

Assessing Courses of the Online Learning Agreement

2.1 Desk study report

Evaluative methods used in higher education and needs of teachers from Erasmus+ courses

Authors:

Dr. De Kool, Researcher, Risbo
Van Leeuwen, Researcher, Risbo

28/11/2023

The European Commission's support for the production of this 'publication' does not constitute an endorsement of the contents, which reflect the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.



Co-funded by
the European Union



Table of contents

<i>Table of contents</i>	2
<i>Introduction</i>	3
<i>Method</i>	3
<i>Literature review</i>	4
Conclusions	9
<i>Empirical results digital interviews</i>	10
Conclusions	15
<i>Literature</i>	16
<i>Appendix 1: Topic list digital interviews</i>	18
<i>Appendix 2: Respondents digital interviews</i>	19





Introduction

AsCOLA is an acronym which stands for “Assessing Courses of the Online Learning Agreement”. An Erasmus+ Key Action 2 project, AsCOLA aims to enhance and digitalize the quality framework of Erasmus+ student mobility and contribute to closing the data gap in the quality aspect of higher education transformation. The project will help higher education institutions (HEIs) better monitor and assess their institutional performance in education activities related to their internationalization strategy and policy.

The project will achieve these objectives through multiple activities, namely:

- Creating an evaluation methodology of the courses offered to Erasmus+ students.
- Developing and piloting an online evaluation tool connected to the Online Learning Agreement.
- Carrying out training sessions and producing train-the-trainers material to equip HEIs with the necessary knowledge to use the tool effectively.

Furthermore, the project will give special attention to including the quality aspect of student mobility in the data exchange that currently takes place within the European Student Card Initiative and the Erasmus Without Paper Network.

To achieve the first goal of creating an evaluation methodology of the courses offered to Erasmus+ students, it's important to get more insight on how student evaluations (and specifically from exchange students) are performed in other higher education institutions and what teachers of Erasmus+ students needs and expectations are from an evaluation method. To get insight on these aspects, a desk study was performed. In this report, the outcomes on both goals are discussed.

Method

The first step was performing a desk study. We used Google Scholar to find relevant and current articles in scientific journals about evaluation in higher education and specifically focused on exchange students (see literature list). We focused on examples and research from not only European Union (EU) countries, but also outside of the EU. Students from the EU often travel to universities outside of the EU as part of an exchange program, where the same difficulties could arise. Since the amount of available literature on the topic is limited, it is good to also have a look at literature from outside the EU to have a broader view on the topic. The outcomes will be presented in chronological order.

The European Commission's support for the production of this 'publication' does not constitute an endorsement of the contents, which reflect the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.



Co-funded by
the European Union



Second, we used digital interviews with teachers of Erasmus+ students to get more information on the needs of teachers when it comes to evaluations from Erasmus+ students. Five digital interviews were conducted in week 16 and week 20 2023 (see appendix 1 and 2 for the interviewed respondents and topic list used). The main results will be discussed in this report.

Literature review

Montgomery & McDowell (2009) examined the social experiences of international students in the UK higher education and the relationships between their social networks and their academic experiences and success. The aim of this article was to present a different perspective on the sociocultural experience of international students in UK higher education. The authors challenge the view that international students need to develop social and academic exchange with UK students to get the most from their university experience. The international community of practice described here presents a picture of a more positive and active international student experience, with international students as the providers of support and knowledge within a supportive and purposeful student community. The research suggests that the rather superficial relationships the international students may have with UK students do not appear to be a disadvantage, and the strong and purposeful bonds they develop with their international network provides them with a supportive learning environment.

Souto-Otero et al. (2013) have analysed the importance of barriers to mobility and examined differences between Erasmus and non- Erasmus students based on a large data set that included data across seven countries. The results underline the effect of social and personal variables as a differentiating factor between Erasmus and non-Erasmus students. They especially highlight the importance of social and personal considerations that relate to balancing the risks (credit recognition, costs) and benefits and to managing personal anxieties (social factors). Finally, the study revealed significant differences regarding barriers by degree sought; students at different levels use very different decision criteria, an aspect that has so far been largely underplayed in both Erasmus-related research and program design.

Wu et al. (2015) presented the empirical results of a qualitative study that explored the following research questions:

1. What are international students' academic, social, cultural struggles in Texas?
2. What support and resources are needed for overcoming these struggles?





The findings revealed that international students encountered different challenges in the US. They must deal with the people, society, school, psychological status, and behavioural changes to adapt to the new environment. Findings will be categories from academic, social, and cultural aspects. Under academic struggle, there were four themes related to their difficulties in academic learning. Based on the findings of this study, recommendations for higher education institutions in the US on how to assist international students in becoming successful were generated.

1. Firstly, colleges and universities should have an English program for international students to support their language proficiency. Language barriers could affect students' academic learning, participation in different events, and cultural understanding. Universities can host workshops where international students become familiar with the use of colloquial English, commonly used slang words, and the social and cultural mores of the US society to communicate effectively both in academic and in non-academic settings.
2. Secondly, for US students and faculty, they should be aware of the value of embracing international students and appreciating the diversity from each other. For example, schools could host orientation programs for learning from international students. Faculty should consider the equal access and learning opportunities for all students. American students also need to develop intercultural competence to interact with international students such as providing training for staff, who will work with international students.
3. Thirdly, tutoring and counselling are expected because international students need guidance to succeed in their academic learning, and their psychological stress should be supported.
4. Fourthly, universities should offer international students a special orientation about US culture and overall academic culture. Such efforts might include seminars by professionals, international students telling of their own experiences in the US, and organizations where friendship ties can be developed with local people.

Mikkonen et al. (2016) conducted a systematic review of qualitative studies. The aim of this systematic review was to identify culturally and linguistically diverse healthcare students' experiences of learning in a clinical environment. The culturally and linguistically diverse healthcare students' learning experiences were divided into three influential aspects of learning in a clinical environment: experiences with implementation processes and provision; experiences with peers and mentors; and experiences with university support and instructions. The main findings indicate that culturally and linguistically diverse healthcare





students embarking on clinical placements initially find integration stressful. Implementing the process of learning in a clinical environment requires additional time, well prepared pedagogical orientation, prior cultural and language education, and support for students and clinical staff. Barriers to learning by culturally and linguistically diverse healthcare students were not being recognized and individuals were not considered motivated; learners experienced the strain of being different and faced language difficulties. Clinical staff attitudes influenced students' clinical learning experiences and outcomes. Additional education in culture and language for students and clinical staff is considered essential to improve the clinical learning experiences of culturally and linguistically diverse healthcare students.

Shen et al. (2017) published an article that aims to analyse the experiences and gains of Chinese doctoral exchange students in seven EU countries sponsored by the China Scholarship Council (CSC). The authors applied a mixed method, namely survey data and a series of semi-structured interviews. They found that international mobility during the period of doctoral training is invaluable. The benefits of Chinese Exchange PhD students in Europe during their overseas study stem from several sources: high-quality academic supervision, deep academic participation, the socialization of academic norms, a deeper understanding of local cultures and so on. According to the exchange Ph.D. students they interviewed, European supervisors have better research capabilities and international vision than domestic ones. In general, they offer high-quality academic supervision to the students. They not only give supervision on the research methods and perspectives, but also play an important role in building an international academic network and well-developed academic standards for the students. The overseas study experience has an impact on the students' research output and career development, and their future working methods and attitudes as well. An advisor is critical for a successful abroad studying experience.

Cacheiro-Gonzalez et al. (2019) used a mixed method approach to discover student's perceptions from the School of Education about the use of the learning platform to improve educational processes in distance higher education. The main research objectives of the study were to identify the student perceptions using the learning platform in distance education, to analyse the didactic interaction through the learning platform and to propose keys to instructional design of the learning platform: course components and communication tools. The analysis provides guidelines for improving the use of the learning platform in distance higher education regarding strengths (student's exchange, and independent learning) and weaknesses (feedback delay, and content repository).





Tsoukalas (2019) defended a PhD thesis about social identity, community, and learning among Erasmus exchange students. The aim of this study was to investigate the Erasmus Program in two European cities, namely Stockholm and Athens. Although most students are generally not well integrated in the host country, the Erasmus Program nonetheless offers a thorough training in handling the cultural diversity and local variations that can be found within the boundaries of the European Union. Many Erasmus students, especially those from southern Europe, have limited linguistic skills. It adds to the burden of living in a foreign country and creates a certain amount of alienation. Despite this, Erasmus students do not generally shy away from their group and seek out the company of their compatriots, at least not to the same degree as many other groups of travellers. Faced with this predicament the students must also rely on other means of communication besides verbal language in their attempts to understand each other and coordinate their common life. Gestures, body language, metaphors and speech acts all come to the fore and help the young students interpret and organise their newfound reality. Communicative action, hence, coordinates behaviour towards social integration and solidarity and in so doing both creates and renews cultural knowledge and social identities. The Erasmus students are a wonderful illustration of this process. Their special life circumstances potentiate the process of communicative action and give rise to a distinct life world. The process starts immediately upon arrival and develops quickly into a comprehensive network of mutual recognition, information sharing, practical assistance, and emotional support. The Erasmus Program is a learning experience.

Bozbay et al. (2020) investigate international students' perception and satisfaction toward Turkish universities' service quality. The authors used a questionnaire to collect data from their respondents. Based on the findings of this study, international students are not satisfied with the service quality of higher education in Turkey. To clarify the results, the poor performing aspect of universities in Turkey is related to support of non-academic staff, which means engagement between non-academic staff and international students' needs to be improved. One possible reason for this dissatisfaction among international students is the language barrier. International students perceive that most support staff in Turkish universities lack communication skills in English. On the other hand, there is a relatively small gap between expectation and perception regarding academic staff in Turkey. The authors recommend that universities in Turkey should reinforce the importance of language and train support staff in terms of language and communication skills.

Horváth (2020) considered the quality of higher education (focusing on teaching and learning) from the students' point of view and tried to create an empirically





reasonable framework for understanding different customer needs and satisfaction from an organizational psychology approach. Horváth applied a marketing approach (GAP model) to discover the psychological contract (implicit expectations and obligations) of Hungarian higher education students, exploring their expectations, satisfaction, obligations, and self-image. Horváth concluded that it is beneficial for the Higher Education Institutions to uncover their students' implicit psychological contract to better manage the learning experience. This approach is a university-wide undertaking, which involves management, administrative and teaching aspects as well. It goes one step further from common student evaluation of teaching methods which could contribute to staff development.

Lee & Stewart (2022) investigated the relationship between gender and study level using the push-pull model among four pull factor dimensions:

- a. Appeal of Korea
- b. Experiential Motivations
- c. Social Network Influences
- d. and Institutional Appeal.

Short-term exchange students showed that Experiential Motivations was the most salient pull factor dimension in general. A 2x3 analysis of variance indicated statistically significant differences by gender and study level among the four pull factor dimensions. They conclude by discussing mobility programs and the need to account for the different motivations of potential students typologically to design policies and programs more effectively. In this study, exchange students were attracted to destination characteristics more than institutional ones. Ultimately, rather than homogenize international students as a singular entity, mobility programs should take the different motivations of potential students by type into account, in addition to other characteristics such as national/regional origins to design policies and programs more effectively. Thus, institutions or departments may want to focus efforts first and foremost on experiences for short-term exchange students as a practical starting point; this would be particularly pragmatic if only limited financial or human resources are available.

Levatino (2022) published an article that aims to better understand the factors that drive exchange students to a particular destination. A conjoint experiment was conducted among students at a Spanish public university allows estimating in an unbiased way the isolated effect of different destination attributes on the destination choice, as well as evaluating their relative importance and comparing different subgroups of students. The results show that the leisure dimension plays a crucial role. University reputation also matters, particularly in the case of academically high-performing students. Recommendations received by

The European Commission's support for the production of this 'publication' does not constitute an endorsement of the contents, which reflect the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.



Co-funded by
the European Union



networks are more important for those who have never lived abroad or attended an international or foreign school.

Conclusions

- Exchange students can have weak relationships with other students, but strong bonds with other (international) students that provide them with a supportive learning environment.
- Social and personal variables play an important role in the mobility of international (exchange) students and their decisions to study abroad (for a short or longer time).
- International (exchange) students will have to deal with academic challenges (for example different academic norms and standards), social (for example language barriers and communication with staff and peers), and cultural challenges (for example understanding different local cultures).
- The (supportive) role of academic staff can have an impact on the satisfaction of international (exchange) students.
- The destination and practical facilities have an impact on the satisfaction of international (exchange) students too.
- The quality of education is important too, but a fundamental part of regular evaluation of courses already.





Empirical results digital interviews

The biases of respondents are a (potential) problem in the evaluation process: *“There are several biases that can occur throughout these student evaluations”* (respondent 1). One example is when students did not get a good mark, then they can deliberately fill in a negative assessment of the course. The same goes for students that received good grades: *“When they are happy with the grade that they are getting, then their evaluation is quite schematic and it's just like everything is great”* (respondent 3). And when their grades are low, they are more critical about the course. Biases can also be the result of *“immediate needs and personal preferences”* of students (respondent 3).

Another problem can be the length of (central) evaluation questionnaires: *“The central one is quite long and tedious. So that's why I have a very short questionnaire too”* (respondent 1). This own additional evaluation has several benefits: *“It is really helpful because it's more detailed compared to the central one. So, it provides me with meaningful information as a teacher. So, I know what to change or what to consider. And because I do it in the middle of the semester, I am able to make changes based on the results and then I think that's very important. The central (standard) evaluation is only at the end of the course”* (respondent 1).

A challenge for (busy) teachers is to find time to reflect on or to discuss the results from evaluations with colleagues and that is a pity: *“It would be very important and very helpful for professional development”* (respondent 1).

Evaluations can be quantitative (closed questions) or qualitative (open questions). *“The central (standard) evaluation mainly has closed questions”* (respondent 1). Some issues can be changed by individual teacher, but other factors cannot, for example the composition of the group of students: *“What kind of group comes together is totally random”* (respondent 1) So when students have negative experiences within the group or complain about the social dynamics within the group, it is mainly beyond control of the teachers: *“So for this that I cannot influence what kind of student groups goes together and comes together. So, this is still an important aspect, but I cannot do anything about it”* (respondent 1). The influence of teachers on the content of a specific course can also be limited: *“I have a strict syllabus to follow”* (respondent 1). Another respondent referred to the required literature in that context: *“I won't change the book. The book will stay, but maybe the format of the class will be changed a little”* (respondent 2).

The same goes for academic facilities and digital infrastructure. The facilities at universities in rich(er) countries are often better than the facilities at universities in poor(er) countries.

The European Commission's support for the production of this 'publication' does not constitute an endorsement of the contents, which reflect the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.



Co-funded by
the European Union



The respondents have mixed opinions about the question whether exchange students should be treated as a specific group within evaluation questionnaires. *"It would be worthwhile to assess them differently. I think it would be beneficial for the teachers to treat them as a different group and have an idea about their own special perspective"* (respondent 1). Another respondent does not agree with this and highlights the importance of equal treatment of all students: *"Everybody is treated on the same level"* (respondent 2). Respondent 5 observed that *"there are no specific questions for exchange students in evaluation forms"* and that it can perhaps be a good idea to *"introduce it"*.

Exchange students with different cultural backgrounds have different attitudes towards giving and getting feedback for example. Language barriers could also have an impact on the interaction between (exchange) students and with their teachers: *"There are language barriers for sure (...) Language barriers can also have an impact on the interaction within the group if they have language barriers, they maybe then have less interaction than they really are done"* (respondent 2). It can be difficult for students to express themselves properly when they speak insufficient English. The language gap can be widened if courses are not offered in English, but in the language of the country where the exchange students reside. During the digital interviews examples were given from courses being provided in native language only, so exchange students could not follow these courses. The same goes for the language used in evaluation forms. *"So, language is extremely important for exchange students"* (respondent 5). Nowadays, many universities changed their policy and started to offer more courses in English, also for native students. This is beneficial for both exchange students and regular students: *"Regular students could interact with the exchange students (...) It is more beneficial (for both) and more inclusive, because they have the opportunity to interact and become friends with others (...) Having these (English) courses which are offered to all students, both the exchange and the great students give them this wonderful opportunity to mix, interact, work together, acquire skills, intercultural skills, for example, and communication skills and that's extremely important"* (respondent 5). Social interactions are *"extremely important for both academic and personal development"* of all students and will lead to a *"true learning experience"*.

Respondent 3 considers that evaluations should distinguish between academic feedback and other personal needs, such as financial, logistical, and practical needs. *"There are other channels and facilities to deal with this kind of experiences. It is not a task of academic staff to support the personal life of (exchange) students."*





Measures to stimulate response rates can be controversial. One given example is that respondents will receive some points when they have completed the questionnaire. These points can be used to be at the beginning of a list for activities where a maximum number of students are allowed to go there, for example seminars. Then students do not have good motives to fill in questionnaires carefully: *"The students just click, click, click and don't really provide really real answers"* (respondent 1).

A controversial issue is that certain students can positively rate and evaluate courses that are not difficult. These are students who want to earn their credits in a simple way. Their positive ratings say nothing about the academic level of a course. The course obligations and credits that students can get for the same amount of work may differ per country and this can become a point of contention.

Another controversial issue can be that students could have the perception that their answers are not (completely) anonymous: *"In the past I've handed my own system in a paper format to them so they could fulfil it at the end of the class. But you know my presence there could influence them as well in that regard, although it's totally anonymous. But still, if it's in paper the handwritten thing more or less could be identified"* (respondent 1). Because of these concerns, the respondent has transferred the paper format to a digital tool.

The evaluation topics also depend on the focus of the courses. *"Most of my courses are based on the interaction between me and students, so these are practical courses. For me, it is very important that the students are interactive and proactive"* (respondent 2). When interaction and reflection are important in courses, then these elements should be included in the evaluation survey of this course. Another respondent considers the well-being of students to be an important point of attention: *"I ask my students how they felt during the course and how did they relate to each other"* (respondent 3). Another respondent meets with them from time to time: *"I do get to have informal meetings with them and ask them where they are, how they stand, if they have any problems"* (respondent 4). Communication with the students is very important. However, offline and online communication is a time-consuming activity for professors and could be a major obstacle: *"Professors are already bombarded with hundreds of emails"* (respondent 4). This could be a reason for slow or late responding to mails from (exchange) students.

Against this background a distinction can or should be made between non academic and academic issues. Examples of non academic issues are personal needs, financial issues, or practical matters such as housing. Universities are responsible for academic issues. *"It could not be institutionalized that the*

The European Commission's support for the production of this 'publication' does not constitute an endorsement of the contents, which reflect the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.



Co-funded by
the European Union



academic staff is supporting the personal life of (exchange) students.”
(respondent 3).

Another challenge is to make or find time for faculty and staff members to learn from the evaluation results. *“I think it differs from faculty to faculty. So of course, I can only speak about our faculty in that regard. Here, there is no formal situation where we for example sit down and discuss the results. Unfortunately, although I think personally it would be very important and very helpful for professional development”* (respondent 1). Other respondents recognize themselves in this observation: *“Thoughts and ideas about improving courses (...) are usually lost in the ocean of tasks when you have a lot of things to do”* (respondent 2). Therefore, it might be a good idea to create a standard way to discuss the ideas to improve courses with other colleagues. Another respondent highlighted the importance of a real dialogue with students about their experiences on given issues: *“We have a lively dialogue with the students of our own Master program about their experiences”* (respondent 3). This implies close contacts with students and has an important advantage: *“This kind of evaluation is much more direct and clear”* (respondent 3).

The timing of evaluation is important. *“The central standard evaluation is only at the end of the course.”* (respondent 1). A disadvantage of evaluation at the end of courses is that there is no room for interventions based on feedback during courses. Evaluations can also take place at the end of the stay of exchange students *“which means that they're more in a hurry to live than to study and to do the exams and to live then to actually discuss how the course went”* (respondent 4). At the end of their stay abroad, their focus is to get their credits and to return to their homeland. In this context investing time in evaluations is not their priority. *“They only care about doing the exams and then they're gone anyway, so they don't really care”* (respondent 4). Nevertheless, it is important to organize evaluations on a regular basis. *“That's why this [AsCOLA] project is so important and very valuable”* (respondent 4).

Several respondents have made a distinction between (standardized) 'formal' evaluations and 'informal' evaluations. Important topics in formal evaluations are the quality of the course, teaching methods and interaction with the professors or instructors. In informal evaluations, more attention is often given to social and personal development and well-being. In evaluations, a distinction can also be made between things that are objectively measurable and things that are subjective in nature. Some respondents say that they are eager to know how students 'felt' during the course. It is often easier to evaluate such personal issues informally than formally. The importance of having a real dialogue with students during evaluations has been pointed out.





Exchange students don't have academic ambitions only, but are also looking for pleasant experiences abroad: *"They want to have fun as well (...) They are always asking for exceptions to the specific dates that they have to be present in the school (...) They always have their own program, and they are always asking for more"* (respondent 4). Their needs for flexible arrangements are not easy for the professors. The need for flexible arrangement can also have practical reasons. One example could be the schedule for re-examinations. Sometimes students can't do the re-examination because they have already left the university to go back home. Sometimes these students can redo the exams when they are back in their own country, but this requires specific (technical) arrangements. *"In order to be flexible, it takes a lot of time from the professors"* (respondent 4). Some professors are more flexible than others. Respondent 4 is very clear about this: *"The key word for me is always flexibility"*.

Students can have different motivations to follow specific courses. Some have intrinsic motivations and 'want' to follow while others 'have' to follow to get their credit points. *"When the criterium was to get the ECTS and they got it, then they are satisfied and don't care about anything else"* (respondent 4). Evaluations can help to get insight into their motivations.





Conclusions

- The respondents have indicated that language barriers (if any) are an issue to be addressed in the survey.
- The respondents have observed that exchange students often have a need for flexible arrangements (for (re)exams, for example). In doing so, they also appeal to the flexibility of lecturers, who are unable or unwilling to provide this for all.
- The respondents emphasized the importance of interactions between regular and exchange students because these contacts enrich the learning experiences of all students. This could also be a relevant issue in the survey.
- The risk of biases is always lurking. Students who pass the course are often less critical than students who fail a course. Their assessment therefore sometimes says more about current satisfaction with the end result than the quality of education. These two aspects must therefore be decoupled in the survey.
- The timing at which evaluations are conducted is relevant. At the end of a course can be problematic for exchange students as they may have already left for their country of origin. Moreover, feedback afterwards cannot be used to adjust courses in the meantime.
- Evaluation is not an end in itself. That is why it is important that lecturers are given and take time to jointly reflect on the outcomes and points for improvement.
- The respondents have mixed opinions about the question whether exchange students should be treated as a specific group or not.
- In the survey a distinction can or should be made between academic feedback and personal experiences and needs of exchange students (like financial, logistical, and practical issues).
- Formal (written) evaluations ideally do not preclude informal (oral) evaluations.
- Exchange students may have different motives for studying abroad. It is important to reveal their motives in the survey.





Literature

Bozbay, Z., Baghirov, F., Zhang, Y., Rasli, A., & Karakasoglu, M. (2020). International students' service quality evaluations towards Turkish universities. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 28(3), 151-164.

Cacheiro-Gonzalez, M. L., Medina-Rivilla, A., Dominguez-Garrido, M. C., & Medina-Dominguez, M. (2019). The learning platform in distance higher education: Student's perceptions. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, 20(1), 71-95.

Horváth, L. (2020). Psychological contract profiling for managing the learning experience of higher education students. *European Journal of Higher Education*, 10(4), 377-396.

Lee, K., & Stewart, W. H. (2022). Destination, Experience, Social Network, and Institution: Exploring Four Academic Exchange Pull Factor Dimensions at a University in the Republic of Korea. *Journal of International Students*, 12(4), 889-908.

Levatino, A. (2022). What do exchange students value when choosing a destination for their study period abroad? A conjoint experiment. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 1-20.

Mikkonen, K., Elo, S., Kuivila, H. M., Tuomikoski, A. M., & Kääriäinen, M. (2016). Culturally and linguistically diverse healthcare students' experiences of learning in a clinical environment: A systematic review of qualitative studies. *International journal of nursing studies*, 54, 173-187.

Montgomery, C., & McDowell, L. (2009). Social networks and the international student experience: An international community of practice?. *Journal of studies in international education*, 13(4), 455-466.

Shen, W. Q., Liu, D., & Chen, H. (2017). Chinese Ph. D. students on exchange in European Union countries: Experiences and benefits. *European Journal of Higher Education*, 7(3), 322-335.

Souto-Otero, M., Huisman, J., Beerkens, M., De Wit, H., & Vujić, S. (2013). Barriers to international student mobility: Evidence from the Erasmus program. *Educational researcher*, 42(2), 70-77.

Tsoukalas, I. (2019). *Apprentice Cosmopolitans: Social identity, community, and learning among ERASMUS exchange students* (Doctoral dissertation, Socialantropologiska institutionen, Stockholms universitet).





Wu, H. P., Garza, E., & Guzman, N. (2015). International student's challenge and adjustment to college. *Education Research International*, 2015.





Appendix 1: Topic list digital interviews

General

- Which courses do you provide for students?
- Who takes these courses? Which type of student? (national students/international students or combination)

To evaluate

- How do you evaluate your courses?
 - How do you do this formally?
 - How do you do this informally?
- Which concrete aspects (of education/course) do you evaluate?
 - What specific questions do you (or would you) ask international students? Why?

Reflection on evaluation

- What goes well in the evaluation?
 - What goes less well in the evaluation?
- What is needed to make the evaluation process work better?
 - Which concrete aspects should be examined more in an evaluation?
- What should we not forget for the evaluation tool of the experiences of exchange students?





Appendix 2: Respondents digital interviews

- Dr. Erzsébet Csereklye
 - Position: assistant professor
 - Institution: Eötvös Loránd University, Faculty of Education and Psychology, Institute of Intercultural Psychology and Education

- Prof.dr. Sofia-Eleftheria Gonida
 - Position: full professor
 - Institution: Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, School of Psychology

- Dr. Viktória Kenyhercz
 - Position: PhD student
 - Institution: Eötvös Loránd University, Faculty of Education and Psychology

- Dr. László Horváth
 - Position: assistant professor
 - Institution: Eötvös Loránd University, Faculty of Education and Psychology, Institute of Education

- Prof.dr. Alexandros Triantafyllidis
 - Position: professor
 - Institution: Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, School of Biology

