or something.

L So for you it was a hassle for you to use at the school?

M I never used the computer at the school, like back then it was in the computer lab and I didn't want to be seen with the people in the computer lab so I wasn't going to be going in there to use it.

L So you didn't use e-mail at all?

M No.

L Because it was a hassle? And you didn't have anyone to write to?

M No, I mean who was I going to send to? I didn't know anyone so.

L And if you knew someone to send to do you think you would have?

M I think it'd be kind of cool if I had a friend over there I could just do that and know it'd get there a lot quicker, I think I probably would have.

L So what means of communication did you use most frequently to communicate overseas?

M I just wrote, just mail. Like to my billet, I'd write and say how ya doin and he'd write back.

L Who did you write most to Japan or Thailand?

M Thailand cause they came here first of all, and we stayed longer in Thailand so we got to know them better, and you know we just got to be closer friends with the Thai kids.

L What was the point of doing the slide and video shows?

M I think its just another way of talking to people and showing them what its like, and its an interesting idea, there's other things we could've done. We could've made it more, like you could've shown youself saying hi, hey this is what its like here. You know, just diffrent ideas of talking to people.

L Do you think it would have been a better idea to make them more informal?

M Yeah, less multi-media professional, and more you know, I mean you can do a professional job on it, but the kind of stuff you do could have been a lot more to our age. We were trying really hard to do stuff that at our age, you know, you weren't into that sort of stuff, we were really trying to be a lot older than we were.

L And do more sophisticated stuff than you could?

M Yeah. Like it looked good and everything but I thing it lost the purpose of why we were trying to do it. Cause they were about the same age as us anyway so it wouldn't have made any difference. But there was like governments that wanted to see it and stuff, so you felt like you couldn't do that. When Dr. Potter would come up and say that people want to see this and my colleagues want to see this and you just went YIKES.

L So did you feel pressure in that sense?

M Yeah, we knew the government was supporting us and we didn't want to, like we felt bad when it didn't look good and stuff, but.

L Were you satisfied with the joint educational projects?

M Oh yeah, it was fun, it wasn't quite what we thought it was going to be. Apparently the Japanese people took it a lot more seriously than we did. We just went there and one day they said we have to do our joint projects. And I remember we made the whole thing up as we went along from ours. Jason and I did Women's rights. But they had stuff like charts and diagrams, but that's the Japanese for you, just a different way of doing things. But that threw us off, we didn't know what we were doing with that.

L So did you know before you went that you'd be expected to do something like that?

M We heard about it, but no one had really uh, I think some people like Lisa and stuff had gone and gotten some information, but we didn't really have really much. We knew about it, definitely we knew.

L But you didn't know what you'd be expected to do personally?

M I think we got to choose in the end some people had brought some stuff so they were doing certain things, but Jason and I didn't.

L Were you satisfied with the presentations that you guys did?

M Yeah, we talked and it was interesting, but the Japanese students weren't into it either. I mean, they were doing it because they were told to and we were at a camp in Japan and we just wanted to go out and swim and stuff. So we were stuck there in 33 degree heat to do these things and we did them but it's not what either of us would've wanted to be doing.

L What about the Thias, were they into it or not?

M I don't know, its hard to remember.

L What was the purpose of doing that then?

M Well, then again, the idea is sound, but taking a bunch of kids somewhere where they want to have fun and then trying to do that. I mean that was an adult thing, that was something that adults who signed up for some kind of program would do, not us.

L So when you said the idea was sound what did you mean?

M The idea of exchanging cultures, I mean all that stuff needs to be done in the world today, but it needs to be done at the university level I think.

L Do you think we could have played down the expectations and have the same sort of thing take place?

M Yeah, if, like you could just talk about it. Like we could be out playing baseball or doing whatever and say like this is what its like over in Canada. And you learn a lot of things about their country just through interaction. But sitting down and throwing out diagrams and stuff, I think the same thing is achieved just through doing stuff together.

L So do you think on the trips you guys had enough time to hang out and mingle?

M Yeah we had a lot of time. The trips were great, we had a great time.

L So the next time would you say to not do those educational presentations?

M I think that the way we did it in Japan, and where we did it, like there was a day when we got together and sat in a board room and that

would have been the best time to do it. But I think something like if they had taken us out somewhere where you could see the pollution and you could say hey this is what its like, and when we come home from a day in Bangkok and we washed our face and there was dirt all over our cloth we could say we knew. Just through practical experience we could've learned more than from sitting down and talking.

L Were you satisfied with the trips?

M Yeah it was really good when we actually went and to give credit to the people in Thailand and Japan, they had it really well planned. I felt bad, they had it more planned than we had when they came here. They were really organized when we were there.

L So did you feel prepared to go into a home in Japan?

M Yeah, I'd done it before. So I knew what to expect and I was prepared to do it. It wasn't so bad in Japan because it was a shorter time.

L And then what went on in Japan?

M The actual travel arrangements for the whole thing was just a joke the way it was set up. I guess one of the mothers was in on it, and the way we travelled was harsh. Getting there even, I left here at 6 in the morning and stayed in Seattle for 7 hours before we clocked a 9 1/2 hour flight to Japan where we caught a bus to a train, a train to another train that took us all the way up the island to Morioka. That was wrong, we should have never done that, for a group of kids. So that was pretty dumb, but when we got there the stuff they had for us was good. And we had people with us who had never travelled before and they had way too much stuff. I had to carry Dana's bag because she

couldn't even lift it. And I packed really light, but I had to walk through down town Tokyo with her stuff.

L So would you have liked more time in Japan?

M Morioka was fine, but I would have liked more time in Tokyo. That's where you get the feeling for Japan.

L How much more time?

M Just a couple days to see things.

L So maybe a week in Japan?

M Yeah. It was neat for me to go to places in Tokyo where I'd been before. There's a lot to see there so I think a couple more days would've been good.

L So what about in Thailand, did you feel any culture shock going into a home there?

M No, it was wonderful in Thailand because they spoke our language and they had so much money, we went to these huge houses bigger than here and driving around in these big cars. There was no culture shock, in fact we probably didn't get a very good flavor for Thailand because we were treated like royalty there and we stayed in the VIP lounges in the airport. And they took us around and we saw northern Thailand and the south and they were great.

L Would you have liked more time in Thailand?

M Well, we got to know the people really well and you always want to stay longer, but I don't know how much longer. You could've stayed another week, but after that people wouldn't want to be there.

L Was there anything you didn't like about the trip in Thailand?

M Not really no, it was just really good.

L Enough time to mingle with the kids?

M Yeah. We had enough time to do pretty much whatever we wanted.

L Has your involvement in FP changed your life at all?

M I certainly have friends now that, like the whole friendship thing, like I talk to Jason all the time and stuff. Not lately but I used to alot. and I think for some people it helped them to decide what they want to go into in university and stuff. I changed my focus, but I think, part of the stuff, like on resumes, it looks incredible. Its really helpful that way. And it gives you a taste of what its like to be in unversity. And you go, hey, I want to do this. I think its a good experience.

L And had it changed you in what you think you want to do with your life?

M Uh, if you'd asked me back then I would have said yeah. But now it hasn't. It sort of gave me a few things to think about. It doesn't now but it did.

L What about learning about other cultures, has that broadened your horizons?

M Travelling, as far as travelling goes, I want to go back there and stuff. Its good to have friends wherever you go. Cause I know I can always stay with them whenever I go back.

L So is there anything that really frustrated you about the whole program?

M There was a lot of grumblings and rumors going around and I don't know if it was true. Like we saw lots of things being bought and not being used, and I thing the way the trip was handled, the way things were arranged and all that. I really felt sorry for Mr. Murphy and Gardiner, and they had to take on a lot in the end. I felt in the end

Mr. Murphy took on a lot of work that he shouldn't have had to have done. But there were problems all the way through like some people doing more work than others, and when you get kids together at that age some people don't like others and there's all the small things too. So the smaller the group and the closer knit it is the better they'll work together in the end. But I liked the way the schools mixed. If it'd been all Oak Bay or SMU kids it wouldn't have been the same effect, because now I have friends elsewhere and that's really good.

L Do you think the way the meetings were organized had anything to do with what was going on in the program?

M Yeah, we needed more guidance definitely, like he'd come out and talk for an hour or something and say go for it guys and we'd all leave and we'd go to the concession and I think we needed more guidance. But that also comes with age, the age thing too. I mean you can't really expect a bunch of grade 9's to do some of the stuff that was expected of us. It wasn't realistic. Video editing is hard and we didn't want to do that, we just wanted to sit there and talk. It was very social and it was great, but it almost got to be too social. And it frustrated a lot of people cause some people would stop and say we've got to get this done, and others wouldn't. There was a lot of resentment about that. and other people got discouraged and I don't know. But basically it was a good experience and I'd recommend it to friends for sure.

Appendix D  
Examples of Condensed Participant Responses

Examples of Condensed Participant Responses to Interview Questions

Why did people become bored with the program?

| <u>Number of Responses</u> | <u>Types of Responses</u>   |
|----------------------------|---|
| 15                         | Got nothing done  |
| 12                         | Meeting format, GP's talks  |
| 12                         | Didn't know what we were supposed to do, had nothing to do, had no goal |
| 9                          | No structure  |
| 5                          | Failure, trying to do something and it never working                    |
| 3                          | Didn't know why we were doing things                                    |
| 1                          | Couldn't go on the trip   |
| 1                          | Felt the program wasn't going anywhere                                  |
| 1                          | There was too much time spent on it, it dragged.                        |

What would have motivated you to complete your work in the program?

| <u>Number of Responses</u> | <u>Types of Responses</u>   |
|----------------------------|---|
| 14                         | More deadlines, and shorter deadlines                                     |
| 13                         | Having a specific goal or purpose   |
| 13                         | Being told what to do, having something to do, knowing what we were doing |
| 8                          | Feeling like we were getting something done                               |

| <u>Number of Responses</u> | <u>Types of Responses</u>                                      |
|----------------------------|--|
| 8                          | Run it in the schools, make it more serious, get credit for it |
| 7                          | Discipline, ground rules, structure                            |
| 5                          | Getting more help  |
| 1                          | Smaller groups and rotating groups                             |
| 1                          | Less talking in information meetings                           |

What motivated you to communicate with the overseas partners?

| <u>Number of Responses</u> | <u>Types of Responses</u>   |
|----------------------------|---|
| 13                         | Communicated the most around travel time to billets, that was when we had someone to communicate with and a reason to communicate with them |
| 11                         | Didn't communicate much when we didn't know them  |
| 8                          | Communicated with them when we knew each other, like after a personal connection had been made with them                                    |
| 5                          | If we knew we were expected to we would have communicated more  |
| 4                          | Communicated the most with the first group that came from Japan   |

| <u>Number of Responses</u> | <u>Types of Responses</u>  |
|----------------------------|--|
| 3                          | Lost interest after a lot of failed attempts to send messages  |
| 3                          | If their English was better we would've communicated more  |
| 2                          | I communicated mostly with the Thais because they came first and we stayed longer there                |
| 2                          | I wasn't going on the trip so I couldn't see any point   |
| 2                          | It was awkward to pick a letter and write, not much to say when you don't know them                    |
| 1                          | Would have been more interested if the means of communication was more convenient                      |
| 1                          | Not interested in pen pals, lost interest  |
| 1                          | It took too long to initially establish groups overseas so there was no one to write to for months     |
| 1                          | We should have sent posters of ourselves first to introduce ourselves using pictures to get it started |

Frequency of use of Communication Technologies:

| <u>Most</u> | <u>2nd Most</u> | <u>Least</u> |
|-------------|-----------------|--------------|
| 8 - Fax     | 3 - Fax         | 1 - Fax      |
| 2 - E-mail  | 3 - E-mail      | 2 - E-mail   |
| 8 - Letters | 4 - Letters     | 2 - Letters  |

Would you like the program connected more closely with your school and school work?

| <u>Number of Responses</u> | <u>Types of Responses</u>  |
|----------------------------|--|
| 16                         | Yes - Needed to be run out of school, get credit, marks, do it for their teacher, they'd take it more seriously, put more into it if it was for school |
| 1                          | It would be a bonus but its not necessary  |

Comments which emerged regarding student discipline.

| <u>Number of Responses</u> | <u>Types of Responses</u>   |
|----------------------------|---|
| 8                          | We needed to be told what to do and when to get it done by. "We were told to set our own deadlines but we never took them seriously because we made them, so it was easy for us to break them too." |
| 6                          | If we were told we had to do it, if it was made like more of an obligation  |
| 3                          | If its totally strict then people will rebel and quit   |
| 3                          | It was too flexible and it was abused   |
| 2                          | We needed to find a happy medium between being strict and flexible and never found it   |
| 2                          | Needed to be self disciplined, self motivated   |

Appendix E  
Data From Japanese Future Partners

Data Obtained from the Questionnaires from the Morioka Future Partners

15 Questionnaires were returned to Victoria; 12 student responses and 3 adult responses.

1. Why did you become involved in the Future Partners Program?

| <u>Number of Responses</u> | <u>Types of Responses</u>                                       |
|----------------------------|---|
| 9                          | I wanted to learn about and meet students/teachers from Canada. |
| 7                          | It sounded interesting.   |
| 6                          | To gain experience that would help me in my education.          |
| 6                          | To gain experience that would help me in my future career.      |
| 4                          | I wanted to learn how to speak English.                         |
| 4                          | I wanted to travel to Canada.                                   |

2. What were the most enjoyable parts of the program for you?

| <u>Number of Responses</u> | <u>Types of Responses</u>   |
|----------------------------|---|
| 10                         | Making new friends in the Future Partners group in Victoria.      |
| 7                          | Learning about global issues from the joint educational projects. |
| 6                          | Making new friends in my Future Partners group in Japan.          |

- 5 Travelling to Canada to meet the Victoria Future Partners.
- 4 Improving my ability to speak English.
- 3 Learning how to speak English.
- 3 Having the Victoria Future Partners staying with me.

3. What means of communication did you use to communicate with the Victoria Future Partners?

| <u>Number of Responses</u> | <u>Types of Responses</u> |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| 14                         | Letters                   |
| 5                          | Fax                       |
| 5                          | Electronic Mail           |
| 3                          | Video                     |

4. Did you have a choice in what means of communication you could use to communicate with the Victoria Future Partners?

| <u>Number of Responses</u> | <u>Types of Responses</u> |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| 12                         | Yes                       |
| 3                          | No                        |

5. Would you become involved in a program like this again?

| <u>Number of Responses</u> | <u>Types of Responses</u> |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| 14                         | Yes                       |
| 1                          | Not sure                  |

## VITA

Surname: Kilby

Given Names: Elizabeth Louise

Place of Birth: Vancouver, British Columbia

Date of Birth: 30/10/65

### Educational Institutions Attended:

|                        |           |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Okanagan College       | 1983-1984 |
| University of Victoria | 1985-1988 |
|                        | 1988-1990 |
|                        | 1990-1992 |

### Degress Awarded:

|       |                        |      |
|-------|------------------------|------|
| BA.   | University of Victoria | 1988 |
| B.Ed. | University of Victoria | 1990 |

PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant the right to lend my thesis to users of the University of Victoria Library, and to make single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the Library of any other university, or similar institution, on its behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or a member of the University designated by me. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of Thesis: Towards a Better Understanding of How To Conduct and Evaluate Educational Exchanges

Author:



-----  
(Signature)

*Elizabeth Kilby*  
-----

(Name)

*Sept 02/92*  
-----

(Date)