

Motivating Students in Agribusiness to Participate in Experiences Abroad

Cheryl J. Wachenheim¹

Department of Agricultural Economics, 207C Morrill Hall, North Dakota State University, Fargo, ND
58105-5636, cwachenh@ndsuext.nodak.edu

and

William C. Lesch

Department of Marketing, Campus Box 5590, Williams Hall, Illinois State University
Normal, IL 61790, wclesch@ilstu.edu

¹ Our thanks are extended to the faculty and staff at Ecole Superieure d'Agriculture d'Angers who have helped open the world for our students. And, to Ed and Maggie, who finally learned to come in from the cold, but who have not yet realized one cannot walk across a river not yet frozen.

Motivating Students in Agriculture to Participate in Experiences Abroad

ABSTRACT

However gradual, institutes of higher education have made progress toward internationalizing their curriculums. Student participation in work and study abroad activities is an important component of these efforts. Educators and agribusiness professionals play an important role in motivating students to work or study in a foreign country. Educators can create and identify existing funding sources for and more effectively market international experiences to students, faculty, and administrators. They can ensure that students not only receive academic credit for their international experiences, but also that the experiences satisfy their expectations. Agribusiness professionals can provide financing, demonstrate flexibility as employers of participant students, increase the visibility of firms' participation to top management and owners, and work with educators to develop relevant international experiences.

INTRODUCTION

“N’etre jamais sorti de son trou”

A French idiom meaning to have never been out of one’s backyard

Cassagne, 1996, p. 87

International business is a fixture of American life; however, unless economic or social exigencies so dictate, few of us consider the sources of goods we use daily. Because the average consumer is completely insulated from all prior, multiple transactions – save the final purchase, the complex system of processes behind their origination and final distribution escape most Americans entirely. Surely, such reflects the experience of the average agribusiness student’s experience; consequently, it is one challenge facing

agribusiness educators as they mold tomorrow's managers and leaders. The agribusiness curricula should be revised to develop students' capacity for thinking globally and appreciating economic and cultural diversities and their impact on business.

Internationalizing the agribusiness curriculum represents an important and pressing objective for educators. Worldwide, economies are increasingly dependent on international trade as a source of growth. As more firms market to and receive resources from a variety of nations, today's students will more likely become involved in international commerce during their careers (Tillery et al., 1994). Those who recognize the growing scope of diversity of consumption and factors of production, including labor, will be better prepared to succeed. Arguably, the best source of such insight is experience. International experience creates an appreciation for the global dimension of agriculture and the importance of communication between the world's people (Woods and Miller, 1995).

The purpose of this paper is to assist those charged with assessing and developing programs intended to accomplish the goal of curricular internationalization by providing an action plan for increasing student involvement in perhaps its most effective component, programs for study and work abroad. First, background information is provided on methods used and progress made in internationalizing business curriculums in the United States. Second, the analogous need for internationalization of agribusiness education and the institutional environment within which it must occur are discussed. Finally, within the context of situational analysis, an action plan for implementing programs including experience abroad is presented.

THE INTERNATIONALIZATION OF BUSINESS CURRICULUMS

In the early 1970s, the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), the primary accrediting group in business curricula, began requiring that member schools formally emphasize international issues in their business curricula (Lundstrom, 1996; Kedia and Cornwell, 1994; Kwok et al. 1994).

Because of widely varying missions and affected constituencies, member responses have been far from uniform. Infusion, the pedagogical process of including select, unspecified international issues in courses across the business curriculum (Lundstrom et al., 1996), has been the primary method used to improve curricular access to international issues. For example, a professor teaching introduction to management could possibly satisfy the agency standard by making reference to issues in intercultural communication as sources of managerial dilemmas and by discussing resolution strategies. A marketing strategy professor might satisfy it by discussing issues arising out of sales force training or adapting products for specific market/consumer needs. Consequently, little focus has been directed toward developing scholastic programming specifically designed to integrate international issues.

A review of the international business education literature can be well summarized by stating that, although progress has been made, U.S. business curriculums are still far from being sufficiently internationalized. Kwok et al. (1994) conceded that, while still falling short, international courses, programs, and other educational experiences available to U.S. business students had increased in number, variety and richness. They found an increased number of schools reporting a commitment to curriculum internationalization and substantive activities to support that commitment. Others have been less generous in their assessment. Lundstrom et al. (1996) report that, according to business practitioners, American business education is not meeting their expectations and needs. Kedia and Cornwell (1994, p.12) assert that U.S. business schools have “largely failed in providing the necessary knowledge and skills to prepare students to function in a global economy.”

Progress Toward Internationalization. Thus, even today, many systematic, comprehensive solutions toward internationalization are still in the development stages within the business collegiate community. Such efforts vary by degree and method.

Degree is defined by specified objectives that may include increasing student awareness and/or understanding of and competence in the international aspects of specific functional areas (e.g., marketing,

finance) and the environment in which business is conducted (e.g., culture, language) (Kedia and Cornwell, 1994). The degree of curricular internationalization will be influenced by a multiple of factors; two of the most important are institutional commitment and available resources. The practical objective for many U.S. business schools is still awareness. This is consistent with the design of most business curriculums around functional areas (e.g., marketing, finance) and the low level of faculty expertise in the international arena (Kwok et al., 1994).

Curricular objectives reflect the collective experiences and goals of the faculty and determine the extent of program internationalization. For discussion purposes, the primary pedagogical strategies (*methods*) available are neatly categorized into infusion, inclusion, and exchanges. Infusion and inclusion can both be accomplished domestically and address objectives and activities advocated by both AACSB (Lundstrom et al. 1996) and the federally funded Centers for International Business Education and Research (CIBER) program, a program initiated in 1988 to increase international instruction, training and research (Kedia and Cornwell, 1994).

Infusion, the internationalization of existing courses, is the dominant method of internationalization (Kwok et al., 1994). Infusion's primary advantages include its ease of administration, relative low cost, and opportunity for rapid implementation. Its disadvantages include the difficulty of effectively internationalizing functional content developed for practice in the United States (Lundstrom et al., 1996) and, when used alone, the resulting absence of education in the international environment (e.g., language, culture).

Inclusion is a slightly more involved form of internationalization and includes creating courses specifically to teach international business. A more costly strategy requiring developmental funds (or the addition of qualified faculty), it represents a further stage of development in the goal of internationalizing a curriculum. This approach requires an entirely different level of faculty buy-in, not only within a college, but also throughout the system, as curricular processes often require external approval. However, the opportunity for direct business application and participation is enhanced as a result of the specific international

focus. In the most advanced form of inclusion, the curriculum includes a major in the functional international area or across disciplines (e.g., International Agribusiness, International Business).

A final strategy for curricular internationalization is *international exchanges*. Nearly 40 percent of business schools in the United States had entered into one or more consortium for conducting international business activities by the mid 1990s (Kwok et al., 1994). International exchanges can impact domestic students in two ways. First, opportunities for international interaction increase when faculty and students from other countries become members of the domestic academic community. Because international exchanges involving U.S. business schools asymmetrically result in foreigners studying at U.S. institutions, working to enhance this impact on domestic students is a worthwhile endeavor.

A second means by which domestic students can value from exchanges is through participation; studying or working in a foreign country (Lundstrom et al., 1996). Throughout much of the developed world, international work or study experience is an encouraged or required part of higher education. Whether the objective is to allow students to experience other cultures or to provide them with work or study opportunities not available domestically, the result is the same (Bor et al., 1995). Well-designed programs will “broaden a student’s intellectual horizons and also immerse a student in the language and culture of a host nation” (Kedia and Cornwell, p. 24).

U.S. institutions of higher education lag painfully behind those of many of their trading partners in graduating students with an international experience (Kedia and Cornwell, 1994). Kwok, et al. (1994) reported that, while one-third of U.S. business schools offered study-abroad programs or internships, less than eight percent required them. They found that only six percent of U.S. business students participated in a study abroad program: three percent in a summer program and another three percent over a semester.

U.S. institutions are not alone in their underutilization of foreign study or work programs as a means to internationalize their curriculums. As such, while the details of this paper address motivating students in the United States to work or study abroad, the concepts within are applicable worldwide.

INTERNATIONALIZING THE AGRIBUSINESS CURRICULUM

Consideration of the decidedly drawn-out approach to internationalization taken by U.S. business schools might lead one to the conclusion that curriculums can be improved simply by revising existing courses to include more content on (infusion), or by developing new courses devoted to (inclusion), international issues (Redman, 1999). However, the most effective strategy to increase student awareness and competency in international issues is to include international experience in the curriculum. This view is well supported in the literature. Kedia and Cornwell (1994), in their pivotal article on the implementation of the CIBER program, suggest that time abroad should be a component of internationalization regardless of degree; that is, whether curricular objectives are to increase the global awareness, understanding or competence of students. This is also supported by progress in curricular revision; institutes of higher education have sought to increase job-related international experience through internships and cooperative education (Kennedy and Harrison, 1996).

Recognizing the value of including a foreign study or work experience as part of a student's academic program stems from the multitude of benefits that result, including exposure to the reality of economic and cultural differences. An anecdotal example is useful to demonstrate the serious lack of appreciation for cultural differences among our students. From a French student spending a semester studying at our U.S. university came the query, "Why are Americans so friendly even when they do not know and therefore cannot care about you?" The student had been shocked by an encounter. One evening, he met an individual who inquired about his well being; the next morning that same person reintroduced himself as if they had never met. It was explained that a common and accepted greeting in the U.S. is what transactional analysis theorists term "cotton candy strokes," verbal greetings or conversational phrases that look and sound good but are intended to convey little real relational content (Downey, personal communication, March 23, 2000). During his time in the United States, this French student will not simply learn this and other U.S. cultural practices, but he will realize from first hand experience that relationships must be managed differently among cultures throughout the world.

Unfortunately, few of our agribusiness students will have such an experience at a time when it is increasingly valuable to recognize that existing cultural differences can profoundly influence personal interaction and commerce (Woods and Miller, 1995). The need for such recognition is clear (Kennedy and Harrison, 1996). The importance of a world market is in no sector of the economy more of a reality than in agribusiness. Domestic markets are limited on both ends of the marketing channel. Land availability is fixed; land available for agricultural production continues to decrease, albeit slowly, as population centers expand. On the demand side, slow population growth rates in countries with well-developed economies limit domestic market growth opportunities for the predominant final product of the sector, food. Furthermore, while the profile of students entering a field in agribusiness evolves (an increasing number come from an urban setting), the student body is still often comprised of those from traditionally rural areas who are much less likely to have been exposed to racial, ethnic, religious, cultural, or other differences between people. In fact, many students, particularly those from the United States, have never experienced first hand the important differences and similarities between peoples of different nations. As such, they do not recognize the importance of and purpose for understanding the people to whom they will sell, from whom they will buy and increasingly with whom they will work.

Regardless of the clarity of its value to those who directly and indirectly work within the international arena, and in spite of evidence that students perceive international experiences positively (Tillery et al., 1994; Sarathy, 1990), students by and large are not studying or working abroad. If internationalization of agribusiness curricula is to become a reality, efforts must be made to motivate students to consider this option seriously during their academic career. As educators and as future employers, this is our responsibility.

The Academic Environment. Understanding an academic institution's environment is a precursor to targeting such efforts. In beginning marketing courses we introduce the concepts of push and pull marketing strategies. The philosophy of those involved in curricular design determines which is a more appropriate means by which to market specific courses to students. General curricular debate within a department often

centers around two issues: 1) whether students are better served by obtaining an expertise in one area (for example, agrifinance) or by obtaining basic knowledge in a variety of disciplines within agribusiness, and 2) the degree to which a student graduating from a program should be a known product (that is, have completed the same courses, had the same co-curricular experiences, and so on). From this debate emerges the identification of courses and co-curricular experiences that will be marketed using a push strategy (as required or as part of a small subset of choices from which students must choose). The remaining courses and experiences are those that, to survive, must have in place an effective supporting pull marketing strategy. They must afford breadth or special skill sets or have a unique allure.

The academic term for these opportunities, electives, is fitting. Students need to elect to participate. Justifying why an international study or work experience should be *central* to an agribusiness curriculum is an important endeavor but one that is beyond the scope of this paper and likely unnecessary for this audience. Rather this paper proposes means by which educators and their partners in agribusiness can motivate students to make the choice of participating in international study and related experiences. Factors influencing student willingness or ability to participate are first identified.

FROM THE STUDENT'S PERSPECTIVE

The Experience at North Dakota State University. North Dakota State University (NDSU) is in its fourth year of a partnership with Federation des Ecoles Supérieures d'Ingénieurs en Agriculture (FESIA), a consortium of five schools of agriculture in France. However, it was not until the third year of the partnership that multiple students participated in the one-month summer program in Europe that comprises NDSU's portion of the exchange. Of the nineteen U.S. students who participated, only two had an intermediate knowledge of the country or the language. Only one indicated an international experience had been part of his planned program of study². It was, therefore, neither obvious what had deterred student participation during the previous two years nor what motivated students to participate during 1999 and 2000.

The education literature provided some guidance. Davis (1993), for example, identifies factors influencing student motivation such as their interest in course content and perception of its usefulness; their general desire to achieve; their self confidence and self esteem; and the importance they attach to approval by others and goal achievement. Davis and others speak to motivational techniques designed to maintain the level of interest that initially brings a student to a particular course. Within the context of motivating students to participate in foreign exchanges, our task, however, is to bring them to the course.

A Strategic Approach to Motivating Students. Using a situational analysis framework for strategic planning, external and internal factors motivating students to participate or not participate in international experiences were first identified³. Related strengths and weaknesses inherent in the academic and agribusiness communities were then assessed.

² Of the twenty-eight students who will participate during the summer of 2000, only one has an intermediate knowledge of the country or the language.

³ Classic situational analysis includes defining the external and internal environment within which corporate goals will be achieved (see for example Schaffner, Schroder, and Earle, 1998). From this emerge strategies by which to achieve these goals.

Influencing Factors. Students who participated in the FESIA exchange and others at NDSU who had participated in international study or work experiences were asked why they did so. Key reasons were having received positive anecdotal evidence about the experience from peers or others whom they trust, receiving academic credit, improving their marketability, and just for the simple pleasure of doing so. These are discussed in some detail.

Students' initial exposure to an international opportunity from and subsequent interaction with others who had participated in the FESIA or a similar exchange (*word of mouth* or *anecdotal advertising*) was important. The best sales people for a study or work abroad experience were those who had previously participated in one and felt they valued from the trip. It is easy to identify these individuals, they are the group who respond "yes" when asked if they would choose to participate if they had the decision to make again. Regardless of the tendency in an academic environment to discount images and testimonials, industry experience has taught us that they make excellent marketing vehicles, particularly in personal selling. One individual we respect sharing his or her positive impression of a product or an experience can outweigh a multitude of scientific data with a contrary message. Anecdotal evidence in the form of testimonials can be critically important to students who have never before considered an experience abroad. Identifying with a former participant can make it easier for these students to envision themselves participating and reduces risk in the decision.

To be effective, testimonial evidence does not have to originate from peers, it can and should come from industry mentors and educators as well. Most students will respond to an enthusiastic teacher or industry mentor who has a genuine interest in them and what they learn. To be effective, however, a mentor must have knowledge of not only the experience under consideration but of its relevance to the individual student. In other words, (s)he must know both the available opportunities and the student.

Students may also be motivated by the opportunity to achieve their goals. In this context, the experience may be measured by its value in satisfying degree requirements or improving marketability (the

academic translation is *resume builder*). The latter will become increasingly important if industry both speaks to and demonstrates the value of international experience.

Finally, many students are simply responding to an opportunity to engage in what we often forget to be a key motivator of our young, the opportunity for pleasure. In this regard, students are not motivated by what they can earn by participating but by participating simply because the idea of spending time abroad appeals to their curiosity, their needs for social competence, and the subjective and symbolic value to be derived from such an experience.

The Constraints. Motivating students to participate in any activity is more effective if we can eliminate constraints that could prevent them from participating. From a variety of sources, ranging from books on education to motivational speakers, comes the lesson “heed the message”; in this case, identify institutional and individual barriers to participation and address them. Again, while literature provided some guidance in understanding and interpreting the behavior of our (NDSU) students, we learned the most by talking to them. Their primary constraints are financial or time specific, those associated with the details of planning and participation, and language inaptitude. These compare with those identified by Kedia and Cornwell (1994), which include lack of financial and institutional support and difficulty of credit transfer.

The financial constraints faced by students need no further discussion: traveling abroad costs money. The significance of time-specific constraints is less evident. Study or work abroad experiences for students occur during the school year or over holiday, term or summer breaks. As such, these opportunities compete with courses at the students’ primary institution and/or time they are free to pursue non-curricular activities. The former is important to many students because participation may delay their date of graduation by a semester or more. Achieving a planned date of graduation is, for whatever reason, an important goal for many students or their parents.

School breaks can also be formidable competition because this is when many agribusiness students work either on the home farm or at jobs that help finance their education and other activities. Students and

sometimes their parents often consider themselves (or their children) as indispensable members of the family farm operation. By principle or necessity, they alternatively may be hesitant to forego income-generating opportunities off the farm during school breaks. Summer programs, the most popular among our students in large part because of their relatively short duration, are particularly troublesome because participating students are unable to offer to potential employers even a three month contiguous term for employment. Although some summer study abroad programs offer a subsequent in-country internship experience, most do not. Students thus interpret a summer study abroad program, even one of short duration, as a substitute for rather than a complement to a summer internship or summer employment. This is in stark contrast to the assertion of Kennedy and Harrison (1996) and the authors of this manuscript, among others that international experiences complement rather than substitute for classroom instruction in preparing students for careers in agribusiness.

Another category of constraints is associated with decision-making by or work for the participant. Examples include arranging for financial aid, scheduling work, school, or other activities or obligations around the trip, arranging for appropriate academic credit, and convincing someone to take care of the student's affairs during their absence. These are the details and these details often make the difference between participating and non-participating for even a motivated student. These must be addressed on an individual basis with an eye to demonstrating program benefits, an effort to adapting programmatic components where possible, and a commitment to assisting the student in the decision process. NDSU students are advised to first consider the decision within the broad context of the value it will provide as compared to alternative opportunities, and to do so without consideration of the details. Using this approach (what one administrator termed the "arbitrary method"), should students decide to participate, the details will either get worked out (and they will participate) or they will not (and they will not participate). A comprehensive review of the sociology literature might reveal that our advice is such because we do not trust students to prioritize an international experience appropriately. However, it is as likely that we recognize many students are neither skilled nor comfortable decision-makers. If a decision includes too many variables, many students will not

decide: the obligation of making the decision often results in inaction. Maintaining the status quo is easier than carefully evaluating all available alternatives under a variety of potential conditions.

Finally, as a general rule, unlike students from most of the world's other countries, U.S. students lack language skills beyond their own (English). Language and cultural skills can be significant obstacles to student participation in international activities (Kennedy and Harrison, 1996). Lack of language skills significantly limits the number of countries in which students can participate in a study or internship opportunity abroad that is not specifically designed for foreign students. Fortunately, an important advantage for U.S. students is that many programs designed for students from throughout the world are presented in English. There are also a limited number of study programs that are taught in English and are specifically for native English speaking students. In fact, finding an appropriate program that is taught in English is not as challenging as convincing students that they can function in the host country where another language is spoken outside of the classroom. Ironically, this hurdle also represents one of the most important benefits of such programs.

Careful review of student choices and follow-up interviews with those who elect to participate and those who do not will often reveal factors considered in the decision making process and how much and in what way each weighs the decision. This information can then be fed-back into promotional efforts and program re-design to improve subsequent participation rates.

A STRATEGIC ALLIANCE BETWEEN ACADEMICS AND AGRIBUSINESS PROFESSIONALS

The remainder of the paper is devoted to the identification and discussion of strategic alternatives by which to increase the number of students in agribusiness who take advantage of the opportunity to study or work abroad. Both educators and agribusiness professionals have a role in motivating students to participate. Both need to capitalize on their ability to satisfy student goals, make the experience relevant for students, and minimize participation cost.

The Role of Educators. Educators are the front line resource available to students. They will increase students' willingness and ability to participate in foreign study or work experiences if they work to

- ! create and help identify existing funding sources
- ! ensure credit received is of value in each student's academic program
- ! apply their expertise toward more effectively marketing international opportunities
- ! increase the visibility of international programs among administrators
- ! ensure students' expectations are met or exceeded
- ! collaborate with other universities and with agribusinesses in developing, implementing and marketing international programs for the maximum mutual benefit

Student participation in international opportunities is not possible without financial resources.

Educators are often the best prepared to identify funding sources available to students. They should be aware of and understand the process of applying for grants and financial aid or, at a minimum, should be able to direct students to those who do. To simplify the process by which students obtain financial assistance for experience abroad, educators must ensure all involved know the details of the opportunity, including its time frame and associated expenses.

Another largely untapped source of financial assistance for international study or work opportunities is the sponsorship of agribusiness. An international experience improves the preparedness of one of their most important productive inputs, human capital. By providing funds either directly to students or indirectly through the host institution, agribusinesses can reduce participation costs for students. While many agribusinesses are willing to and often do support educational programs, it is necessary that solicitation or acceptance of such support include full disclosure to, and agreement from, the department, college and university.

Educators can also ensure students are aware of and receive any credit available within their academic program for the international experience. Consequently, educators must understand how credit associated with the experience will fit into each individual student's program of study. If the experience is or is part of a new or existing but seldom-used program, it is likely the associated credits will apply only as electives. In the long run, educators can work to change this. In the interim, an international opportunity and the associated academic credit are best considered by a student during their initial program of study planning. Those educators serving as academic advisors take note.

Finally, educators must effectively market the program to students, faculty, administrators and agribusinesses. From among these audiences, because most international experiences are still those that require a pull marketing strategy, students are the most important. Knowing what motivates them and their goals is necessary but not sufficient. Educators must also identify an effective means to communicate how the experience will help them meet their goals. This necessitates not just knowing student goals, but it will often include helping students first identify them.

Marketing international opportunities to administration, faculty, and support staff within your department, college, and university is likely to increase student awareness and may result in additional resources to inform and motivate students and perhaps reduce program costs. A marketing effort must be directed toward the educators of your target group of students, educators who must be convinced of the value of the experience. A variety of evidence in the academic literature suggests that the level of faculty interest and expertise in international business is low. Regardless of whether this is a result of the disciplinary nature of most U.S. business programs (Kedia and Cornwell, 1994) or the lack of faculty exposure to international issues and experiences during doctoral programs (Nehrt, 1987), it is an impediment to the success of international programs.

Internally, success requires more than a champion; it requires financial support and participation by administration. At a minimum, key administrators should have exposure to the successes of your program

and should know the value of the program to their academic unit. Internationalization is more likely to occur in an environment where administrators recognize and encourage, fund and follow faculty efforts.

A final marketing strategy is to do all you can to ensure the program markets itself. Meet or exceed students' expectations. In a pull strategy environment, particularly with limited resources, your best marketing tool may be word of mouth.

Implementing the strategic alternatives identified has, to varying degrees, a learning curve and in other ways involves an investment of time and financial resources. Therefore, it often pays to collaborate efforts whenever possible. An added benefit of collaboration is the increased awareness of alternative international experiences available to students among educators and industry mentors, alternatives that may be more appropriate for the individual students they are advising.

Role of Agribusiness Professionals. Agribusiness professionals can motivate students to participate in international experiences through

- ! promoting their efforts
- ! offering financial support
- ! demonstrating flexibility as an employer
- ! working with educators

As future employers, agribusinesses are well suited to work to ensure students recognize the value of a study or work abroad component in their education. Encouraging students can be explicit (tell them your firm values the experience) or implicit (demonstrate this through hiring practices). Financial support is also important. Financial constraints are real for many students. Firms will make international opportunities more attractive or simply possible by reducing the direct or indirect (foregone revenue) cost of participating. Direct support can take the form of scholarships to help students cover the cost of the program or financial contributions to the college offering the program to do the same. Indirect support will result from reducing

what a student must sacrifice to participate. Whenever possible, firms should demonstrate flexibility when employing students who want to take advantage of an international opportunity. Firms willing to do so should advertise that fact.

Supporting agribusinesses will benefit from making participation a firm event. Sponsored student participation in international experiences can be featured within the firm and with firm stakeholders. It will be easier to gain permission for and support of flexibility for internships, sponsorship of international activities for students, and other activities that encourage student participation if others within the company understand their importance to the firm and the industry. Students can actively participate by making a presentation about their experience to the school, community, or members of the firm or by writing an article about their experience for a firm or industry newsletter. Sponsoring students may also increase firm visibility. Many study-abroad programs aimed at students involved in agriculture and agribusiness include visits to farms and other agribusinesses in the country of study. Promoting visibility of sponsoring firms while abroad should be considered by educational institutions if it increases industry cooperation.

Finally, it is imperative that agribusiness work with educators to promote, encourage, develop, and implement programs that involve an international component. Practitioners should be directly involved in the curricular revision or development process. Practitioners will gain in that needs of industry will be more explicitly included in the curriculum (Kennedy and Harrison, 1996). Educators will gain directly from industry expertise (usually expertise without direct cost) and may benefit from new, private funding for their programs and internships and placements for their students.

CONCLUSION

Students who will one day comprise agribusiness need to know and respect that borders are not simply lines on a map but represent differences that profoundly affect commerce. Feasible opportunities exist for educators and agribusiness professionals and their firms to increase the number of students who will

graduate with this knowledge as the result of time abroad. It is up to us to ensure they have the opportunities.

REFERENCES

- Bor, W.V.D. 1995. "Rethinking Higher Agricultural Education in a Time of Globalization and Rural Restructuring," 2(3): 29-40.
- Cassagne, J.M. 1996. 101 French Idioms. Passport Books. Lincolnwood, Illinois.
- Davis, Barbara Gross. 1993. Tools for Teaching. Jossey-Bass Publishers. San Francisco, California.
- Kedia, B.L. and T.B. Cornwell. 1994. "Mission Based Strategies for Internationalizing U.S. Business Schools." *Journal of Teaching in International Business* 5(3): 11-29.
- Kennedy, P.L. and R.W. Harrison. 1996. "International Internships in Agribusiness Curricula: A Proposal for Implementation," *Journal of Agribusiness* 14: 173-182.
- Kwok, C.C.Y., J. Arpan, and W.R. Folks. 1994. "A Global Survey of International Business Education in the 1990's," *Journal of International Business Studies* 25(3): 605-623.
- Lundstrom, W.J., D.S. White and C.P. Schuster. 1996. "Internationalizing the Marketing Curriculum: The Professional Marketer 's Perspective," *Journal of Market Education* (Summer): 5-16.
- Nehrt, L.C. 1987. "The Ranking of Masters Programs in International Business," *Journal of International Business Studies* 18(3): 91-99.

Redman, Donna H., Alvin R. Schupp, and William B. Richardson. 1999. "Impact of College of Agriculture Courses on Graduating Seniors' Awareness and Interest in International Agriculture," *NACTA Journal* 43(2): 18 - 23.

Sarathy, R. 1990. "Internationalizing MBA Education: The Role of Short Overseas Programs," *Journal of Teaching in International Business* 3(4): 101-118.

Schaffner, D.J., W.R. Schroder and M.D. Earle. 1998. *Food Marketing: An International Perspective*. WCB/McGraw-Hill. Boston, Massachusetts.

Tillery, K.R., K.G. Cudd, and A.L. Rutledge. 1994. "International Business and the Undergraduate Student: A Study of Perceptions and Attitudes," *Journal of Teaching in International Business* 5(3): 41-62.

Woods, S.J. and G.D. Miller. 1995. "Faculty Participation in Residential International Training Programs: Benefits, Challenges, and Implications for Teaching," *NACTA Journal* 39(4): 22-25.

Yahya, I. and G.E. Moore. 1986. "On Becoming a Successful International Educator," *NACTA Journal* 30(2): 56-59.