

The Role of Higher Education in the Internationalization of American Society Since 1950

by Misao MAKINO*

I. Introduction.

The purpose of this paper is to describe the role of American higher education in the internationalization of American society since 1950. In this study, higher education includes only officially accredited, degree-granting, four-year colleges and universities in the United States. This does not include two year colleges, junior colleges, community colleges, vocational/technical colleges, or professional schools separate from four-year institutions. With this much of the topic clear, however, it must now be stated that clarifying the actual scope of the topic will prove far more difficult. Since no research study can proceed without a well-formed problem, this demanding conceptual task must be undertaken.

After completing a process definition of internationalization, this study takes up the specific, empirical history of the means by which higher education institutions in America have internationalized themselves. The importance of this part of the study can be seen from the fact that we are dealing here with two rather different kinds of effect: the effect of internationalization on the internal community of higher education institutions; and, the effect of the internationalization of that community on the external American society at large. Without a clear picture of the internal internationalization, discriminations about the role of the academic community in internationalizing the larger society would be impossible to make. Besides a chronological sketch of the institutional internationalization process since 1950, this section also contains detailed statements on the programs of three different universities. The amount and fineness of detail allows further discriminations about the relations between internal internationalization and external effect.

In the conclusion to this study, the findings of both the conceptual and the

*Faculty of Regional Development Studies, Toyo University

historical sections are gathered together. They are then brought into relation to a highly synoptic view of the overall sources of internationalization in American society since 1950. From this larger synthesis, the conclusions of this study about higher education's role in that process flow clearly and easily.

II. Internationalization: a Process Definition.

A. Internationalization and Isolationism.

Internationalization is a process by which national culture and character change through contacts with other nations. In the case of the United States, it is ironic that a nation whose beginnings were so multinational would find it so difficult to become international. In the 17th century, the explorers, exploiters, and settlers of the new continent came from many different nations, cultures, classes, religions, and professions. Those who were largely responsible for settlement of the northeastern region, however, and who became the politically and economically dominant group, were predominantly caucasian and northern European.

They had two other salient characteristics in common. One was a tendency to have been isolated in their home, European countries, often as members of Protestant religious minorities. The other was a tendency to have been isolated socially in Europe in other ways, such as by being farmers, explorers, or criminals. In the new world, most of these settlers did not mix easily with the indigenous people; instead, they formed their own closely-knit groups that resisted mixing either with the natives or with dissimilar Europeans in later immigrations.

Very early in the formation of the American national character, therefore, was a tendency toward isolation that would eventually characterize much of America's attitude toward other nations, as well as severely impede internationalization.

That this attitude has remained a constant part of American regard for other nations has been repeatedly shown in recent times by Americans' ignorance of external affairs and resistance to external involvement. During the fuel crisis of 1977, when gasoline prices rose dramatically all over the US, a Gallup Poll showed that more than "half of the general public were totally unaware that [America] must import part of [its] precious petroleum supplies, and fewer than ten percent knew that more than half of [American] energy requirements came from foreign sources."¹⁾

Such ignorance is often accompanied, in America, not by an innocent desire to know the truth, but by a resistance to American involvement abroad. In 1980, for example, as the developed world struggled through a recession that was closely tied to balance-of-payments problems and highly sensitive to deteriorating international trade patterns, “a Roper poll revealed that 49 percent of Americans surveyed believed that foreign trade was either irrelevant or harmful to the United States.”²⁾ This attitude contrasts strongly with the facts that, in 1980, one out of three acres of American farmland produced foodstuffs for export, and that “fully 25 percent of [the US] economy was involved in either exports or imports,”³⁾

Indeed, by 1986, the trend toward US interdependence with other nations had greatly accelerated. At that time, investments abroad exceeded \$300 billion. Four out of five new jobs in America were being generated as a direct result of international trade and not of purely domestic industrial expansion. In the American labor force, more than 5 million jobs depended on American export and import transactions. At the level of corporate ownership, one-third of all American corporations were internationally based or owned by nationals of other countries. And in agriculture, one out of three US farm acres produced products specifically for export.⁴⁾ It is highly questionable, however, whether this obvious internationalization of certain segments of American society is making a substantial difference in the “global quotients” of the nation’s students, or of the citizenry at large. Several educational task forces have studied American students, specifically, “only to confirm how woefully underexposed young people are to other countries’ languages and cultures, and, worse yet, how only marginally aware the students are of America’s own foreign policies.”⁵⁾

Some attempts to quantify this situation have been made. In 1981, the National Task Force on Education and the World View reported that only “10 to 15 percent of U.S. college students could be presumed to be globally literate.”⁶⁾ And just two years earlier, the National Council on Foreign Languages and International Studies published data that showed:

- a. Only 15 percent of American high school students were studying foreign languages and that only 8 percent of American colleges and universities required a foreign language for admission.
- b. Less than 1 percent of the college-aged group in the United States was enrolled in any course which specifically featured international issues or areas.
- c. Only 1 to 2 percent of the 10 million college students in America have participated in a study abroad program,⁷⁾

A preliminary response to the question of the role of higher education in the internationalization of American society since 1950 can thus be given. Since so few Americans ever attend institutions of higher education, since so few Americans ever read books or articles written by professors in such institutions, and since so few higher education students have international experience, higher education has done very little directly, in any period of American history, to internationalize American society. Since 1950, with the large and complicated obligations incurred by Americans for the destinies of other nations, such as Japan, Germany, Taiwan, and Israel, certain segments of American society have greatly increased and refined their contacts with other nations. During the 1950's, however, and well into the new internationalism of the Eisenhower era, the prolonged McCarthyism showed that the average American was still staunchly and stubbornly isolationist.

A deeper look at the nature of internationalization may help to clarify this situation. Over time, cultural patterns become personal habits. Personal habits constitute a very important part of personal identity. When national and personal identities are closely matched, a nation is coherent and rather highly resistant to fundamental change. Contacts with other nations and cultures are viewed, in such coherent nations, as opportunities for the advancement and reproduction of the coherent nation, not as opportunities for change. Trade, exchange, and diplomacy are all peaceful processes by which internationalization does not threaten national or personal integrity. War, economic competition, and spying are all invasive processes that threaten national or personal integrity. As long as the citizens of a coherent nation feel that the reproduction of their own kind, both biologically and culturally, is unthreatened by contacts with other nations, internationalization proceeds smoothly. One such a threat is felt, however, internationalization becomes a zone of conflict. If we recall that the United States has been dominantly caucasian, English-speaking, Christian, and capitalist, we can easily see the roots of the continued resistance to internationalization in the average American.

In the last twenty years, moreover, internationalization has gained a new dimension that is, in some respects, even more threatening to Americans than differences in race, language, religion, or economic system. It has become increasingly clear that the activity of industrialized peoples is destroying important elements of the earth's biosphere and thus posing a threat to the viability of all life on the planet. This situation is unbounded by national characteristics. It therefore suggests that, to survive as a species on a developed planet, human beings must begin

to see themselves as members of a single, coherent species that is in various kinds of serious relations to all other living things on earth. Such biological coherence contrasts strongly with national coherence on all parameters of race, religion, language, etc. Such a unification of humanity has found a comfortable home in the vision of very few Americans and of very few American politicians. It is, nonetheless, the fact that a great deal of the impetus of this vision has come from the work of scientists at colleges and universities in the United States. The ecological dimension of internationalization thus suggests that the phenomenon we are attempting to describe and understand here is quite complex.

B. Internationalization as Ideal and as Actuality.

We may further refine this complexity by distinguishing between the attempt at internationalization in American higher education, and the actual internationalization of American society. We may agree with Backman in defining international education broadly as including "international studies, global education, foreign language study, exchanges, study abroad, area studies, comparative education, and the like."⁸⁾ we may remember that public education in the United States is, in principle, open to all citizens until the costs of tuition, books, lodging, etc. create more and more severe differentials higher in the educational system. We may reformulate the question of this study, then, in terms of the gap between the ideal of a fully and equally educated citizenry, necessary for a fully functioning democratic nation, and the actuality of the tiny percentage of Americans who attend institutions of higher education or pay any attention, in their daily lives, to the work of the experts and professionals who staff such institutions.

Certainly, few Americans would oppose the arguments that the United States should possess an educational system capable of producing at least a minimal cadre of experts about other peoples and cultures, as well as professionals in business and government who can transact negotiations across national borders. Few would oppose the view that we should have scientists and technicians who can extend and share human knowledge on a global basis. And few would argue against the proposition that America must have citizens who are knowledgeable enough to support tough leadership decisions and policies in a dangerous and complicated world.⁹⁾

The first two propositions, however, can be fulfilled by only a tiny percentage of the population becoming fluent in international affairs. This would be interna-

tionalization conceived as the deliberate creation of a class, group, or kind of expert who is specifically delegated authority to deal with extra-national affairs. Clearly, higher education in America since 1950 has contributed to internationalization in this sense, as will be seen in more detail below.

However, the third proposition encompasses all Americans and suggests somehow that an entire society, beyond the technical requirements of experts and professionals, can be internationalized. This would, presumably, be internationalization conceived as change in national character at the personal level. Such change would result in average citizens who would no longer be bound by prejudices of birth, place, ethnicity, religion, economy, etc. and could clearly and compassionately recognize and respond to the humanity of any other people, also regardless of their national or cultural origins.

It is extremely important to understand that these three propositions, easily stated as aspects of a single process of internationalization, contain some potentially severe conflicts. Experts and professionals in business and government are usually concerned, first and foremost, with the maintenance and extension of their existing spheres of power, prestige, and productivity. The reproduction of their own situation is their foremost concern. Scientists are usually concerned with being as free as possible of such conservative agendas so that they can pursue knowledge regardless of its implications for national political or economic destiny. Average citizens, especially those who become members of the growing group of regular world tourists, are usually interested in friendly, stimulating contact with different kinds of people, without demands for power or knowledge.

We may then ask, Which group could be served and serviced by institutions of higher education in the United States? Clearly, the answer is, all three. However, many business people, government officials, and tourists, have little or no higher education experience. It seems likely, therefore, that the most consistent group of Americans internationalized by higher education since the 1950's has been scientists. But the history of science shows again and again that science, in Western Europe at least, survived and flourished outside the university for centuries before it was fully incorporated as part of the university curriculum. And, the same history shows that science was an international, multicultural, and multilingual activity from its earliest beginnings in Mediterranean cultures. It would seem more accurate, therefore, to state that science has been an internationalizing influence on the university from the beginning. If we recall that most European and American

universities began as expositors, refiners, and preservers of Christian dogma and nationalist cultural agendas, then the independence of science as an internationalizing influence can be more clearly grasped.

What, then, is our well-formed research problem? What precisely do we mean here by the role of higher education in the internationalization of American society since 1950? How can we specify and operationalize this question so that it is amenable to treatment and answer with the existing and available sources? One further step must be taken, in this conceptual distillation, before these questions can be answered firmly and clearly. We must distinguish, with reference to the special conditions of American demography and educational organization, between internationalization and multiculturalism.

C. Internationalization and Multiculturalism.

In 1975, approximately in the middle of the target period of this study, the US Bureau of the Census showed that, of 221 million Americans, about 80 % should be classified as caucasian and non-hispanic. The same census showed that within this 80 %, there was a diversity of origins: 12 % English; 9.9 % German; 5.9 % Irish; 3.1 % Italian, 1.9 % French; 1.8 % Polish, and, 8 % Russian. Of the other 20 %, 12 % were black and 5.6 % were Hispanic, mostly Mexican and Puerto-Rican.¹⁰⁾ The remaining percentage was composed of Native Americans and others. The most recent census, completed in 1991, has shown dramatic increases of all ethnicities, especially those from Latin America and Asia. Also, in large, southerly metropolitan areas, such as Greater Los Angeles and the Miami-Dade County area, caucasians are now the numerical minority. By 1990, this domestic ethnic diversity resulted in major public school districts offering classroom instruction in dozens of languages besides English. The San Francisco Unified School District offered such instruction in 26 languages, and the Miami-Dade Unified School District offered instruction in 42 different languages.

Added to this ethnic diversity, which has existed in the United States since its founding, is another kind of diversity signaled by the decentralization of educational authority. In effect, the United States has not one but fifty educational systems. This peculiarity of American education has led some authorities to argue that the American educational tradition "is isolationist" and its "structure is in important respects anarchic."¹¹⁾ The Constitution, when it separated the powers of the federal government and the states, effectively delegated responsibility for educa-

tion to the states by making no explicit statement on the subject. The Constitution did insist on the general principles of separation of church and state, which implied separating religious education from public education, and on the maintenance of a system of free, public schools.

Each state then gradually assumed control of its own system of education, and they now differ, between states, "in almost every respect: in the way the system is administered, in the methods of financing, in the degree of control over curricula, teacher certificates, teachers' salaries. etc."¹²⁾ At another level, this decentralization has allowed most states to allow, in turn, wide differences between schools and school systems in the different communities inside their state borders. One of the most significant characteristics of American education, that makes it especially different from education in Japan, is the extent to which schools are operated by local school authorities, which means local citizens either elected or appointed to local school boards or committees. This diversity of operation and orientation, and this decentralization of authority, also characterizes the US higher education system.

But, through all of this diversity, a striking amount of uniformity has persisted. The first multicultural education in the United States, in formal schools, was probably the bilingual German, French, and Spanish programs during the 18th and 19th centuries. By the end of the 19th century, however, the dominant pressure on all of American education was to assimilate immigrants to an Anglo-Saxon, English-speaking, Christian pattern. The two world wars turned many Americans against German and Japanese studies, but this temporary provincialism began to be reversed by court decisions and legislation during the 50's, 60's, and 70's.

American education could have gone in either of two possible directions. It could have pressed for equal educational opportunities for minority children, or for preparation of all children for living in a multicultural, multiethnic society.¹³⁾ The overwhelming evidence shows that Americans, American educators, and American politicians and officials, have chosen the first direction. This has meant that the specifically caucasian, anglo-saxon, protestant, and western european cultural basis of American education has not, for the most part, been seriously or systematically questioned. This is clear from detailed studies not only of government legislation but also of textbooks, curriculum plans, and teacher training programs¹⁴⁾

D. Summary and Transition.

This survey of American education and society has important implications for our study. First, it shows that the originally isolationist character of Americans has been perpetuated in the treatment of ethnic minorities inside US borders. Second, it shows that Americans are not inclined, for the most part, to entertain fundamental change in national or personal character as a legitimate goal of education. Third, it shows that higher education may eventually be seen as, in some ways, working against the prevalent definition of internationalization in American society.

We may suggest that higher education could, since 1950, have pursued two clear paths. One of those is the culturally unbounded cooperation characteristic of the traditional practice of science. The other is the culturally mixing and accommodating path of preparing students to live in a world that is thoroughly and positively multiracial, multiethnic, multilingual, etc. Neither of these paths, however, would have been continuous with the emphasis of most lower level American education on equalizing educational opportunities for minorities to become Americans in a specifically eurocentric cultural sense.

This attempt at cultural levelling was a response to two major pressures. One came from the ethnic minorities themselves, who saw in educational opportunity access to the wealth, power, and success of the American system. The other came from both the minorities and many others in the society and focused on the need, mentioned above, for an informed, articulate, and politically responsible citizenry as a necessary condition for democracy. These distinctions should show that internationalization and multiculturalism need not be conceived in the same way and, more importantly, that there are alternative conceptions that can bring efforts at internationalization into conflict with efforts at multiculturalism.

For the purpose of this study, therefore, we need to keep clearly before us two parameters on the meaning of internationalization. First, internationalization must, minimally, focus on relations between Americans and non-Americans who were born in other nations, cultures, and countries outside the borders of the United States. Second, internationalization must involve university personnel in some kind of restructuring of university activity in relation to those non-American persons and nations. In this way, we can avoid confusing internationalization with domestic multiculturalism. By insisting on this separation, we can also keep clearly before us the two paths not followed by American domestic multiculturalism--the

internationalism of science and the internationalism of preparation for life in a multicultural world.

With this much conceptual clarification behind us, we may now turn to the empirical field in which many institutions of American higher education have taken steps to internationalize American society, since 1950, in one or more of the senses of internationalization discussed above. We turn now, in other words, to institutional designs, initiatives, and accomplishments in internationalizing American society.

III. Internationalizing American Society: Institutional Designs. Initiatives, and Accomplishments in Higher Education Since 1950.

A. The Pluralism of American Higher Education.

The discussion of internationalization and multiculturalism showed that pluralism in American education is deeply rooted in both the legal and cultural traditions of the country. Higher education is not an exception to this rule. We may create a manageable field of inquiry by referring to the designs, initiatives, and accomplishments that concern us as circumscribed by the designation of international education. We may then recall Backman's definition of international education as broadly including "international studies, global education, foreign language study, exchanges, study abroad, area studies, comparative education, and the like."¹⁵⁾ It will become abundantly clear in our examination of some of the material from Backman's work, which presents in detail seventeen different approaches to internationalizing a campus or, to institutionalizing "an international commitment," that there is no one single design that has been found suitable for all institutions.¹⁶⁾

With such a specific focus on American institutions of higher education, moreover, we may give some further substance to the notion of international education. We can view this notion in terms of both persons and programs. With respect to persons, it means making deliberate efforts "to educate persons through actual experience in other countries or through education at home geared to supranational or other-culture frameworks."¹⁷⁾ With respect to programs, it means

first, increasing the number and quality of programs, courses, and other opportunities for the study of international and global affairs; and second, infusing the entire . . . curriculum with a sense of the international and global, so that a growing number of courses and programs, in whatever subject, can better reflect the realities of an increasingly interconnected world¹⁸⁾

Taken together, these definitions constitute an overall summary of the explicit goals that motivated international education in United States higher education since World War II. From this summary standpoint, we can now turn to some of the early historical highlights of this period in American higher education.

B. Some Early Historical Highlights of Internationalization in American Higher Education.

In 1948, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education established a Committee on International Aspects of Teacher Education. The committee focused in its early years on promoting exchange of educators between America and other nations. Eventually, members of the committee came to understand that active steps were needed on American higher education campuses if America's new international role were to be fulfilled constructively and competently. In 1952, the committee decided "that a study should be undertaken to find out what the various member institutions...were doing in the whole field of education in international affairs." The result of this decision was a volume of case studies, published in 1956, much like that of Backman cited earlier, in which several universities, colleges, and programs were discussed in detail.¹⁹⁾

The contents of this early book need not detain us, but it shows that, during the target period of this study, detailed and systematic attempts have been made by American academics to assess internationalization in higher education. It is clear from some of the discussions in these early studies, moreover, that the different senses of internationalization--that of the practice of science, that of the reproduction of national power and productivity, that of the education of a democratic citizenry, and that of international tourism--were not clearly distinguished then any more than they are now. In fact, more often cited during the 50's was the desirability for American academics, through internationally-oriented reforms on their campuses, to contribute to a stable world without war.²⁰⁾

The diversity and decentralization of American higher education, however, has never meant that higher education institutions functioned in a social vacuum. Efforts such as that by the Association just cited were often driven by institutional events outside the universities and colleges. Since a thorough study of such external institutions, such as foundations, businesses, and government offices, would take us far from our topic, only the most important of such events will receive brief mention here.

In summarizing the role of the private foundations, during the post World War years. Professor George Beckmann, then of the University of Washington, wrote :

The Rockefeller Foundation was the first large national foundation to recognize the need to develop non-Western studies as an integral part of American higher education, and it was the only major foundation that was active in this field until after World War II....Of the many foundations, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Carnegie Corporation, and especially the Ford Foundation have contributed the lion's share in support of graduate training and research programs at major universities, of the recruitment and training of graduate students through national fellowship programs, of research by individual scholars and by groups of them, and of efforts by undergraduate colleges to add non-Western studies to the mainstream of liberal learning.²¹⁾

This effort by private American foundations included, in 1952, the beginning of the Ford Foundation Area Fellowship Program, an initiative soon joined and imitated by other foundations.²²⁾ But none of these fellowship programs has had the continued success and popularity of the Fulbright program.

From 1949 to 1968, the US Government Fulbright' program, in cooperation with American universities and colleges, sent approximately 32,000 Fulbright fellows to more than 120 countries to teach and study.²³⁾ The program has been in continuous operation since that time and its success and popularity seems undiminished. But the primary impetus to internationalization of the American higher education campus after World War II came in 1957 with the Russian launching of the first artificial earth-orbiting satellite.

From a primarily political and military rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union, the competition moved directly and rapidly onto scientific and educational grounds. The United States Government responded in 1958 with the National Defense Education Act. This act focused a shift in US overseas interests from rebuilding Europe to outflanking the Soviet Union in gaining influence in the newly forming nations of Africa and Asia. The new resources suddenly poured into American education "led to a positive explosion of interest in area studies."²⁴⁾

It is important to understand, however, that the primary purpose of the NDEA, like most of the higher education internationalization of this time, was the creation of "specialists, not generalists," and the training of "graduate students, not undergraduates."²⁵⁾ Nonetheless, there were some marked "trickle down" effects on undergraduate education. For example, the range of elective courses was extended to take in areas, peoples, and issues of the larger world not previously thought

appropriate for undergraduate consideration. Many of these electives initiated increased attention to the non-European world. A spate of new courses appeared in comparative development and comparative political systems; non-Western religions began to get more scholarly and studious attention, and history departments increased the range of their interest in geography.²⁶⁾

The NDEA, which has continued to function until the present, was joined in 1975 by the Foreign Assistance Act. Title XII of this act was designed "to encourage American agricultural universities to work collaboratively with less developed countries in solving problems of hunger and inadequate agricultural production."²⁷⁾

Besides federal legislation, in the internationalization of American higher education, were numerous agreements among federal agencies and universities and colleges. In the early 1950s, several large institutions entered into contracts, to provide overseas developmental assistance, with the Federal Operations Administration.²⁸⁾ The most ambitious, extensive, and long-lived cooperations between the federal government and higher education, initiated in this period, however, were the programs sponsored by the US Agency for International Development (AID). Professors and professionals from many fields, such as engineering, chemistry, agriculture, nursing, and law, and from many institutions, such as Cornell, California, Ohio, Harvard, and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, have worked in AID programs in India, Brazil, Nigeria, Iran, Chile, the Philippines, and many other countries and regions.²⁹⁾

The internationalization of American higher education required for these programs resulted in universities and colleges taking on three distinct roles. First, they became the prime area in which technicians in all fields were recruited for work overseas. The university administrations cooperate by "stretching sabbaticals and leaves of absence, or by rearranging classroom schedules on their home campuses" so that critical faculty members and graduate students are free to travel and work abroad.³⁰⁾

Second, the universities and colleges themselves undertook to provide training resources for people brought to the United States by AID for specialized training. These resources must be and have been kept flexible in order to accommodate both academic and nonacademic training. That is, some of the international students come to enroll as regular students for specific courses, certificates, or degrees. But many others are simply filling lacunae in professional training in their own countries by being "short-term or long-term observers in classrooms, seminars, laborator-

ies, and field projects”³¹⁾

In 1967, AID was directly responsible for the placement of approximately 6,500 international students in American university and college programs.³²⁾

The third role of American higher education institutions, in cooperation with AID, has been directly conducting a wide range of contracted projects in many different countries. “As of March 31, 1962, the United States government had awarded 103 foreign aid contracts, totaling almost \$120 million, to 62 universities operating in 37 separate countries.”

While these projects have been designed to carry American expertise to the betterment of less fortunate people, all of the projects have taken place in areas that were considered by the US government to be crucial for its conduct of the peaceful operations of the Cold War. With the recent changes in world political structure and power, however, it remains to be seen what new priorities will drive such government and university cooperative efforts.

It is perhaps no exaggeration to assert that the effort to internationalize American higher education, in order to internationalize American society, reached its most articulate peak during the 1960’s. In 1964 and 1965, for example, 67 universities and colleges, under 101 separate contracts with AID, were carrying out technical assistance tasks in 41 different nations. In 1964, American institutions of higher education offered 150 study-abroad programs for undergraduates; just two years later that number had doubled. Also, in 1958, only 50 American colleges and universities offered intercultural courses that went beyond strictly language instruction. By 1970, more than 700 institutions had developed such courses and regularly featured them in their curricula at both undergraduate and graduate levels.³³⁾

It should come as no surprise, then, that American academics became more and more able to state in specific terms the comprehensive considerations that were seen as necessary for successfully internationalizing an American institution of higher education. The following list, with all of the emphases in the original, is a full statement of such considerations :

1. *All American institutions of higher learning should make studies of world affairs an important and permanent dimension of their undergraduate programs.* Such studies should include the role of the United States in world affairs, Western civilization, important non-Western civilizations, foreign languages and problems of international relations, economic growth, social change and order. Study abroad, effectively organized and directed, should be an important and integral part of undergraduate education.

2. *All American universities should improve the competence of their graduate and professional schools to teach and to conduct research on international aspects of their disciplines and professions.*
3. *Many universities (more than at present) should become diversified centers of strength to train specialists in world affairs for careers in teaching and other professions, government and business; to undertake research; to exercise leadership in language-training and linguistics; to prepare teaching materials for all levels of education; and to open the perspectives of scholarship to other institutions and to adult citizens in their communities. Some centers will focus on particular geographic areas, others on policy problems and functional studies, cutting across disciplinary lines.*
4. *Most universities and colleges have students and scholars from other countries. These institutions need to develop special educational programs fitting the needs of their foreign guests. At the same time, they should integrate these programs as fully as possible with the programs for American students, and with the host institutions' other international programs. Foreign students on American campuses constitute an educational and cultural resource that universities and colleges should draw on more fully. A high priority should be given to better selection and other measures to improve the quality of the students' educational experience. There is also a pressing need to receive more foreign students.' *Problems of quality and quantity require concurrent attention.**
5. *Many universities and colleges would benefit from undertaking cooperative activities with educational institutions in other countries. A few should undertake programs of assistance to educational institutions overseas. To carry on effectively these increasingly important activities, the participating university should: develop a high degree of competence on a continuing basis for the particular overseas activities it undertakes; ensure the participation of its best faculty members; and relate its overseas activities to its educational program at home for the mutual strengthening of both.*
6. *Universities that undertake a wide range of programs in world affairs, at home and abroad, face complex problems of management. Their faculties and administration alike need to develop long range priorities and plans in order to make the most effective use of their scarce resources and make possible the balanced, yet flexible, growth of the total university educational program.³⁴⁾*

By 1981, however, many highly educated observers of American society were expressing strong reservations about the success of America's attempt to internationalize itself. In 1980, the prestigious American Council on Learning conducted a large-scale survey of college students to attempt to determine "what college students actually know and perceive about global relationships" and to measure "their comprehension of current global complexities."³⁵⁾ It is important, for the current study, to consider the significance of such a sample.

First, college students are "among the better informed" of young American citizens.³⁶⁾ This status refers not only to their higher level of formal education. It

also refers to the fact, well-established by Coleman and Jencks in their studies of relations among home, school, and achievement. that such students have relatively higher exposure to the information-rich, literate media of the society. This sample is significant for this study, secondly, because, by 1981, the entire American society had been subjected to the effects and influences of whatever internationalization had been carried out on university and college campuses. Many of these students' parents were among the first groups and classes of higher education students to have international education available to them. The Council on Learning survey thus constituted a measure of the longer term, cross-generational effects on society at large of the internationalization of higher education begun in earnest in the United States, as we have seen above, after 1950.

Detailed analyses of thousands of completed surveys showed that these educationally privileged members of American society were confused by the following:

- a. The degree to which U.S. dependence on foreign oil increased during the 1970's and the vulnerability of [the US] economy to increases in oil prices or decreases in the supply.
- b. The membership of OPEC and why it can raise oil prices.
- c. The causes of inadequate nutrition as a global problem.
- d. The United States' record on signing human rights treaties adopted by the United Nations and the major accomplishments of the Helsinki Accords.
- e. The comparative world membership of Islam and Christianity and the countries in which Islam predominates or has a significant minority
- f. The difficulties connected with either national self-sufficiency or dependency in a world of interdependent nations.
- g. The historical origins of the Western sovereign territorial state and the modern state system and the emergence of nationalist movements as significant political forces in European history.
- h. The patterns of world birth and death rates today.
- i. The pattern of the world's past and possible future consumption of fossil fuels.
- j. The reasons for the lack of substantial progress toward world peace during the twentieth century.
- k. The main purpose of the recently completed multilateral trade negotiations, and the demands of representatives of developing nations in the North-South talks.³⁷⁾

The available literature from the late 70s and early 80s shows wide differences in the optimism and pessimism with which American educators and government officials viewed test results such as these. Perhaps the simplest summary of these views, that did not indulge either the prophets of doom or the polyannas of reform, was that the informed citizenry America "would like to create is still far from existence."³⁸⁾ Also far from existence, in the view of many experts on international

education, was research that showed precisely why and how internationalization in higher education succeeds or fails in effecting internationalization in the society at large. As early as 1967, this lack of research was seen as a function of the way in which international education was being carried out. Since universities and colleges were responding largely to the impetus of government and foundations, there was a “rush to provide the mechanics of assistance” to other countries, with “little time or money for basic research.”³⁹⁾

By the mid-80s, some of this lack had been made up by the appearance of an increasingly large number of journals, studies, and books devoted to international education. Research in international education, however, has seemed to many to share the same limitations of other social science research in relation to decision-making and public policy. It seems that “research rarely influences policy directly, but does so (if at all) through a variety of indirect mechanisms.” One of the most important of these, at least in the United States, is the presence of specialists, not generalists, in positions in “governmental agencies, local, state and national, in ‘think tanks,’ and in private industry.” From such positions, these highly and specially trained people may exert considerable influence on public policy and decisionmaking.⁴⁰⁾

This reflection on research in international education may be taken together with the conclusion, reached by the early 80s, concerning the absence of internationalization in American society at large. What emerges is the possibility that internationalization of higher education, in America or in any other country, has not, does not, and will not have a substantial direct effect on the level of internationalization of the society. What it will effect is the ability of a select, and specially trained group of people, whether in higher education, government, or business, to make decisions with international dimensions.

By 1986, the increasing pressure on the United States from rapidly modernizing nations, with distinctly non-European histories, brought a change in the vocabulary of our field from “international education” to “global education.” This change in terms reflected the worldwide realization that human issues were making national borders less and less important in understanding and defining reality. Global education in America was being called on to respond to the “increasing internationalization of society and interdependence among peoples and nations.” In line with the arguments we have heard before, the most recent group of publications again emphasizes the citizen in a new role “and places a special responsibility upon our

educational institutions to develop” citizens with a “global perspective.” Such a perspective would allow the knowledge and understanding of the world normally gained in American education to reach “the world beyond [American borders]—its peoples, nations, cultures, systems, and problems.” A global perspective would allow Americans to understand how the world affects America and how America affects the world.⁴¹⁾

Indeed, by 1986, the need for global education, with much the same agenda as the internationalization of three decades earlier, was perceived to be even more urgent. The three major American television networks, ABC, CBS, and NBC, were revealed to give from one-half to two-thirds of their evening news time to international news. A survey of viewers, however, discovered that the viewers were able “to understand the major points of only one-third of the items” to which they listened.⁴²⁾

In general, the experienced observers of American education attributed the absence of a global perspective among Americans at large to several factors. Numerous studies of public school curricula had shown that geography was a neglected topic that was frequently poorly taught and often not taught at all. The absence of second language ability among Americans was attributed to the short duration of language courses whose primary emphasis was on reading and writing, not on communication with living contemporaries over global issues. Besides school curriculum, these observers repeated a finding of earlier studies that teacher education was not adequately preparing teachers to present international material. Also, most American teachers simply lacked the personal experience and background to make global issues vital to their students. Finally, from this same general standpoint, the American business community and the federal government were faulted for their reluctance to adjust policy and practice to the requirements of an interdependent world.⁴³⁾

From the standpoint of this brief review of international education in the United States since 1950, it is safe to conclude that the all of American education, including higher education, has had a small effect on the internationalization of American society at large. Thousands of people have passed through the various international programs in American education, but the influence of those thousands on the aggregate viewpoint of the mass of Americans seems to have been slight.

It is therefore necessary to recall that when we look at American higher education, we are viewing a small part of the society where some events may be quite

different than those outside the university. This difference seems quite striking in the extent to which many American universities and colleges have focused on international education and have attempted to internationalize their campuses. To really appreciate the depth and detail of these attempts, we turn now to three case studies of internationalization in American institutions of higher education. These cases will help us to extend our understanding of the role of American higher education in the internationalization of American society.

C. Internationalization of American Institutions of Higher Education: Highlights from 3 Case Studies.

Since American institutions of higher education are parts of American society, the internationalization of such institutions constitutes internationalization of parts of the society. While four year, degree-granting colleges and universities are very special institutions, they nonetheless include parts of the lives of many Americans. One of the ways, therefore, of empirically demonstrating and examining the internationalization of American society since 1950 is to look at specific higher education programs in international education begun since that time.

The three programs reported here took place at state-supported institutions. At the time of their operation, in the late 70s and 80s, federal funding for international education had already begun to decline. These programs thus “present a good case for a balanced financial base. More importantly, they argue for strong institutional commitment and a diversified programming focus.” These three institutions are typical of mid-sized comprehensive universities and large doctorate-granting institutions.⁴⁴⁾

1. The University of North Carolina at Charlotte.

After more than five years of planning, the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, located at Charlotte, North Carolina, began its Program of International Studies in 1975. The first year of the program saw three important emphases: a. to develop an academic concentration in international studies for undergraduates; b. to sponsor campus programs designed to increase international awareness among university members; and, c. to respond to the expressed needs of the local business community for expertise in international affairs. From 1975 to 1980, the Program of International Studies experienced the following main events:

1975/76

1. Seven campus events sponsored.
2. First overseas summer study/travel trip conducted
3. Publication begun of *International Studies Bulletin*.
4. Contributions of \$8,200 raised from the business community for faculty and program development.
5. Total operating budget (including personnel) of \$22,500.

1976/77

1. Full-time director and secretary appointed.
2. Half-time position created for foreign student advisor.
3. First grants received--four totaling \$90,000.
4. Eleven campus and community events sponsored.
5. Two overseas summer study/travel trips conducted.
6. Thirty-five students concentrating in international studies.
7. Office moved out of administrative building to main academic complex.
8. Twenty-four faculty members supported in professional development program.
9. Contributions of \$8,200 raised from local businesses.
10. Total operating budget (including personnel) of \$126,200.

1977/78

1. Commitment to international studies reaffirmed through new mission and goals statement.
2. First semester abroad program established.
3. Five grants received totaling \$122,000.
4. Sixteen campus and community events sponsored.
5. Five overseas summer study programs conducted.
6. Advisement given to 116 foreign students and 60 students concentrating in international studies.
7. Five new interdisciplinary courses developed.
8. Seventeen lecturers and visiting speakers sponsored.
9. Twenty-two faculty members assisted under faculty development program.
10. More than \$10,000 received from local businesses.
11. Total operating budget (including personnel) of \$166,000.

1978/79

1. Program for International Studies renamed Center for International Studies.
2. Three additional professional staff members and two support staff members hired.
3. English Language Training Institute developed.
4. Three grants received totaling \$89,000.
5. Advisement given to 200 foreign students and 80 students concentrating in international studies.
6. Sixteen campus and community events sponsored.
7. Thirteen lecturers and visiting speakers sponsored.
8. Twenty faculty members assisted under the faculty development program.

9. First faculty exchange program initiated.
10. First student exchange program initiated.
11. Seven summer travel/study programs conducted.
12. Total operating budget (including personnel) of \$215,000.

1979/80

1. Additional office space allocated, doubling previous amount.
2. Staff size increased to seven professional staff members, six full-time support staff members, and four part-time support staff members.
3. Nineteen activities sponsored on and off campus.
4. Professional activities by thirty-four faculty members supported.
5. Lectures by fourteen off-campus speakers sponsored.
6. Eight summer programs overseas and two semester abroad programs (India and Denmark) sponsored.
7. Two faculty exchanges and four student exchange programs coordinated.
8. Business contributions received totaling \$13,000.
9. Three grants received.
10. Faculty colloquia initiated.
11. Total operating budget of \$400,000 (funds from state, contributions, grants, contracts, and participant fees).⁴⁵⁾

As could be expected of such a large-scale university program, many factors have been involved in its success. Those at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte who were involved in this program were not able to prioritize these factors, but they were able to reach a consensus on a list of seven highly significant elements. First, there was major institutional commitment to international education by the university's top administrative officers. This commitment was demonstrated concretely by "resource allocation, mission and goals statement, and program encouragement."⁴⁶⁾ Second, the entire program received the strong support and endorsement of critical segments of the UNCC faculty. Third, the program was able to secure, fairly early on, the appointment of a full-time director, with a mandate to develop the international program with little administrative interference. The program and its director, in other words, were given the "freedom to take risks."⁴⁷⁾

The third significant element in the program's success was the development of a dedicated and talented professional support staff for the center. The fourth factor reflected the favorable locale of the center's creation, which provided opportunities to develop community programs, which in turn gave the center additional resources for its maintenance and development. Fifth was an element of efficiency gained by centralized administration of all aspects of the international education programs at

UNCC. Avoided in such a situation are costly, divisive, and unnecessary duplications, competitions, and conflicts. Finally, the center could not have happened without the seventh factor which was outside funding from grants, contributions, revenue-generating activities, and contracts.⁴⁸⁾

2. Ohio University at Athens.

In one way or another. Ohio University, founded in 1804 in Athens, Ohio, has had some kind of involvement in international education for almost the entire century of its existence. Like other American institutions of higher education, however, large-scale, university-wide plans and programs did not develop until adequate funds and interest appeared in the 50s and 60s. As early as 1958, the Ohio University College of Education, contracting with AID, undertook to provide assistance to the federal government of Nigeria for educational programs for teachers in Nigeria. Since then, through AID as well as in cooperation with foundations and other government agencies, both domestic and foreign, Ohio University has sent faculty and students abroad to dozens of countries, and hosted study and research by thousands of international students and faculty.⁴⁹⁾ By 1969, because of the growing complexity of the university's international activities and programs, the administration centralized all such activities into a new Center for International Studies. This center included the several area studies programs, the master's degree programs, study abroad programs, the foreign student office, and the administration of AID contracts.⁵⁰⁾

By the early 80s, the center had five main program components. 1. Area studies programs. There were three such programs focusing on Africa, Southeast Asia, and Latin America. In each program, directors coordinate classes and special events, encourage lectures, seminars, and cultural presentations, and supervise degree programs in their areas. 2. Academic programs. Both degrees and certificates are available at the graduate and undergraduate levels. A Master of Arts in International Affairs (MAIA) features an interdisciplinary program that can be completed in one year with five specific concentrations: administrative studies, African studies, development studies, Latin American studies, and Southeast Asian studies. The Bachelor of Arts in International Studies, administered jointly by the center and the College of Arts and Sciences, offers a multidisciplinary approach to the study of major world regions. Two years of a relevant language are required for this degree, with a third year highly recommended. Additional certificate programs can be

taken as minors and award certificates to students who complete a prescribed number of courses on a particular world region.

3. Coordination role. Since the center has only introductory level courses of its own, it must see to the effective and efficient cooperation of many other university entities in order to ensure the stability and quality of its programs. Coordination is thus a crucial activity involving all center staff. 4. Special programs. The center is responsible for several special programs and activities. These include a Peace Corps Office, the Malaysian Advisory Committee, the Fulbright-Hayes Advisor, the Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowships Committee, and a Publications Editorial Board. The Board supervises publications in international studies by the Ohio University Press in cooperation with the center. 5. Overseas agreements. By the early 80s, Ohio University had negotiated 26 agreements with foreign institutions requiring research, contacts, exchanges, or staff development. Although all of these agreements were under the direction of other academic units, the associate provost in charge of the center was part of the initial negotiating group and is expected to provide periodic review of the progress of the arrangements.⁵¹⁾

In accord with university-wide planning requirements, the center received a detailed statement of objectives from the International Studies Program Planning Unit. This statement was completed in 1980 and covered the three-year planning cycle from 1980 to 1983:

- I. Support international academic programs where there is student interest, scholarship, creative accomplishment, and social need.
 - A. Support and strengthen area studies programs (e.g., African studies, Latin American studies, Southeast Asian studies).
 1. Improve remuneration to area directors through released time and summer support equivalent to half-time during the academic year and during the summer.
 2. Add courses in the social sciences, humanities, and fine arts related to Africa, Latin America, and Southeast Asia either by retraining current faculty members or by adding new faculty members, particularly in the areas of Latin American Art, African sociology, ethnomusicology, and the performing arts (including dance and drama).
 3. Strengthen foreign language offerings at Ohio University (particularly, in non-European languages), by providing instruction in Dutch, Portuguese, Arabic, Chinese, and African languages.
 4. Strengthen library acquisitions and services by adding another bibliographer in Alden Library, with specializations in Latin America and Africa, and increasing the acquisition budget for retrospective purchases.
 5. Offer undergraduate international area studies courses yearly and develop advanced undergraduate area studies courses.

6. Establish and offer graduate seminars in area studies.
 7. Promote communications among the area studies faculties through establishment of faculty-graduate student colloquia.
- B. Support and strengthen cross-area studies (e.g., development studies and international administrative studies).
1. Provide a balanced offering of courses or concentrations in the social sciences, humanities, and professional areas through the retraining of current faculty members, particularly in the areas of development administration; international communications; food, nutrition, and development; international health administration; and comparative Third World literature.
 2. Cooperate in the development of the Master of Administration, particularly the option in international administration.
 3. Cooperate in the development of an international option within the Master of Science in Environmental Sciences program.
 4. Submit a proposal for a Center for Development Studies.
- C. Improve curriculum integration and cooperation with departments.
1. Develop dual masters degree programs in international studies combined with linguistics, international business, education, health administration, and communications.
- II. Attract quality students, both American and foreign.
- A. Maintain an enrollment of approximately thirty to thirty-five students in each program option within the Master of Arts in International Affairs (Africa, Latin America, Southeast Asia, Development, and International Administration).
- B. Obtain scholarship and graduate associateship funds commensurate with these enrollment levels, namely:
1. Maintain the special residential scholarship program for foreign students and returned Peace Corps volunteers and regular scholarship funds.
 2. Increase graduate associate stipend funds by 10 percent per year to restore the funds removed from the program by budget cuts during the past five years.
- C. Obtain an enrollment of fifty students in the Bachelor of Arts in International Studies program.
- D. Promote the name of Ohio University among international constituencies--particularly in institutions of higher education, the Peace Corps, and international agencies--through continuous contact and quality publications.
- III. Support staff development, including teaching, research, and creativity.
- A. Expand research opportunities.
1. Identify and regularly publish information about research grant opportunities.
 2. Obtain support from outside agencies for faculty travel abroad for research purposes.
 3. Publish a minimum of twelve papers yearly in the Papers in International Studies series

[published jointly by Ohio University Press and the center] to provide a research outlet.

4. Provide modest funds for travel to professional meetings for faculty members and staff members.

B. Provide opportunities for faculty members to develop and improve area expertise.

1. Obtain support from the Department of Education for faculty preparation and new courses in international development and health.

2. Develop and strengthen relations with institutions of higher education to provide faculty exchange opportunities.

3. Encourage faculty and staff participation in study abroad programs.

IV. Improve academic counseling for students in graduate and undergraduate programs in international studies.

A. Improve the advising system through quarterly advising sessions for students with program directors.

B. Provide international studies degree program advisors with information on each student assigned to them.

C. Develop, through cooperation with the Placement Office, a permanent file on international career opportunities.

D. Maintain and expand the Peace Corps Office to provide information to all interested students.

E. Assist students interested in further study at Ohio University with appropriate information.

V. Provide an attractive learning environment for students.

A. Expand international studies library acquisitions and services.

B. Promote the exchange of information and communication among international studies students through support of the International Forum.

C. Provide a central location for information on study abroad programs and opportunities (including Ohio University Study Abroad programs, Fulbright programs, and other programs).

D. Support artistic and cultural events (visits, lectures, presentations, films, social activities) that provide an international dimension to Ohio University.

E. Provide outlets for quality graduate research through the Publications Office.

VI. Expand opportunities for international education throughout southeastern Ohio.

A. Provide opportunities for adult education and lifelong learning.

1. Restructure outreach courses to make shorter, more intensive, and more focused workshops and minicourses available.

2. Develop telecommunications courses on Asia and Latin America along the lines of the existing Modern Africa television course.

3. Develop seminars, workshops, and speakers programs, in cooperation with colleges and universities in the region.

B. Provide assistance in outreach activities to teachers and schools.

1. Develop curriculum materials for use in primary and secondary schools.

2. Provide opportunities for school visitation by foreign students and faculty.
 3. Serve as a resource center in international education for all levels of education.
- C. Support cooperative efforts and expansion of international education.
1. Work with the International Education Association of Ohio Colleges and Universities on international studies seminars and workshops.
 2. Cooperate with the African Studies Association, the Consortium of Latin American Studies Program, the Association for Asian Studies, the Consortium for International Studies Education, the Institute of International Education, and similar organizations, in the development of international education.⁵²⁾

3. Texas Southern University.

Located in Houston, Texas, Texas Southern University is unusual in this collection because it was first designated exclusively as a university for blacks. and because it still has a predominately black enrollment. By 1984, however, the student body included many nonblacks as well as international students from more than 55 countries. By an act of the state legislature. Texas Southem focuses on the problems and issues of urbanization and therefore offers academic specialization and degrees in urban planning and programming. The university's international programs reflect this specific mission as well as the awareness that urbanization is a worldwide trend. The development of international studies at this university can be seen through the following timeline:

1965	Establishment of the Houston Inter-University African Studies Program
1967	Texas Southern University African Studies Program initiated
1971	Launching of the Teacher Corps/Peace Corps Project
1971	Beginning of the Peace Corps Internship Project
1972	Establishment of the International Program Council
1972	Summer study project in West Africa
1973	Initiation of the Texas Consortium Program
1974	Fulbright-Hayes Conference started
1975	Initiation of the Model United Nations Conference
1977	Linkage exploration with Nigerian universities
1978	Global campus concept enunciated by administration
1978	Establishment of the Office of International Programs
1979	Caribbean/American Exchange Project
1979	Haiti/Texas Southem University agreement
1979	International Studies Center established
1979	Undergraduate International Curriculum Studies Committee approved
1979	Trade mission to Nigeria
1980	Summer project in Haiti

- 1980 Initiation of conference series on international trade and finance
- 1981 Minor concentration in international studies approved
- 1981 Initiation of the Intercultural Film Series
- 1981 Summer study project in Barbados
- 1981 Summer study project in Haiti and the Dominican Republic
- 1981 Proposal prepared for an interdisciplinary master's degree program in international studies
- 1981 Linkage Agreement approved with Kookmin University in Korea
- 1982 Linkage Agreement approved with Universidad Nacional Pedro Henrique Wena⁵³⁾

By 1984, after an evolution of international programs at Texas Southern University over a period of fifteen years, members of the university were prepared to state the strengths and weaknesses of their program. The following sixteen items were considered strengths of the program: "1. An institutional commitment to the support of international studies is a part of the university's mission; 2. There is administrative support for international studies initiatives; 3. A large corps of faculty members have had international training and experience; 4. There are foreign students from more than fifty-five countries; 5. The university is located in a metropolitan city that is a regional center for several large multinational corporations and a hub of international activity; 6. The salary of the director of the Office of International Programs is paid from state funds; 7. The staff of the office is competent and strongly committed to intercultural and international programs and is augmented by a significant number of faculty members who are interested in international projects and programs; 8. A large segment of the university's community clientele is interested in the various international programs and activities sponsored on campus; 9. The location of the Office of International Programs in the Graduate School provides for contacts with all academic departments and facilities making programmatic initiatives institutionwide; 10. There are major workshops and other activities for faculty development that produce strong support from the faculty for curriculum development in international studies; 11. Other universities in the area are interested in interuniversity projects; 12. Texas Southern University has worked with other institutions in Texas to develop and expand international programs at those schools, a venture that has increased the visibility of Texas Southern University's own international programs; 13. The director of international programs reports directly to the vice-president for academic affairs; 14. Budget resources from several sources have provided for a more diversified approach to program development; 15. The minor concentration in international studies at

Texas Southern University will increase student awareness, international training, and employment options; 16. The administration is committed to developing a major in international studies and an area-specific center for international studies."⁵⁴⁾

On the other hand, five program weaknesses centered on the difficulty of obtaining adequate funding for the wide range of desirable and possible international program activities: "1. Adequate funds are lacking to support continuous, systematic planning. Funds derived largely from federal or private sources cannot be relied on if the international studies program is to become an integral part of the institution's curriculum; 2. To articulate international program objectives to the public at large and to many segments of the university community is often difficult. Therefore, frequent activities that require funds must be carried on to maintain program visibility; 3. Adequate staff support is needed to relieve the director, who must often write grant proposals, help implement programs, travel, and develop new initiatives for program development; 4. In a university that has a large population of low-income students, setting up study abroad projects and finding funds to support them is often difficult. Most low-income students must work while attending school and therefore have neither the funds nor the time to participate in study abroad; 5. There is a need to generate greater support for international program development from the private sector. Such support would help to counter the inconsistency in federal support, and it would specifically contribute to training students for service in the corporate sector,"⁵⁵⁾

D. Summary

Our task here is to describe the role of higher education in the internationalization of American society since 1950. The foregoing material, a historical sketch of internationalization in higher education, and samples from the programs of three American institutions of higher education, engaged in extensive international education programs from the 50s to the 80s, have some intriguing implications for our topic.

A close reading of the three institution's material shows scant attention paid to the issue of the internationalization of society beyond the boundaries of the university as a separate institution. The fourteen other universities and colleges, both public and private, detailed in Backman's valuable study show no significant deviations from this impression. Most of the discourse reported, like that in the

sample above, is devoted to establishing and maintaining activities inside the institutions that significantly increase the internal international climate or external connections with other institutions, agencies, or governments which have similar mandates toward international activity. But the specific features of that activity are rarely concerned with increasing the international awareness of American society at large.

It was suggested in the discussion of the meaning of internationalization, in Section II above, that we can clearly distinguish four senses of internationalization: that of science; that of power and productivity; that of a democratic citizenry; and, that of tourism. In attempting to ascribe either intention or outcome to such higher education international programs as described above, it is important to note that the available literature has given us no clear measures to differentiate and describe the outcomes of such programs. The absence of such measures suggests that we must be very circumspect in attempting to connect this material from particular institutions with the question of higher education and the internationalization of American society.

It seems accurate enough to state, especially in view of the prominence of AID, Peace Corps, and Fulbright Programs in both the historical and programmatic material, that the internationalization both of science and of power and productivity have figured heavily in the intention of American international education. It seems equally clear that the internationalization involved in tourism, as a deliberate, programmatic focus, has been the most remote from program intentions of the four kinds of internationalization. This is not to deny, of course, that the tens of thousands of students and faculty who went abroad, and the other tens of thousands who came to the United States, learned nothing in their occasional functions as tourists. Certainly, most of these people acted as tourists in their host countries some of the time, thus both contributing to that industry there and improving, to some extent, their competence as guests in other lands.

However, the absence of crucial kinds of research on international studies programs makes definitive statements about outcomes extremely tenuous. In summarizing his recent exhaustive study of international studies and the American undergraduate, Lambert comments that “[a]lmost all of the evaluation of study abroad has concentrated on the characterological and attitudinal benefits that accrue to individual students. . . .” He reports a surprising “lack of evaluative research on the academic content of study abroad and the substantive knowledge

that students gain.”⁵⁶⁾

It may well be that only indirect and unplanned--unintended--outcomes of internationalization may also be all that can be said for the most controversial kind of internationalization, that of the citizens of the American democracy. Indeed, it does not seem possible at this time to make definite, detailed, and scientifically verifiable statements about the specific quantity and quality of internationalization that higher education has actually contributed to American society since 1950. In the concluding remarks, however, we shall see that cogent and meaningful statements, though not scientific in the strictest experimental sense, can be made that respect and use the available evidence to the fullest possible extent.

IV. Conclusion.

The goal of our inquiry has been to describe the role of higher education in the internationalization of American society since 1950. We began by limiting the consideration of higher education institutions to officially accredited, degree-granting, four year colleges and universities. We then explored the concept of internationalization and found that, in a society as large and complex as that of the United States, internationalization has at least four distinct meanings: 1. The internationalization involved in the traditional practice of science that seeks knowledge without regard for the boundaries of nation, race, language, or religion; 2. The internationalization of the reproduction of power and productivity by which one nation uses the land, people, and resources of other nations to reproduce itself either regardless of or in concert with similar reproduction in the other nations; 3. The internationalization of democracy in which the citizenry of a democratic nation increase their awareness of the facts, aspects, and issues involved in their nation's political and economic relations with other nations; 4. The internationalization of tourism in which individuals and groups travel beyond the borders of their own nation to experience the land, people, and customs of other nations and to return to their own nations with some additional awareness of or involvement in the lifeways of other, nations.

Following the statement and exploration of these conceptual parameters, we looked in detail at the ways in which higher education in America has internationalized its own activities since 1950. We found that institutions of higher education in America were driven primarily by the external funding and agendas of business, government, and foundations. We found that, without such external sources of

funding, most of the international education in American higher education institutions would not have taken place. It became clear, through the historical survey, as well as through a close reading of the details of international education in three universities, that American higher education has primarily reflected rather than initiated international concerns in the broader society, and that American higher education has primarily served the internationalization of its own community rather than of the larger society.

We may now draw upon the internationalizing conditions of American society since 1950 to help complete our picture of the topic. Since 1950, there have been five principal avenues by which American society has been internationalized: a. Immigration; b. War; c. Media; d. Trade; and, e. Tourism. We may delineate, with acceptable accuracy, the relative role of higher education in each avenue. In immigration, the role has been minor. Although many non-US citizens have come to America under the various guises of international education, few have become permanent residents. By far the largest percentage of immigrants have come with no connection to American institutions of higher education. In war, higher education has had a moderate role, due to its providing training, information, and research resources for American military forces. However, the administration of war, particularly of those in Korea and Vietnam, has been far from the nation's campuses. Also, most of the combat personnel in both of those wars, and in the recent Gulf War, have been young people with little or no experience or background in institutions of higher education.

In the media as an avenue of internationalization, higher education may be seen as having had a moderate to strong role. The majority of personnel in the major national media organizations have had some college or university training and education. College and university libraries and archives continually serve the media as sources of information. Professionals and experts from institutions of higher education are frequently interviewed and consulted by media representatives on international issues. In trade, higher education may again be seen as having had a moderate to strong role. Most of the AID contracts, for example, linking institutions of higher education in America with critical situations in other nations, have involved some degree and amount of transfer, from the United States to the other nations, of products and technology made in the United States. These transfers have in turn been part of the growing realization of the American business community that international trade is good business. Professional schools of business,

most of them lodged in four year colleges and universities, have thus become major centers of contact, connection, consulting and exchange between the US and other nations' business communities.

In tourism, higher education has had a small to moderate role. By far the largest percentage of American tourists abroad have gone with no connection to institutions of higher education. However, at the same time, over the decades since 1950, hundreds of thousands of students and faculty have travelled to other nations, under the aegis of international education, and have functioned, to some extent, as tourists. Higher education has thus made a definite, though modest, contribution to the informal internationalization that happens to tourists beyond the explicit, formal limits of contracts and courses.

These findings on the role of higher education in the internationalization of American society since 1950 may be synthesized as follows:

1. *With respect to its own community*, higher education has been the primary source of all four kinds of internationalization--science, power and productivity, democracy, and tourism.
2. *With respect to the society at large*, higher education has been a secondary, facilitating source in the avenues of immigration, war, media, trade, and tourism.
3. *With respect to its own community*, higher education has promoted primarily two kinds of internationalization--that of science and that of power and productivity. Promotions of the internationalizations of democracy and tourism have not been direct or major effects of higher education in its own community.
4. *With respect to the society at large*, higher education has weakly facilitated internationalization in immigration, war, and tourism, and moderately to strongly facilitated it in media and trade. In tourism, it has facilitated the kind of internationalization referred to above as tourism. In trade, it has facilitated the kinds of internationalization referred to above as the reproduction of power and productivity and of tourism. In media, it has facilitated all four kinds of internationalization, but especially, with respect to the larger society, the kinds of internationalizations involved in science and democratic awareness. In war, it has facilitated the internationalizations of science and of the reproduction of power and productivity. In

immigration, it has facilitated the internationalizations of democracy and of tourism.

There is no question, therefore, that higher education has had a significant role in the internationalization of American society since 1950. In the most obvious case, if there had been no universities and colleges, most of the international education programs would not have taken place, regardless of the needs and desires of businesses, governments, and foundations. Such institutions could not simply have created universities and colleges for their own use. Also, without universities and colleges, the major avenues by which scientists in many nations have kept in communication through political and economic change and turmoil would have been closed. Again, without universities and colleges, the major repositories of information and of many kinds of specialized expertise would not have been available to other groups and agencies whose agendas included international activities of various kinds. It is simply not possible, therefore, to think away American higher education since 1950, and to retain the internationalization of the society that has actually occurred.

[REFERENCES]

- 1) Earl L. Backman, *Approaches to International Education*, (New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., 1984), vii.
- 2) Ibid., viii.
- 3) Ibid.
- 4) Elaine Haglund, "The Transition Phase In International Human Resource Development: The Case Of The U.S.A.," *International Education* 16(2)(Spring 1 987), 44-45. See also, Richard D. Lambert, ed., *New Directions In International Education*, (Philadelphia, P.A: The American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1980), 18-30, and, David B. Audretsch and Michael P. Claudon, eds., *The Internationalization of U.S. Markets*, (New York: New York University Press, 1989), ix-xvi and 200-203.
- 5) Ibid., 45.
- 6) Ibid. 7) Ibid.
- 8) Backman, *Approaches*, xiv.
- 9) Ibid., vii.
- 10) Lotty v.d. Berg-Eldering and Ferry J. M. Rijcke, "Introduction," in, Lofty v.d. BergEldering, Ferry J.M. Rijcke, and Louis V. Zuck, eds., *Multicultural Education: A challenge for teachers* (Dordrecht, Holland: Foris Publications, 1983), XI.
- 11) Robert E. Ward, *National Needs for International Education*, (Washington, D.C.: Center for Strategic and International Studies, Georgetown University, 1977), 3.

- 12) Ibid., XXII.
- 13) Ibid., XXIV.
- 14) Raymond H. Giles and Donna M. Gollnick, "Ethnic/Cultural Diversity as Reflected in State and Federal Educational Legislation and Policies," In, Frank H. Klassen and Donna M. Gollnick, eds., *Pluralism and the American Teacher* (Washington, D.C.: AACTC, 1977), 143 ff.
- 15) Backman, *Approaches*, xiv.
- 16) Ibid., xv.
- 17) Steven E. Deutsch, *International Education And Exchange: A Sociological Analysis*, (Cleveland, Ohio: The Press of Case Western Reserve University, 1970), 1.
- 18) Humphrey Tonkin and Jane Edwards, *The World In The Curriculum: Curricular Strategies for the 21st Century* (New Rochelle, N.Y.: Change Magazine Press, 1981), 6.
- 19) C. O. Arndt, comp. and Lawrence H. Conrad, ed., *Programs And Projects For International Understanding: A Report By The Committee On International Relations*, (Oneonta, N.Y.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1956).
- 20) Ibid., 5.
- 21) George M. Beckmann, "The Role of the Foundations," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 356: 12-22 (November, 1964), 12-13.
- 22) Tonkin and Edwards, *The World In The Curriculum*, 30.
- 23) Irwin T. Sanders, Jennifer G. Ward, and James A. Perkins, *Bridges to Understanding: International Programs of American Colleges and Universities*, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1970), 3.
- 24) Tonkin and Edwards, *The World In The Curriculum*, 31.
- 25) Ibid., 32.
- 26) Ibid., 31.
- 27) Backman, *Approaches*, 1.
- 28) Ibid.
- 29) David G. Scanlon and James J. Shields, eds., *Problems And Prospects In International Education*, (New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1968), 11.
- 30) Ibid., 11.
- 31) Ibid., 12.
- 32) Ibid., 12.
- 33) Ibid., 7-8.
- 34) Education and World Affairs, *The University and World Affairs*, (New York: Walker and Company, 1960), 4-5.
- 35) Tonkin and Edwards, *The World In The Curriculum*, 37.
- 36) Ibid.
- 37) Ibid., 37-38.
- 38) Ibid., 38.
- 39) Scanlon and Shields, *Problems and Prospects*, xxi.
- 40) T. Neville Postlethwaite, ed., *International Educational Research: Papers In Honor of Torsten Husen*, (New York: Pergamon Press, 1986), ix-x.
- 41) The Study Commission On Global Education, *The United States Prepares For Its Future: Global Perspectives In Education*, (New York: Global Perspectives In Education, Inc., 1986),

- 12.
- 42) Ibid.
- 43) Southern Governors' Association Advisory Council on *International Education, International Education: Cornerstone of Competition*, (Washington, D.C.: Southern Governors' Association, 1986), 7.
- 44) Backman, *Approaches*, 3.
- 45) Ibid., 12-14.
- 46) Ibid., 14.
- 47) Ibid, 15.
- 48) Ibid.
- 49) Ibid., 84-85.
- 50) Ibid., 90.
- 51) Ibid., 90-93.
- 52) Ibid., 98-102.
- 53) Ibid., 122-23.
- 54) Ibid., 131-32.
- 55) Ibid., 132-33.
- 56) Richard D. Lambert, *International Studies and the Undergraduate*, (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1989), 162.

[BIBLIOGRAPHY]

- Arndt, C.O, comp. and Lawrence H. Conrad, ed., *Programs And Projects For International Understanding: A Report By The Committee On International Relations*. Oneonta, N.Y.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1956.
- Audretsch, David B. and Michael P. Claudon, eds. *The Internationalization of U.S. Markets*. New York: New York University Press, 1989.
- Backman, Earl L. *Approaches to International Education*. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., 1984.
- Beckmann. George M. "The Role of the Foundations." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 356 (November, 1964), 12-22.
- Berg-Eldering, Lotty v.d., and Rijke, Ferry J.M., "Introduction," in, Lotty v.d. Berg-Eldering, Rijke, Ferry J.M., and Zuck, Louis V., eds. *Multicultural Education: A challenge for teachers*. Dordrecht, Holland: Foris Publications, 1983.
- Deutsch, Steven E. *International Education And Exchange: A Sociological Analysis*. Cleveland, Ohio: The Press of Case Western Reserve University, 1970.
- Education and World Affairs, *The University and World Affairs*. New York: Walker and Company, 1960.
- Giles, Raymond H., and Gollnick, Donna M., "Ethnic/Cultural Diversity as Reflected in State and Federal Educational Legislation and Policies," in, Frank H. Klassen and Donna M. Golnick, eds., *Pluralism and the American Teacher*. Washington, D.C.: AACTE, 1977.
- Haglund, Elaine. "The Transition Phase In International Human Resource Development: The Case Of The U.S.A., *International Education* 16(2)(Spring 1987), 42-50.
- Lambert, Richard D. ed. *New Directions In International Education*. Philadelphia, P.A: The American Academy of Political and Social Science. 1980.

- Lambert, Richard D., *International Studies and the Undergraduate*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1989.
- Postlethwaite, T. Neville, ed. *International Educational Research: Papers In Honor Of Torsten Husen*. New York: Pergamon Press, 1986.
- Sanders, Irwin T., Jennifer G. Ward, and James A. Perkins, *Bridges to Understanding: International Programs of American Colleges and Universities*, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1970.
- Scanlon, David G. and James J. Shields, eds. *Problems And Prospects In International Education*. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1968.
- Southern Governors' Association Advisory Council on International Education. *International Education: Cornerstone of Competition*. Washington. D.C.: Southem Governors' Association. 1986.
- The Study Commission On Global Education. *The United States Prepares For Its Future: Clobal Perspectives In Education*. New York: Global Perspectives In Education, Inc., 1986.
- Tonkin, Humphrey and Jane Edwards. *The World In The Curriculum: Curricular Strategies for the 21st Century*. New Rochelle, N.Y.: Change Magazine Press, 1981.
- Ward, Robert E. *National Needs for International Education*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Strategic and International Studies, Georgetown University, 1977.